

FRANCIËLLA VAN DER HEIJDEN, ANNE-RIGT POORTMAN, AND TANJA VAN DER LIPPE
Utrecht University

Children's Postdivorce Residence Arrangements and Parental Experienced Time Pressure

Although the rise in postdivorce joint physical custody has fueled scholarly interest in its impact on children, consequences for parents remain understudied. Because children's residence arrangements determine time and coordination demands associated with child care, this study investigated the relationship between postdivorce residence arrangements and parents' time pressure. Regression analyses on 4,460 formerly married or cohabiting parents in the Netherlands showed that main residence (mother residence, father residence, or joint physical custody) is more strongly related to time pressure than is nonresident parents' visitation frequency. Compared with mother residence, joint physical custody is associated with less time pressure for mothers and slightly greater pressure for fathers, which supports the idea of higher care demands when parents spend more time with their children. The results do not support the role of coordination demands; the extent of interparental contact and the number of transitions the child makes are not related to time pressure.

Joint physical custody of children after divorce has become increasingly common (e.g., Cancian, Meyer, Brown, & Cook, 2014; Trinder,

2010). The terms *joint physical custody*, *shared residence* (the term used in this study), and *shared placement* refer to a residence arrangement in which children alternate living between parents (Bartfeld, 2011). Several countries, such as Australia, the Netherlands, and Belgium, have adopted policies that encourage shared residence, under the assumption that shared residence buffers the negative effects of divorce on children (Fehlberg, Smyth, Maclean, & Roberts, 2011; McIntosh, 2009; Sodermans, Matthijs, & Swicegood, 2013).

There is considerable debate, however, on whether shared residence is beneficial for children (e.g., Harris-Short, 2010). Some scholars suggest that the involvement of both parents in children's lives is beneficial, whereas others note the possible stressful effects of having to transition between parents or of being continually exposed to parental conflict (Amato, Meyers, & Emery, 2009; Cashmore et al., 2010).

Surprisingly, the debate on the pros and cons of shared residence disregards the consequences for parents, although similar arguments may apply (for exceptions, see Botterman, Sodermans, & Matthijs, 2015; Sodermans, Botterman, Havermans, & Matthijs, 2015). Parents are likely to be affected by their children's residence arrangements because child-care responsibilities vary considerably. Shared residence allows parents to benefit from the other parent's resources; as a result of sharing child-care tasks, the demands and stresses of child rearing may decrease. In contrast, shared residence may be particularly stressful because parents must coordinate child-care tasks (Bauserman, 2012).

Department of Sociology, Utrecht University, P.O. Box 80140 Utrecht, Utrecht 3508 TC, Netherlands (f.i.vanderheijden@uu.nl).

Key Words: divorce, living arrangements, nonresidential parents, work-family balance.

We therefore shift the focus to parents and investigate the relationship between children's residence arrangements and the time pressure experienced by parents. Time pressure relates to feelings of not having enough time to meet demands and feelings of being rushed when meeting demands, which may result in psychological and health problems (e.g., Kleiner, 2014; Roxburgh, 2004). Residence arrangements may affect the amount of time parents spend caring for their children and coordinating child care, which might lead to differences in perceived time pressure.

We distinguish between two aspects of residence arrangements: the main residence of the child (i.e., mother, father, or shared residence) and the visitation of nonresident parents. This distinction is important because the child-care tasks and responsibilities that are associated with main residence may be more structural and demanding than those associated with visitation (e.g., Stewart, 1999), thereby suggesting a stronger relationship to time pressure.

To study the relationship between residence arrangements and the time pressure experienced by parents, we use recent large-scale data on formerly married or formerly cohabiting parents with minor children in the Netherlands ($N = 4,460$). The data include a relatively large number of parents with shared residence and detailed measures of residence arrangements and time pressure. We control for conflict between parents and for other family and work demands that are known to affect time pressure.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To understand the relationship between children's postdivorce residence arrangements and time pressure, we follow the work-family literature (e.g., Bianchi & Milkie, 2010) by focusing on the demands that parents must meet (Karasek, 1979). Demands are "structural or psychological claims associated with role requirements, expectations, and norms to which individuals must respond or adapt by exerting physical or mental effort" (Voydanoff, 2005, p. 823). Additional demands increase individuals' feelings of time pressure via the enduring negative stress that demands can create (Kleiner, 2014).

Researchers often distinguish between family demands, such as child care, and work demands (e.g., Bianchi & Milkie, 2010; Van der Lippe,

2007; Van der Lippe, Jager, & Kops, 2006). Although family and work demands may be intertwined and may reinforce one another in their relationship with time pressure, we focus on family demands and control for work demands. We focus particularly on child-care demands, because these are likely to vary between residence arrangements. We distinguish time demands, or the time that parents spend taking care of a child, and coordination demands, or the extra time and energy involved in planning or arranging child care. We assume that both the time demands and the coordination demands associated with child care are important in understanding the relationship between residence arrangements and time pressure. These two types of child-care demands lead to competing expectations about how residence arrangements relate to time pressure.

Time demands are child-care demands that arise from spending time with a child. We expect that independent of other demands, as parents spend more time with a child, they spend more time and energy taking care of the child, thus leading to feelings of time pressure (Roxburgh, 2002). This argument applies to all parents (Craig & Mullan, 2010; Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2003), but especially to divorced parents. Single divorced parents must fulfill all household roles and responsibilities alone, and those who have repartnered are less likely to receive the support and investment that a biological parent would provide (Becker, Salzburger, Lois, & Nauck, 2013). Divorced parents may therefore be more easily overburdened by the demands that they face, resulting in work-family conflict and time pressure (Kendig & Bianchi, 2008; Rose, Hewitt, & Baxter, 2013).

