

TARA KOSTER<sup>1</sup>, ANNE-RIGT POORTMAN, AND TANJA VAN DER LIPPE<sup>2</sup> *Utrecht University*PAULINE KLEINGELD *University of Groningen\**

## Parenting in Postdivorce Families: The Influence of Residence, Repartnering, and Gender

**Objective:** This study investigates the role of residence (including shared residence), repartnering (including LAT relationships), and additional children (step- and half-siblings) on parenting in postdivorce families, and whether patterns differ by gender and type of parenting behavior.

**Background:** Patterns of parenting are indicative of how parents redefine their roles and responsibilities after divorce and repartnering, but extant research has largely overlooked parenting across a full array of postdivorce families.

**Method:** The analyses were based on data from Wave 2 of the New Families in the Netherlands survey, which was conducted among a random sample of divorced or separated heterosexual parents with minor children (N = 2,778).

**Results:** Residence was highly relevant for parenting in regular care, leisure, irregular care,

and influence in child-related decision-making. Repartnering and additional children had smaller effects and it mattered which type of parenting behavior was considered, but they were generally associated with lower parental engagement, except for decision-making influence. Gender differences were only found for decision-making influence, showing that variations in parenting across residence arrangements or between repartnered or single parents were more pronounced for mothers than fathers.

**Conclusion:** Residence was more strongly related to parenting than repartnering, and the strength and nature of associations varied between parenting behaviors. Influence in decision-making stood out as a distinct parenting behavior; and also the frequency and obligatory nature of parent-child activities mattered.

### INTRODUCTION

Parenting has become increasingly complex because of the rise in divorce and repartnering (Amato, 2000). Parenting is more complex after divorce (or more generally, separation), because family members live in multiple households—with children residing with one parent most of the time (i.e., sole residence), or living alternately with each parent (i.e., shared residence or joint physical custody). When parents start a new relationship, new parent figures and possibly additional children enter the family, which may lead to a redefinition of parental roles and involvement. This

Department of Sociology, Utrecht University, Padualaan 14, 3584 CH Utrecht, The Netherlands (t.koster@uu.nl).

\*Department of Ethics, Social and Political Philosophy, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands.

© 2020 The Authors. *Journal of Marriage and Family* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of National Council on Family Relations.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

**Key Words:** child custody, divorce, family structure, gender, parenting.

study focuses on biological parents' parenting across postdivorce families and examines how residence, repartnering, and their interplay shape patterns of parenting. Parenting refers to a broad range of parent-child activities as well as parents' influence in child-related decision-making. It is important to study patterns of postdivorce parenting, because these are indicative of how parents redefine their roles and responsibilities after divorce and repartnering. In addition, parental involvement is important for children's well-being and development (Amato, 2000).

Existing studies have consistently found that nonresident parents are less involved with their child than resident parents, suggesting that residence is a key factor in explaining parenting behaviors (Bastaits et al., 2014; Hawkins et al., 2006). Resident mothers are found to be generally more engaged in (different types of) parenting than resident fathers (Dufur et al., 2010; Lee & Hofferth, 2017). Findings about gender differences in parenting for nonresident parents are less conclusive, with some studies indicating that they adopt similar, low-involved parenting styles, whereas others suggest that nonresident mothers are more engaged than nonresident fathers (Kielty, 2006; King, 2007; Stewart, 1999). Research on parenting in the increasingly common shared residence arrangement is scarce, but indicates that shared resident parents are more involved with their child than nonresident parents (Bastaits et al., 2014).

Another strand of literature has examined the role of repartnering. Repartnering typically refers to co-residing with a new partner (be it married or not). This literature is largely separate from the residence literature (Bastaits & Mortelmans, 2017) and has focused on nonresident fathers and their child-support payments or frequency of visitation, and more recently also on qualitative parenting behaviors (Kalmijn, 2015; McGene & King, 2012). Some studies have found that repartnering reduces nonresident fathers' parenting (Juby et al., 2007; Kalmijn, 2015). Other studies have found this to be the case only when they have additional children, suggesting that it is important to distinguish between repartnering and the role of new parenting responsibilities (Manning & Smock, 2000; McGene & King, 2012). Studies that include nonresident mothers, resident parents, and particularly parents in shared

residence are scarce and yield mixed findings. For example, studies found that repartnered resident parents, both fathers and mothers, were less involved with their child from a prior union than their single counterparts, whereas others reported no differences between resident mothers, either repartnered or single (Carlson & Berger, 2013; Hawkins et al., 2006; Thomson et al., 2001). Some studies even found that repartnering had a positive effect on parenting (Bastaits & Mortelmans, 2017).