Depending on children's residence arrangements, divorced parents differ in the amount of time that they spend with their children and thus in their time demands. Bakker and Karsten's (2013) qualitative study suggests that sole-resident parents experience more time demands resulting from child care and experience more work-family conflict than do shared-residence parents. Consequently, we expect that sole-resident parents face the most time pressure and nonresident parents the least, with shared-residence parents falling in between. Also, increases in visitation should increase time demands of nonresident parents and decrease the time demands of resident parents.

Coordination demands are parents' logistical challenges of planning and arranging child care (McIntosh, Smyth, Kelaher, Wells, & Long, 2010; Spruijt & Duindam, 2009). For instance, divorced parents must discuss when the child spends time with whom, who transports the child from one household to the other, who takes care of the child when he or she becomes sick, and so on (Smyth, Caruana, & Ferro, 2003). This coordination, and perhaps negotiation, can become quite complex and burdensome (Cashmore et al., 2010) because the process requires time and, even more important, energy, thereby increasing time pressure.

Logistical challenges and planning have been explicitly linked to shared residence because shared residence requires more cooperation than sole residence (Bauserman, 2012). Therefore, coordination demands are likely to be greater in shared residence than in other arrangements (McIntosh et al., 2010; Spruijt & Duindam, 2009). We expect that the greater coordination demands associated with shared residence increase time pressure for these parents relative to sole-resident or nonresident parents. Similarly, increases in frequency of visitation also increase time pressure by elevating coordination demands.

Overall, we contend that time demands are more important than coordination demands because coordination with the other parent is more ad hoc and likely to cost less time and energy than the actual child-rearing activities that occur during time spent with the child. Therefore, we expect that shared-residence parents experience less time pressure than sole-resident parents but more time pressure than nonresident parents because of the different time demands. The time advantage of shared residence over sole residence may, however, be partially offset by greater coordination demands. Conversely, the time disadvantage of sharing residence compared to being a nonresident parent may be further magnified by greater coordination demands.

To evaluate these expectations, we estimate models with and without controlling for coordination demands. We assume that the relationship between residence arrangements and time pressure after controlling for coordination demands is due to time demands. Once controlling for coordination demands, we expect that the time pressure difference between sole-resident parents and shared-residence parents increases

and that the time pressure difference between shared-residence parents and nonresident parents decreases. Analogous arguments can be made for visitation.

Gender Differences

Women generally perform more household chores and spend more time caring for children than men (e.g., Roxburgh, 2006). Previous studies have shown that women experience higher levels of time pressure than men do (Kleiner, 2014; Mattingly & Sayer, 2006; Offer & Schneider, 2011). Moreover, researchers suggest that family demands are more strongly related to time pressure for women because women feel more responsibility for the family domain, whereas men feel more responsibility for the work domain (Bakker & Karsten, 2013; Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2003; Voydanoff, 2002).

Empirical findings have shown that mothers experience more work interference from children than fathers do and that female homemakers experience more time pressure than male homemakers do (Roxburgh, 2002; Voydanoff, 2002). These findings suggest that mothers face more time pressure because they have more demands; they also suggest that similar family demands lead to more time pressure for women than for men. Moreover, the few studies that have focused on the consequences of residence arrangements for parents have shown that residence arrangements matter more for mothers' subjective well-being, social contacts, and leisure activities (Botterman, Sodermans, & Matthijs, 2015; Sodermans, Botterman, Havermans, & Matthijs, 2015; Van der Heijden, Poortman, & Van der Lippe, 2015). Thus, we expect that the differences in time pressure across main residence and visitation will be greater for mothers than for fathers.

Control Variables

First, children's residence arrangements are inseparably linked with conflict between parents (Bauserman, 2012; Trinder, 2010). Although the empirical findings are mixed, most commonly, parents with shared residence had less predivorce and less postdivorce conflict than parents with a sole residence arrangement (Bakker & Mulder, 2012; Melli & Brown, 2008; Sodermans, Matthijs, & Swicegood, 2013). Because conflict is likely to increase overall

levels of stress and, perhaps, time pressure, it is important to take conflict into account as a possible confounder. For instance, if parents with shared residence have low levels of postdivorce conflict, then any observed lower time pressure of shared-residence parents compared to sole-residence parents may be partially attributed to their lower conflict levels.

Second, we control for (other) current family demands. Child-care demands decrease as children age because they become more independent, attend school, and require less care (Bakker & Karsten, 2013; Craig & Sawrikar, 2009; Van der Lippe, 2007). Having more children increases overall child-care demands (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010; Rose et al., 2013). Finally, children's physical, psychological, or social problems represent additional demands that require energy and may increase time pressure (Fitzpatrick, Janzen, Abonyi, & Kelly, 2012). Current family demands also include the presence of a new (non)resident partner, because a new partner is likely to offer support and help the parent with raising children (Amato, 2000; Wang & Amato, 2000). We take into account additional children with this new partner, because these children would increase overall child-care demands.

Third, we control for work demands. The number of working hours is an important job demand that is associated with time pressure (e.g., Rose et al., 2013; Van der Lippe et al., 2006). In addition, highly educated parents are likely to have higher levels of job demands and to experience higher levels of time pressure (Van der Lippe, 2007).

Finally, we control for the predivorce problems of parents and the former union type, because studies suggest that formerly cohabiting fathers are less involved with their children than are formerly married fathers (Tach, Mincy, & Edin, 2010), and parental problems may affect both the choice of residence arrangements and the experienced time pressure.

METHOD

Data

We use the first wave of the survey New Families in the Netherlands (NFN; Poortman, Van der Lippe, & Boele-Woelki, 2014), which was conducted in 2012–2013. Although the primary mode was an online survey, the final reminder asking respondents to participate in the survey

also included a written questionnaire. Approximately 20% of the respondents participated through the written questionnaire. The sample was randomly drawn by Statistics Netherlands and consisted of parents who dissolved their marriage or cohabitation in 2010 and had children younger than age 18. Both former partners were asked to participate; in approximately 30% of former households, both parents met that request. Overall, approximately 39% of the approached parents participated, with higher response rates among formerly married parents than among formerly cohabiting parents (43% and 32%, respectively). On the household level, in approximately 58% of former households, at least one parent participated in the survey. These response rates are relatively high for a web-based survey in the Netherlands, a country with generally low response rates (De Leeuw & De Heer, 2001), especially given this particular group of recently divorced parents, who were likely in the midst of a turbulent period in their life at the time of the survey. Former cohabiters, men (particularly those with children younger than four years old), younger persons, people of non-Western descent, people with low incomes, and those on welfare were underrepresented, whereas men with children officially registered at their address were overrepresented. For the group of former cohabiters, parents from the most urban areas and men with fewer than two children were also underrepresented. Possibly, parents with severe conflicts were less likely to participate, whereas involved parents were more inclined to participate than those who were less involved with their child.

From the initial sample of 4,481 parents, we excluded individuals whose children were older than age 18 ($n = 21$, 0.5%). We used full information maximum likelihood estimation (FIML) to handle missing values for the dependent variable ($n = 16$, 0.4%), independent variables ($n = 294$, 6.6%), or control variables ($n = 135$, 3.0%). The final sample consisted of 1,874 fathers and 2,586 mothers, of which 4,015 parents have complete information for all variables.

Measures

Dependent variable. Experienced time pressure is derived from Garhammer's index of time pressure (Garhammer, 2002; Van der Lippe, 2007). We calculated the mean responses to seven statements on a scale from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 5

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Time Pressure, Children's Residence Arrangements, Coordination Demands, and Control Variables for Men ($n = 1,874$) and Women ($n = 2,586$)

Variables	Men		Women		Range	N of items	α
	M	SD	M	SD			
Time pressure ^a	2.62	0.78	2.71	0.81	1–5	7	.87
Sole-resident respondent	0.08		0.72		0–1		
Nonresident respondent	0.61		0.04		0–1		
Shared residence	0.31		0.24		0–1		
Visitation nonresident respondent per month ^{b, c}	5.46	3.58	3.14	3.96	0–28		
Visitation nonresident ex-partner per month ^{b, c}	3.93	4.37	4.56	3.29	0–28		
Frequency of child transitions	16.93	14.45	15.28	13.80	0–54		
Contact with ex-partner ^a	6.61	1.97	6.47	1.97	1–9		
Predivorce conflict ^a	2.26	0.75	2.46	0.85	1–4	5	.87
Postdivorce conflict ^a	1.83	0.97	1.91	0.96	1–4		
Postdivorce conflictual incidents	2.97	2.57	3.06	2.74	0–8	8	.92
Age of youngest child	9.33	4.27	9.02	4.38	0–18		
Number of children	1.94	0.79	1.89	0.81	1–10		
Children's predivorce problems	0.32		0.38		0–1		
Nonresident new partner ^d	0.29		0.28		0–1		
Coresident new partner ^e	0.28		0.22		0–1		
Children with new partner ^f	0.05		0.04		0–1		
Employed ^g	0.89		0.84		0–1		
Working hours per week ^c	38.78	7.37	26.82	9.36	0–145		
Education ^a	6.60	2.02	6.54	1.87	1–10		
Parental predivorce problems	0.34		0.41		0–1		
Formerly married ^h	0.73		0.70		0–1		

^aHigher values indicate more time pressure, contact, conflict and education. ^bThe visitation variables reported in Table 1 are not mean-centered but were mean-centered in the multivariate analyses. ^cStandard deviations were calculated excluding those that were imputed with the mean value. ^dNonresident new partner: 0 = no partner, 1 = nonresident new partner. ^eCoresident new partner: 0 = no partner, 1 = new coresident partner. ^fChildren with new partner: 0 = no children with the new partner, 1 = at least one child with the new partner. ^gEmployed: 0 = unemployed, 1 = employed. ^hFormerly married: 0 = formerly cohabiting, 1 = formerly married.

(*totally agree*): “I cannot get a proper sleep,” “I am under time pressure,” “I wish to have more time for myself,” “I feel that others put me under time pressure,” “I cannot deal with important issues properly due to lack of time,” “I cannot recover properly from illness due to lack of time,” and “I am under so much time pressure that my health suffers.” This composite measure was approximately normally distributed, with a mean of 2.62 for fathers and 2.71 for mothers, and reliability $\alpha = .87$ for the overall sample. As Table 1 shows, mothers reported slightly more time pressure than fathers.

Independent variables. The first three independent variables concern residence arrangements. Information about residence arrangements was requested for one particular child, the focal

child. The focal child was the respondent's oldest child if all children were younger than age 10 or the youngest child older than age 10 if at least one child was older than age 10. We asked where the focal child resided the majority of the time. If the child resided with one parent, we asked how often the nonresident parent saw the child.

Main residence of the child consisted of three categories indicating whether the child lives most of the time with the respondent, the ex-partner, or both parents an (approximately) equal amount of time (shared residence). These responses were coded into dichotomous variables, with “shared residence” as the reference category. Table 1 indicates that mother residence was most common (61% for fathers, 72% for mothers), followed by shared residence (31% for fathers, 24% for mothers) and father residence

(8% for fathers, 4% for mothers), although there appears to be a noteworthy difference between fathers' and mothers' reports. Previous studies have suggested that men report more father involvement in child care after divorce than their ex-partners (Lin, Schaeffer, Seltzer, & Tuschen, 2004). Alternatively, involved parents, and fathers in particular, might have been more likely to participate in the survey than less involved parents.