The current study contributes to prior research first by combining the separate strands of literature on residence and repartnering. We consider both residence and repartnering and examine their interplay, showing whether repartnering has different effects on parenting depending upon whether parents reside with the child. Second, in case of repartnering, we include living-apart-together (i.e., LAT) relationships and the role of stepchildren and shared children. Separating repartnering from additional children has not been systematically done in prior research. Third, we take into account shared residence. The rise in shared residence in many Western countries, offering increased opportunities for both parents to remain close with their child after divorce, merits studying parenting in this residence arrangement. Fourth, we study the role of gender across a wide range of postdivorce families. Prior research mainly compared within one gender (Castillo et al., 2011; Thomson et al., 2001), or compared fathers and mothers in only a limited number of family structures (Lee & Hofferth, 2017; Stewart, 1999). Fifth, we distinguish multiple parenting behaviors. Most researchers have studied parenting in routine care—the more obligatory and regularly occurring activities necessary for the child's daily functioning (e.g., taking the child to school or sports). We also include less obligatory activities, such as leisure (e.g., playing a game) and irregular care (e.g., attending parent-teacher meetings). We furthermore include parents' influence in child-related decision-making (e.g., about medical treatment child). Patterns of parenting across postdivorce families may depend on the specific type of parenting behavior.

We use the New Families in the Netherlands survey (NFN; Poortman et al., 2014, 2018). These data include extensive information about parenting and family structure of a

large sample of divorced and separated parents, yielding enough cases to study a wide variety of postdivorce families.

### *Residence and Parenting*

Residence arrangements shape parents' opportunities for and constraints on parenting. Resident parents may be more involved with their child than their nonresident counterparts because they have greater access to the child (Castillo et al., 2011; Furstenberg & Nord, 1985). Living together in the same house allows resident parents to spend time with and be close to the child, and to take primary responsibility for the child's daily care. Nonresident parents are more constrained in their access to their child, because they often face practical barriers to maintain contact (e.g., geographical distance and time), which hinder high-level parenting (Hawkins et al., 2006). Also the child may decide to have less contact with the nonresident parent, which negatively affects engagement in parenting. The involvement of parents in shared residence is expected to be in between that of resident parents and nonresident parents. In shared residence, the child spends about an equal amount of time in both parents' home (Nielsen, 2011). This offers both parents the opportunity to remain actively involved in parenting, more so than nonresident parents.

Opportunities for parenting may also depend on parents' gatekeeping behavior. In intact families, parents often actively promote each other's involvement with their child, which is referred to as positive gatekeeping (Pruett et al., 2006). Gatekeeping in divorced contexts is more restrictive for the nonresident parent (i.e., negative gatekeeping), because of a protective resident parent (Pruett et al., 2006). The resident parent may limit the nonresident parent's access to the child by not allowing (face-to-face) contact beyond the agreed upon visitation schedules. Nonresident parents' opportunities to be involved with their child are then reduced. Parents in shared residence likely engage in positive gatekeeping because they often desire that the child maintains a close relationship with both of them (Nielsen, 2011). In sum, we hypothesize that: (H1) Resident parents are most involved with their child, followed by parents in shared residence and nonresident parents, respectively.

### *Repartnering, Additional Children, and Parenting*

Repartnered parents (be it co-residing with a new partner or not) may either be more or less involved with their child from a prior union than those who did not repartner. Repartnering, particularly when co-residing with a new partner, may increase parenting because parents have more time available: household chores can be shared with the new partner and the extra financial resources brought in by the new partner allow parents to work less (Bastaits & Mortelmans, 2017). In contrast, repartnering may also distract parents from spending time with their child because they shift their attention to the new partner (Manning & Smock, 2000). Repartnered parents may perceive competing loyalties between their child and their partner, which may result in trading parenting responsibilities for responsibilities to the new partner. The child may therefore have less social capital as the repartnered parent may invest less in the child, thus limiting the child's access to the parent's resources (Coleman, 1988; Coleman et al., 2000). Moreover, when the repartnered parent has children with the new partner (i.e., shared children) or when the new partner has children from a prior union (i.e., stepchildren), the repartnered parent has to take care of additional children. In case of additional parenting responsibilities, the child's access to the parent's resources may be even less as there is less time and energy available to dedicate to this child. Also the child may distance him or herself from the repartnered parent, thereby restricting the opportunities for parenting (Kalmijn, 2015). Children may find it difficult to accept that their parent has a new partner, or they may not get along well with the stepparent (and/or possibly step- and half-siblings). Furthermore, the new partner may be actively engaged in the child's parenting (Meggiolaro & Ongaro, 2015). He or she may do so to show that (s)he is a good partner or because the repartnered parent may pull the new partner into new parenting responsibilities. Because parenting tasks are then shared, the biological parent's involvement may decrease.