We included the following two variables to indicate visitation frequency: ex-partner visitation when the respondent was the sole-resident parent and respondent visitation when the respondent was the nonresident parent. Both variables were constructed from two questions, and they indicate the number of days the child resided with the nonresident parent per month, ranging from zero to 28. Respondents with a sole-residence arrangement were initially asked how many times per year the nonresident parent saw the child. The categories included "never," "once or twice per year," "several times per year," and "once per month or more frequently." We constructed a variable indicating the number of visits per year and divided this figure by 12 to indicate the number of visits per month. If the nonresident parent saw the child more than once per month (which applied to the vast majority of respondents), the respondents were asked to complete a residential calendar. Parents used the calendar to indicate with which parent the child stayed during the day and overnight for each day in four weeks of an average month (Sodermans, Vanassche, Matthijs, & Swicegood, 2014). We counted the number of overnight and daytime stays with the nonresident parent and divided this by two. We then combined the two measures. Although men reported slightly more visitations, nonresident parents saw their child approximately four times per month (Table 1).

If visitation was not applicable for respondents, we allocated them the score of 0. Thus, for nonresident ex-partner visitation, nonresident respondents and respondents with shared residence are coded as 0. Similarly, for nonresident respondent visitation, sole-resident respondents and respondents with shared residence are coded as 0. For ease of interpretation, we mean-centered the visitation variables in the analyses. As a result, the estimates for the main residence refer to the difference between parents with shared residence, sole-resident parents with average ex-partner visitation, and nonresident

parents with average visitation. In addition, the estimates for the visitation variables refer only to those with a visitation arrangement.

We included two measures for coordination demands. The first measured how often the child transitioned from one parent to the other per four weeks of an average month and was computed from the residential calendar (the same calendar as referred to earlier). We counted the number of transitions from one parent to the other in four weeks of an average month. The residential calendar was completed by respondents with shared residence and respondents with sole residence arrangements in which the nonresident parent visited the child at least once per month. Only 125 fathers (6.7%) and 250 mothers (9.7%) saw their child less than once per month, and they were allocated the value of 0 because there are zero transitions when there is no visitation. The maximum value of 54 was allocated when the child spent each day and each night with a different parent. If the respondents indicated that the residential calendar for the first two weeks and the second two weeks of a month were the same, the transitions in the first two weeks were counted twice. The means are quite high, with approximately 15 to 17 transitions per four weeks (Table 1). The standard deviations are approximately 14, indicating that alternating schedules vary substantially, which aligns with previous qualitative findings (Smyth et al., 2003).

Second, we measured coordination demands by the face-to-face, telephone, or e-mail contact frequency between respondents and their ex-partners: 1 = *never*, 2 = *less than once per year*, 3 = *once per year*, 4 = *several times per year*, 5 = *once per month*, 6 = *several times per month*, 7 = *once per week*, 8 = *several times per week*, and 9 = *daily*. The mean is approximately 6.5, indicating that parents had contact on a nearly weekly basis (Table 1). The Kendall's tau association between the two measures of coordination demands is .225.

Control variables. Predivorce conflict consists of the mean of a scale of five items with a reliability of $\alpha = .87$ for the overall sample. Respondents indicated how often there was "tension" or "heated discussion," and how often "strong accusations were made," "partners were not on speaking terms," or "arguments got out of hand." The possible answers included 1 = *never*, 2 = *sometimes*, 3 = *frequently*, and

4 = *often*. Conflict after divorce consists of two measures, with a Kendall's tau association of .479. First, respondents indicated how often there were conflicts or tensions between them and their ex-partners, on a 4-point scale: 1 = *never*, 2 = *sometimes*, 3 = *often*, and 4 = *very often*. Table 1 shows that the mean is 1.83 for fathers and 1.91 for mothers, with a standard deviation of approximately 0.96. Second, we calculated how many incidents occurred after the divorce when the ex-partner "blamed the respondent for things," "said bad things about the respondent to others," "called or came by uninvited," "turned the children against the respondent," "made false accusations towards the respondent," "blackened the respondent's and ex-partner's common history," "scolded the respondent," and "threatened the respondent with physical violence." This procedure resulted in a count variable measuring more severe conflicts ranging from 0 to 8, with a reliability of $\alpha = .92$ for the overall sample. Overall, mothers reported slightly higher levels of conflict than fathers on all measures (Table 1). The Kendall's tau associations of the postdivorce conflict measures with predivorce conflict were .253 and .318, suggesting no problems of multicollinearity.

The age of the (youngest) child is measured in years ranging from 0 to 18 years old. The number of children is measured as a count variable ranging from 1 to 10. The predivorce problems of children are controlled for by a dichotomous variable, coded as 1 when the respondent indicated that any of the children experienced a serious illness, handicap, or social or psychological problem prior to the divorce. Two dichotomous variables indicate whether respondents had a new nonresident or coresident partner, where "no new partner" was used as the reference category. In addition, we computed an additional variable coded as 1 when the respondent had (adopted) children with this new partner.

We employed a dichotomous variable for employment (0 = *not employed*, 1 = *employed*). The number of working hours indicates how many contractual hours the respondents worked per week. We assigned unemployed parents the gender-specific mean for working hours. This allows us to use the employment variable to compare unemployed parents with parents who work an average amount of hours; the working hours variable refers only to working parents (Poortman & Kalmijn, 2002).

Education is measured by asking respondents to indicate their highest attained level of education (1 = *unfinished primary school*, 2 = *primary school*, 3 = *lower vocational education*, 4 = *lower secondary education*, 5 = *intermediate secondary education*, 6 = *higher secondary education*, 7 = *intermediate vocational education*, 8 = *higher vocational education*, 9 = *university*, and 10 = *postuniversity*). We treated this variable as continuous because alternative specifications in which education was recoded into the number of formally required years of education or dummy variables yielded similar results.

Predivorce parental problems were controlled for by a variable coded 1 when the respondent or ex-partner experienced severe physical illness, a handicap, psychological problems, violence, drug or alcohol abuse, or was in contact with the police. Finally, we included a variable indicating whether the former relationship involved (0) *cohabitation* or (1) *marriage*.

Analytical Strategy

We analyzed fathers and mothers separately using linear regression. We included all parents without clustering on the former household level because analyses randomly excluding one of the parents from the same former household or with clustered standard errors yielded similar results. We tested whether the differences between the estimates for fathers and mothers were significant using the equality of regression coefficients test (Paternoster, Brame, Mazerolle, & Piquero, 1998).

We present three models, shown in Table 2. Model 1 included main residence, visitation, and control variables. This model excluded conflict because we aimed to show the difference between models excluding and including this important confounder. Model 2 included predivorce and postdivorce conflict. Model 3 included coordination demands, which allowed us to examine the change in estimates for residence arrangements.

We used full information maximum likelihood (FIML; MLMV in Stata) to account for missing values. In short, this approach computes a likelihood function for each case using all observed information for that case (Enders & Bandalos, 2001). FIML is found to perform well, even under conditions of nonrandom missing patterns, and produces efficient and unbiased estimates (Arbuckle, 1996; Enders,

Table 2. Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Parental Time Pressure, Separated for Men (n = 1,874) and Women (n = 2,586)

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3				
	Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Gender diff.
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	
Intercept	1.506	.159**	1.878	.123**	1.229	.168**	1.660	.132**	1.194	.184**	1.558	.148**	*
Main residence (shared residence)													
Nonresident respondent ^a	-.021	.040	-.078	.084	-.074	.040*	-.148	.084*	-.092	.045*	-.130	.090	
Sole-resident respondent ^a	.015	.073	.166	.038**	-.035	.073	.127	.038**	-.062	.078	.140	.045**	*
Frequency of visits, nonresident respondent ^b	.003	.007	-.019	.020	.008	.007	-.013	.020	.010	.007	-.015	.020	
Frequency of visits, nonresident ex-partner ^b	-.025	.015	-.013	.006*	-.024	.015	-.011	.006*	-.022	.015	-.014	.007*	
Coordination demands													
Frequency of child transitions													
Contact with ex-partner ^c									-.002	.001	.000	.001	
Control Variables									.009	.011	.012	.010	
Predivorce conflict ^e					.066	.026**	.034	.021	.066	.026**	.034	.021	*
Postdivorce conflict ^e					.069	.022**	.106	.019**	.071	.022**	.108	.020**	*
Postdivorce conflictual incidents					.014	.009	.009	.007	.016	.009*	.011	.008	
Age of youngest child	-.008	.005*	-.014	.004**	-.005	.005	-.011	.004**	-.004	.005	-.010	.004*	*
Number of children	-.030	.023	.053	.020**	-.032	.023	.048	.020**	-.031	.023	.048	.020**	**
Children's predivorce problems	.086	.039*	.196	.034**	.066	.039*	.156	.034**	.062	.039	.154	.034**	*
Nonresident new partner ^d	.121	.042**	.070	.037*	.094	.042*	.060	.037*	.094	.042*	.062	.037*	*
Coresident new partner ^e	-.120	.044**	-.057	.043	-.164	.045**	-.076	.042*	-.163	.045**	-.075	.042*	*
Children with new partner ^f	.187	.083*	.042	.081	.187	.083*	.063	.081	.189	.083*	.065	.081	*
Employed ^g	.538	.057**	.084	.044*	.551	.057**	.077	.043*	.554	.057**	.075	.043*	**
Working hours per week	.017	.002**	.011	.002**	.017	.002**	.011	.002**	.017	.002**	.011	.002**	*
Education ^g	.006	.009	.037	.009**	.005	.009	.034	.009**	.005	.009	.034	.009**	*

Table 2. Continued

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3					
	Men		Women	Men		Women	Men		Women			
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE		
Parental predivorce problems	.163	.037**	.113	.033**	.109	.038**	.051	.035	.108	.038**	.050	.035
Formerly married ^b	-.018	.042	-.006	.037	-.009	.042	-.011	.036	-.006	.042	-.009	.036
R ²	.094		.063		.114		.086		.116		.086	

Note. Residence arrangements were represented as two dummy variables with shared residence serving as the reference group. diff. = differences.

^aNonresident fathers do not experience significantly less time pressure than sole-resident fathers (B Model 1 = -.036, B Model 2 = -.039, B Model 3 = -.030; SE = .068; $p > .05$). Nonresident mothers experience significantly less time pressure than sole-resident mothers (B Model 1 = -.244 [SE = .080, $p < .01$], B Model 2 = -.275 [SE = .079, $p < .01$], B Model 3 = -.270 [SE = .079, $p < .01$]). The gender differences between these estimates are significant in all models ($p < .05$). ^bThe visitation variables were mean-centered. ^cHigher values indicate more contact, conflict, and education. ^dNonresident new partner: 0 = no partner, 1 = nonresident new partner. ^eCoreisident new partner: 0 = no partner, 1 = new coresident partner. ^fChildren with new partner: 0 = no children with the new partner, 1 = at least one child with the new partner. ^gEmployed: 0 = unemployed, 1 = employed. ^hFormerly married: 0 = formerly cohabiting, 1 = formerly married.
 * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$, one-tailed.

2001; Enders & Bandalos, 2001). Compared to multiple imputation of missing data, FIML is more efficient, always produces the same results, involves fewer decisions, and is incorporated into the regression analyses (Allison, 2012).

We tested the robustness of our models in several ways. First, we tested the possible nonlinearity of all continuous variables. Nearly all the relationships were linear; for those relationships for which we found indicators of nonlinearity (i.e., serious conflict for fathers), our overall findings did not change. Second, to account for possible income differences, we included register data for the respondents' personal income in 2011 in our analyses. Income had no significant relationship with time pressure and did not change any of the relationships between the other variables and time pressure. Finally, to account for possible differences between formerly cohabiting and married respondents, we estimated fully interacted models. These analyses did not reveal any differences in the variables of main interest. For reasons of parsimony, we included only linear specifications, omitted income, and showed only the results for the total sample of formerly married and cohabiting parents, while controlling for former union type.