Prior research has focused on co-resident new partners and their findings are mixed. Note that it is difficult to compare the results, because studies focus on different residence arrangements (e.g., resident and/or nonresident parents), different outcome measures (e.g., relationship quality, parent-child activities),

and different samples (e.g., children's different ages, recent or older data collection). Although some studies have found a positive effect (Meggiolaro & Ongaro, 2015) or no effect at all of repartnering—or only in case of new parenting responsibilities—(Carlson & Berger, 2013; Manning et al., 2003), most studies have suggested a negative effect of repartnering on parenting (Juby et al., 2007; Tach et al., 2010). We therefore expect: (H2) Repartnered parents, particularly when they co-reside with their partner and/or have additional parenting responsibilities, are less involved with their child from a prior union than parents without a new partner.

#### *Residence, Repartnering, and Parenting*

Nonresident parents may be more likely to shift their investments to the new partner than resident parents and parents in shared residence. Because the child is not living with them, it may be easier and less stressful to shift the focus to the new family with whom residence is shared (Manning & Smock, 2000). In contrast, resident parents and parents in shared residence (alternately) share a household with their child, which means that parenting goes on. Because of these greater and more continuing parenting responsibilities, particularly among sole resident parents, they probably do not shift their focus to the new partner as strongly as nonresident parents do. We thus expect the following: (H3) The negative effect of repartnering on parenting is the strongest for nonresident parents, followed by parents in shared residence and then resident parents. Note that we refrain from expectations about interactions between additional children and residence, because we cannot test these given the small number of cases in some combinations of additional children and residence.

#### *Gender Differences in Residence and Repartnering on Parenting*

Although access to the child is more limited for nonresident mothers than for (shared) resident mothers, the often close relationship with the child prior to the divorce and strong norms about motherhood may lead nonresident mothers try to compensate by being as involved as possible (Kielty, 2006; Scott et al., 2007). Because fathers are expected to be the primary breadwinner instead of primary caretaker, nonresident fathers may feel less pressure than nonresident mothers

to compensate by actively engaging in different parenting tasks (Furstenberg & Nord, 1985; Stewart, 1999). Hence, fathers' involvement is expected to be more varied across residence arrangements than mothers'.

For similar reasons, repartnering may have a greater impact on fathers' engagement with the child. Because mothers likely feel more pressure to contribute to parenting than fathers and generally have a stronger bond with their child (Scott et al., 2007), they may be more likely than fathers to maintain their original parental role and less inclined to shift their attention to a new partner. In contrast to mothers, fathers are not necessarily viewed as "bad" fathers when they spend less time on parenting, because society does not expect them to be the primary caregiver (Kielty, 2006). This makes it more socially acceptable for fathers to focus on a new partner than for mothers (Manning & Smock, 2000). We thus expect the following: The effects of (H4) residence and (H5) repartnering on parenting are stronger for fathers than mothers. Although the interplay between residence and repartnering may also differ between fathers and mothers, we refrain from expectations because we cannot test these given the small number of cases in some combinations of gender, residence, and repartnering. For similar reasons, we cannot test interactions between additional children and gender.

#### *Type of Parenting Behavior*

The role of residence and repartnering may depend on the type of parenting behavior. Resident and shared resident parents spend a lot of time with their child, allowing for parenting in a wide range of parent-child activities, from leisure to providing daily routine care. Nonresident parents see their child less often. In the limited time they spend together, nonresident parents may be more restricted or less motivated to be engaged in caring activities. Especially more obligatory and frequent activities necessary for the child's daily functioning (e.g., taking the child to school or sports) may be done more often by the resident parent because the most common visitation schedules typically include stays at the nonresident parent's house during weekends. Instead, nonresident parents may be more inclined to engage in leisure activities (Furstenberg & Nord, 1985; Stewart, 1999). This suggests that involvement in leisure may vary less across residence arrangements than

involvement in (routine) caring activities. Parents' influence in child-related decision-making may vary least across residence arrangements, as decision-making power is less tied to actually having access to the child. Moreover, in many Western countries, including the Netherlands, automatic continuation of joint parental authority after divorce is regulated by law, suggesting that residence should not matter regarding parents' decision-making.