RESULTS

Model 1 in Table 2 suggests that neither main residence nor visitation is significantly related to time pressure for fathers. When conflict is controlled for in Model 2, we see that fathers with a shared residence arrangement (reference category) experience significantly more time pressure than nonresident fathers. There is no difference between sole father residence and the other main residence types (see the notes to Table 2). With regard to visitation, we observe no differences in time pressure for fathers.

The relationship between main residence and time pressure is significantly different for mothers than for fathers in Models 1 and 2 ("Gender diff." column in Table 2). The findings regarding main residence are rather similar in Models 1 and 2. In line with our expectations, sole-resident mothers experience more time pressure than mothers with shared residence in Models 1 and 2 (Table 2), although the difference is slightly smaller when conflict is controlled for. When we alternate the reference category, we observe that sole-resident mothers also experience more time pressure than

nonresident mothers in Models 1 and 2 (see the notes to Table 2). Thus, sole-resident mothers experience the most time pressure compared with all other residence arrangements. The difference between nonresident and shared-residence mothers is significant only when conflict is controlled for in Model 2. Nonresident mothers experience significantly less time pressure than shared-residence mothers.

Regarding visitation, Models 1 and 2 reveal that nonresident ex-partner visitation is associated with slightly lower time pressure for sole-resident mothers. When nonresident ex-partners see their children more frequently, sole-resident mothers experience less time pressure, which aligns with our expectations. There is no relationship between nonresident mothers' own visitation and time pressure.

Model 3 introduces contact and the frequency of child transitions as indicators of coordination demands. We argued that coordination demands, by increasing time pressure, would partially offset the time demand advantage of shared residence compared to sole residence and contribute to the time demand disadvantage of shared residence compared to being nonresident. These ideas are not supported because Model 3 (Table 2) shows that coordination demands, as indicated by contact frequency and the frequency of child transitions, are not significantly related to time pressure for fathers. Consequently, we find similar estimates for main residence and visitation in Model 3.

For mothers, we find little change in the relationship between residence arrangements and time pressure. Only the difference between shared-residence and nonresident mothers becomes nonsignificant, which might be due to the small group size of nonresident mothers ($n = 106$).

Control Variables

Pre- and postdivorce conflict are related to greater time pressure among all parents, whereas conflictual incidents do not appear to be related to time pressure (Table 2). Regarding other family demands, our findings align with previous research (Table 2). A larger number of children and children's predivorce problems are related to greater time pressure, whereas older children are related to less time pressure for mothers. For

fathers and mothers, a new coresident partner is associated with less time pressure, whereas a nonresident partner is associated with higher time pressure. Only for fathers is having a child with the new partner associated with higher time pressure.

In line with previous research on work demands, employment and number of working hours are significantly associated with increased time pressure for both fathers and mothers, but significantly more so for fathers (Table 2). Higher education is associated only with greater time pressure for mothers, which is significantly different from fathers.

Regarding characteristics of the former relationship, parental predivorce problems are consistently associated with greater time pressure for fathers. We find no significant differences in time pressure between formerly married and formerly cohabiting parents.

DISCUSSION

Joint physical custody of children has become increasingly common (Cancian et al., 2014; Trinder, 2010). Thus far, the debate on the consequences of this arrangement—also called shared residence—has centered on children (Harris-Short, 2010; Spruijt & Duindam, 2009). The consequences for parents remain largely unexplored, although varying child-care responsibilities across residence arrangements suggest that parents are likely affected as well. Acknowledging that a crucial difference among residence arrangements is the child-care demands parents face, this study has investigated the associations between residence arrangements and feelings of time pressure. We distinguished between time and coordination demands, arguing that these demands vary between residence arrangements, thus leading to differences in time pressure.

Our results suggest that time pressure is greater when parents spend more time with their children. On the basis of time demands, we expected that shared residence may decrease the demands and stresses of child care when compared with sole residence, whereas shared residence may increase the demands and stresses of child care compared with nonresident parents. We found that sole-resident mothers indeed experience more time pressure than shared and nonresident mothers, although the results for shared and nonresident mothers do

not significantly differ. Shared-residence fathers experience more time pressure than nonresident fathers, at least when conflict is taken into account. We found hardly any differences between father residence and the other residence arrangements, which might be due to the small number of sole-resident fathers and nonresident mothers in our sample ($n = 244$, 5.5%) and because of the low prevalence of sole father residence (e.g., Bucx, 2011; Cancian et al., 2014).

Our findings also suggest that the time spent with children plays a more important role than the planning or coordination involved; we found no solid support for the role of coordination demands. We argued on the basis of coordination demands that the lower time demands associated with shared residence compared with sole residence may be (partially) offset by higher coordination demands. Conversely, the higher coordination demands of shared-residence parents vis-à-vis nonresident parents add to the already greater time demands of shared-residence parents. Our measures of coordination demands were, however, found to be unrelated to time pressure, and the estimates for residence arrangements did not change according to our expectations once coordination demands were controlled for.

The findings furthermore suggest that in particular children's main residence (i.e., sole, shared, or nonresident parent) is related to time pressure, whereas visitation of nonresident parents matters less. These findings are in line with our assertion that child-care tasks and responsibilities associated with nonresident parents' visitation may be less structural and demanding than the child-care responsibilities for resident parents (e.g., Stewart, 1999). Therefore, visitation may be less related to time pressure than main residence. We did find one exception, however: Sole-resident mothers experience less time pressure when their former partner sees the child more frequently.

The gender differences in the relationship between residence arrangements and time pressure suggest that residence arrangements have a stronger association with time pressure for mothers than for fathers. Being a nonresident parent or a parent with shared residence might alleviate child-care demands more for mothers than for fathers, whereas being a sole-resident parent is more burdensome for mothers than for fathers. Previous studies have suggested

that family demands weigh more heavily on women than on men, whereas work demands matter more for men (Bakker & Karsten, 2013; Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2003; Van der Lippe, 2007; Voydanoff, 2002). Studies have also shown that female homemakers experience more time pressure than do male homemakers (Roxburgh, 2002). The findings regarding our control variables further corroborate these ideas. Children's characteristics have a stronger relationship with time pressure for mothers, whereas work characteristics (i.e., employment, working hours) have a stronger relationship with time pressure for fathers.

Despite the insights provided by our research, this study has several limitations. Because we rely on cross-sectional data, we cannot make solid causal claims, and there may have been sources of selection we could not account for, such as fathers' job flexibility and mothers' health (Melli & Brown, 2008). Formerly married parents, involved parents, and parents with low levels of conflict may have been more inclined to participate in the survey, which could have led to an underestimation of the role of former union type and serious conflict. The self-selection may have been stronger for men than for women, which may have decreased the likelihood of finding differences between fathers across residence arrangements and may partially underlie the gender differences that we observed. The selection characteristics that we controlled for may be biased by their retrospective measurement. Finally, residence arrangements are measured for only one child. Although this is a common strategy (e.g., Sodermans et al., 2013), residence arrangements may differ across children.

As one of the first studies to examine the relationship between children's postdivorce residence arrangements and the consequences for parents, this study has shown that children's main residence and the accompanying differences in time demands are associated with time pressure. The increase in shared residence after divorce at the cost of sole mother residence may be particularly beneficial for mothers in terms of time pressure. This finding is particularly interesting when shared residence is perceived as a strategy to increase women's labor-market participation and to stimulate a more favorable work-family balance (Smyth & Moloney, 2008). Shared residence is associated with lower time pressure for mothers and may consequently

support a more favorable work–family balance for divorced mothers. Furthermore, shared residence may alleviate stress for mothers, which, in turn, may increase the quality of parenting (Bartfeld, 2011). Whereas work–family conflicts and time pressures are currently the most pressing for mothers, an increase in shared residence may increase both child-care demands and time pressure for fathers, which might lead to a smaller gender gap in experienced time pressure in the (near) future.

REFERENCES

- Allison, P. D. (2012). *Handling missing data by maximum likelihood*. Paper presented at the SAS Global Forum 2012, Orlando, FL. Retrieved from <http://www.statisticalhorizons.com/wp-content/uploads/MissingDataByML.pdf>
- Amato, P. R. (2000). The consequences of divorce for adults and children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(4), 1269–1287.
- Amato, P. R., Meyers, C. E., & Emery, R. E. (2009). Changes in nonresident father–child contact from 1976 to 2002. *Family Relations*, 58(1), 41–53.
- Arbuckle, J. L. (1996). Full information estimation in the presence of incomplete data. In G. A. Marcoulides & R. E. Schumacker (Eds.), *Advanced structural equation modeling* (pp. 243–277). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bakker, W., & Karsten, L. (2013). Balancing paid work, care and leisure in post-separation households: A comparison of single parents with co-parents. *Acta Sociologica*, 56(2), 173–187.
- Bakker, W., & Mulder, C. H. (2013). Characteristics of post-separation families in the Netherlands: Shared residence versus resident mother arrangements. *GeoJournal*, 78(5), 851–866.
- Bartfeld, J. (2011). *Shared placement: An overview of prevalence, trends, economic implications, and impacts on child well-being* (Report to the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families). Madison, WI: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin–Madison.
- Bauserman, R. (2012). A meta-analysis of parental satisfaction, adjustment, and conflicts in joint and sole custody following divorce. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 53, 464–488.
- Becker, O. A., Salzburger, V., Lois, N., & Nauck, B. (2013). What narrows the stepgap? Closeness between parents and adult (step)children in Germany. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75(5), 1130–1148.
- Bianchi, S. M., & Milkie, M. A. (2010). Work and family research in the first decade of the 21st century. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 705–725.
- Botterman, S., Sodermans, A. K., & Matthijs, K. (2015). The social life of divorced parents. Do custody arrangements make a difference in divorced parents' social participation and contacts? *Leisure Studies*, 34(4), 487–500.
- Bucx, F. (Ed.). (2011). *Gezinsrapport 2011 [Family Report 2011]*. The Hague, Netherlands: Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau.
- Cancian, M., Meyer, D. R., Brown, P. R., & Cook, S. T. (2014). Who gets custody now? Dramatic changes in children's living arrangements after divorce. *Demography*, 51, 1381–1396.
- Cashmore, J., Parkinson, P., Weston, R., Patulny, R., Redmond, G., Qu, L., ... Katz, I. (2010). *Shared care parenting arrangements since the 2006 Family Law reforms: Report to the Australian Government Attorney-General's Department Sydney*. Sydney: Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales.
- Craig, L., & Mullan, K. (2010). Parenthood, gender and work–family time in the United States, Australia, Italy, France, and Denmark. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(5), 1344–1361.
- Craig, L., & Sawrikar, P. (2009). Work and family: How does the (gender) balance change as children grow? *Gender, Work & Organization*, 16, 684–709.
- De Leeuw, E. D., & De Heer, W. (2001). Trends in household survey nonresponse: A longitudinal and international comparison. In R. M. Groves, D. A. Dillman, J. L. Eltinge, & R. J. A. Little (Eds.), *Survey nonresponse* (pp. 41–54). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Enders, C. K. (2001). The performance of the full information maximum likelihood estimator in multiple regression models with missing data. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 61(5), 713–740.
- Enders, C. K., & Bandalos, D. L. (2001). The relative performance of full information maximum likelihood estimation for missing data in structural equation models. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 8(3), 430–457.
- Fehlberg, B., Smyth, B., Maclean, M., & Roberts, C. (2011). Legislating for shared time parenting after separation: A research review. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family*, 25(3), 318–337.
- Fitzpatrick, T., Janzen, B., Abonyi, S., & Kelly, I. (2012). Factors associated with perceived time pressure among employed mothers and fathers. *Psychology*, 3(2), 165–174.
- Garhammer, M. (2002). Pace of life and enjoyment of life. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(3), 217–256.
- Harris-Short, S. (2010). Resisting the march towards 50/50 shared residence: Rights, welfare and equality in post-separation families. *Journal of Social Welfare & Family Law*, 32(3), 257–274.