In case of repartnering, parents need to divide their time between their child and their new partner (Thomson et al., 2001). It is difficult for repartnered parents to reduce their time spent on regular, routine care activities, as these activities are more obligatory and important for daily functioning of the child. Irregular care and particularly leisure activities are less demanding and less part of the child's routine care. It may therefore be easier to reduce the time spent on these activities, suggesting a stronger negative effect of repartnering on parenting in irregular care and leisure than in regular care. The smallest difference between repartnered parents and non-repartnered parents may be found for parents' influence in child-related decision-making, as deciding on important issues in the child's life is less bound by time restrictions than involvement in parent-child activities.

#### *Selection into Residence or Repartnering*

It is important to be aware of parents' possible selection into particular postdivorce family types. Research has shown that parents who opt for shared residence might possess certain desirable traits (e.g., high socioeconomic status, low predivorce conflict) that not only affect their choice for this particular residence arrangement (Cancian et al., 2014) but also their parenting behavior (Poortman & Van Gaalen, 2017). Similarly, selection into sole father custody (e.g., high predivorce involvement, mother's health limitations or financial problems) may affect parental involvement (Golombok & Tasker, 2015; Kitterød & Lyngstad, 2014). Research on repartnering has shown several factors to affect new union formation, such as attitudes, personality traits or socioeconomic status (De Graaf & Kalmijn, 2003; Pasteels & Mortelmans, 2017), which have also been found to affect parenting (Bulanda, 2004; Manning et al., 2003). To address possible selection issues, analyses control for a wide

range of parental demographic and predivorce relationship characteristics. As we do not have information about parents' health, personality traits, or attitudes, we cannot completely rule out the possibility of selection.

## METHOD

### *Data*

We used the survey New Families in the Netherlands (Poortman et al., 2014, 2018; Poortman & Van Gaalen, 2019a, 2019b). Because questions about parenting were not included in Wave 1 (2012/13), we only used Wave 2 (2015/16). The sampling of the first wave was done by Statistics Netherlands (CBS). CBS has access to register data about the complete Dutch population, which allows for sampling on specific criteria, such as parenthood and marital status. A random sample was drawn from the population of formerly married or cohabiting heterosexual parents with minor children who officially divorced (for married parents) or started living apart (for cohabiting parents) in 2010. Both ex-partners were sent a letter by post inviting them to complete an online survey. A gift voucher of €5 was enclosed. The final reminder included a paper-and-pencil questionnaire. For about one third of the contacted former households, both ex-partners participated. The response rate in Wave 1 was 39% among persons and 58% among households. These response rates are comparable to other Dutch family surveys, and relatively high considering that NFN uses an online mode and targets a group of recently divorced parents (Poortman et al., 2014). In total, 4,481 parents participated in Wave 1, with former cohabiters, men (particularly those with young children), younger persons, people of non-western descent, and people on low incomes and on welfare being underrepresented. Participants of Wave 1 were invited to participate in Wave 2, in which a similar procedure was followed. Both ex-partners participated for about one fifth of the former households. The response rate was 63% on the individual level, adding up to 69% on the household level, with a total of 2,544 participating parents. Besides re-approaching parents of the first wave, a refreshment sample of parents with minor children who divorced or separated in 2010 was approached. At the time of Wave 1, CBS provided a list of extra respondents, which was

meant to be used in case response rates would have been extremely low. As these respondents were not used for Wave 1, they were approached for Wave 2 to compensate for panel attrition. For a quarter of the former households, both ex-partners participated. The response rate was 32% among persons and 52% among households, resulting in 920 participants in the refreshment sample. Both samples of Wave 2 were—as in Wave 1—selective on former union type, gender, age, ethnicity, and main source of income. Especially the lower educated and people who were less satisfied with their lives were more likely to drop out after the first wave. The total sample consisted of 3,464 respondents (original sample:  $n = 2,544$ ; refreshment sample:  $n = 920$ ).