- Karasek, R. A., Jr. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(2), 285–308.
- Kendig, S. M., & Bianchi, S. M. (2008). Single, cohabitating, and married mothers' time with children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(5), 1228–1240.
- Kleiner, S. (2014). Subjective time pressure: General or domain specific? *Social Science Research*, 47, 108–120.
- Lin, I.-F., Schaeffer, N. C., Seltzer, J. A., & Tuschen, K. L. (2004). Divorced parents' qualitative and quantitative reports of children's living arrangements. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 385–397.
- Mattingly, M. J., & Sayer, L. C. (2006). Under pressure: Gender differences in the relationship between free time and feeling rushed. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 205–221.
- McIntosh, J. E. (2009). Legislating for shared parenting: Exploring some underlying assumptions. *Family Court Review*, 47(3), 389–400.
- McIntosh, J., Smyth, B., Kelaher, M., Wells, Y., & Long, C. (2010). *Post-separation parenting arrangements and developmental outcomes for infants and children: Collected reports*. Victoria, Australia: Family Transitions.
- Melli, M. S., & Brown, P. R. (2008). Exploring a new family form: The shared time family. *International Journal of Law Policy and Family*, 22(2), 231–269.
- Nomaguchi, K. M., & Milkie, M. A. (2003). Costs and rewards of children: The effects of becoming a parent on adults' lives. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65(2), 356–374.
- Offer, S., & Schneider, B. (2011). Revisiting the gender gap in time-use patterns multitasking and well-being among mothers and fathers in dual-earner families. *American Sociological Review*, 76(6), 809–833.
- Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P., & Piquero, A. (1998). Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficients. *Criminology*, 36(4), 859–866.
- Poortman, A., Van der Lippe, T., & Boele-Woelki, K. (2014). *Codebook of the survey New Families in the Netherlands (NFN): First wave*. Utrecht, Netherlands: Utrecht University.
- Poortman, A. R., & Kalmijn, M. (2002). Women's labour market position and divorce in the Netherlands: Evaluating economic interpretations of the work effect. *European Journal of Population/Revue Européenne de Démographie*, 18(2), 175–202.
- Rose, J., Hewitt, B., & Baxter, J. (2013). Women and part-time employment: Easing or squeezing time pressure? *Journal of Sociology*, 49(1), 41–59.
- Roxburgh, S. (2002). Racing through life: The distribution of time pressures by roles and role resources among full-time workers. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 23(2), 121–145.
- Roxburgh, S. (2004). "There just aren't enough hours in the day": The mental health consequences of time pressure. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 45(2), 115–131.
- Roxburgh, S. (2006). "I wish we had more time to spend together...": The distribution and predictors of perceived family time pressures among married men and women in the paid labor force. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 529–553.
- Smyth, B., Caruana, C., & Ferro, A. (2003). Shared parenting: The views of separated parents with 50:50 care arrangements. *Family Matters*, 65, 48–55.
- Smyth, B., & Moloney, L. (2008). Changes in patterns of post-separation parenting over time: A brief review. *Journal of Family Studies*, 14(1), 7–22.
- Sodermans, A., Botterman, S., Havermans, N., & Matthijs, K. (2015). Involved fathers, liberated mothers? Joint physical custody and the subjective well-being of divorced parents. *Social Indicators Research*, 112, 257–277.
- Sodermans, A. K., Matthijs, K., & Swicegood, G. (2013). Characteristics of joint physical custody families in Flanders. *Demographic Research*, 28, 821–848.
- Sodermans, A. K., Vanassche, S., Matthijs, K., & Swicegood, G. (2014). Measuring postdivorce living arrangements: Theoretical and empirical validation of the residential calendar. *Journal of Family Issues*, 35(1), 125–145.
- Spruijt, E., & Duindam, V. (2009). Joint physical custody in the Netherlands and the well-being of children. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 51(1), 65–82.
- Stewart, S. D. (1999). Disneyland dads, Disneyland moms? How nonresident parents spend time with absent children. *Journal of Family Issues*, 20(4), 539–556.
- Tach, L., Mincy, R., & Edin, K. (2010). Parenting as a "package deal": Relationships, fertility, and nonresident father involvement among unmarried parents. *Demography*, 47(1), 181–204.
- Trinder, L. (2010). Shared residence: A review of recent research evidence. *Child & Family Law Quarterly*, 22, 475–498.
- Van der Heijden, F., Poortman, A., & Van der Lippe, T. (2015). *Children's postdivorce residence arrangements and parents' contact with their parents, neighbors, and friends*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Van der Lippe, T. (2007). Dutch workers and time-pressure: Household and workplace characteristics. *Work, Employment and Society*, 21(4), 693–711.

- Van der Lippe, T., Jager, A., & Kops, Y. (2006). Combination pressure: The paid work–family balance of men and women in European countries. *Acta Sociologica*, *49*(3), 303–319.
- Voydanoff, P. (2002). Linkages between the work–family interface and work, family, and individual outcomes: An integrative model. *Journal of Family Issues*, *23*(1), 138–164.
- Voydanoff, P. (2005). Toward a conceptualization of perceived work–family fit and balance: A demands and resources approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *67*(4), 822–836.
- Wang, H., & Amato, P. R. (2000). Predictors of divorce adjustment: Stressors, resources and definitions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *62*, 655–668.