Parents provided information on a focal child who was selected in Wave 1. If at least one of the children was 10 or older at the time of Wave 1, parents reported about the youngest child of 10 or older. If all children were younger than 10, parents reported on the oldest child. Parents answered questions about the same child in Wave 2. Because Wave 2 took place about 3 years after Wave 1, the cut-off age for selecting the focal child was 13 years old for parents in the refreshment sample. Although ex-partners received similar instructions and questions, some of them reported about a different child (18%), as information on the child's gender and age did not coincide. In case both former partners participated, we furthermore found that the father more often than the mother reported shared residence (44.1% according to the father and 38.1% according to the mother) or father residence (6.5% according to the father and 5.3% according to the mother). Because either report may be "true," the analyses include both partners' reports (see Section 2.5).

We excluded respondents who had children with a same-sex ex-partner ( $n = 12$ ). Cases were also excluded when the focal child was older than 18 years of age ( $n = 506$ ), because the measures for parenting were less relevant for older children. Respondents with another residence arrangement than sole- or shared residence for the focal child were excluded ( $n = 102$ ). Respondents with a missing value on the four dependent variables that represent different parenting behaviors were also excluded ( $n = 44$ ). Finally, we excluded cases with missing values on all other variables used in the analyses ( $n = 22$ ). The final sample consisted of 2,778 respondents

(from 2,363 households), of which 74% was previously married. Note that this percentage also includes a small group of registered partners (4%), who have almost the same legal status in the Netherlands as married couples.

### *Measures of Dependent Variables*

*Regular Care and Leisure.* Respondents reported how often (1 = *Not* to 7 = *Few times per day*) they spent time with their child during the last month in the following eight activities: "Dropping child off or picking child up from school or sports," "Having dinner together," "Helping with school or homework," "Talking with child about issues in child's life," "Doing household tasks together," "Playing a game or doing crafts," "Watching television," and "Leisure activities away from home, such as to the zoo." From the first five items measuring *regular care*, we created a scale by taking the mean (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.86$ ). We also calculated the mean score on the latter three items measuring *leisure* (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.80$ ).

*Irregular Care.* Respondents reported how often (1 = *Almost never* to 5 = *Always*) they participated in four activities: "Look after child when ill," "With child to doctor, hospital or dentist," "Attend child's play, presentation or competition," and "Attend parent-teacher meetings." We calculated the mean score on these items (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.83$ ).

*Influence in Child-Related Decision-Making.* Respondents indicated how much influence (1 = *Very little* to 5 = *A lot*) they had in decisions regarding: "School child," "Sport or musical instrument child," "Medical treatment child," and "What to allow child, such as what time to go to bed." A scale was created by taking the mean (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.91$ ).

Note that for all items involved in the four dependent variables, respondents could also choose the answer category "Not applicable" (e.g., Child is too old or too young). We treated these respondents as having a missing value on these particular items. Respondents were included when they had a non-missing value on at least one of the items included in the scale. For some items, we found missing values of about 10%, as these items indicate activities for which children are too young (e.g., helping with school) or too old (e.g., dropping off/picking

up), or that may not be relevant at all (e.g., influence sport/musical instrument). Also note that for every dependent variable, exploratory factor analyses revealed a single factor behind the items, with sufficiently high factor loadings (range factor loadings regular care 0.69–0.81; leisure 0.60–0.87; irregular care 0.70–0.85; influence 0.79–0.91). Correlations between the different parenting behaviors were statistically significant and positive, ranging from  $r = 0.46$  (between leisure and influence) to  $r = 0.78$  (between regular care and leisure).

### Measures of Independent Variables

**Residence.** Respondents indicated with whom the focal child lived most of the time at the time of the survey, with answers: “With me,” “With ex-partner,” “With both parents about equally,” and “Other arrangement.” We excluded respondents in the “Other arrangement” category and constructed three dummy variables for whether the respondent was the *resident parent* (reference group), *nonresident parent*, or in *shared residence* (1 = *Yes*). Such a categorization distinguishing between shared residence versus two types of sole residence has also been commonly used in previous research about shared residence (e.g., Bastaitis et al., 2014). The assumption is that parent–child contact is the highest for resident parents, followed by shared resident and nonresident parents, respectively. Additional analyses estimating the mean amount of monthly parent–child contact showed that the residence groups differed in expected ways (i.e., resident parents: 23 days; shared resident parents: 14 days; nonresident parents: 5 days)—but contact also varied within residence groups, especially for nonresident parents (i.e., range 0–14 days, with about 20% seeing their child 8 days or more).

**Repartnering.** Respondents reported whether they had: “No steady partner,” “Steady partner, not living together,” “Steady partner, living together unmarried,” and “Steady partner, living together married.” Additional analyses revealed that for some of our measures for parenting there was no difference between respondents without a steady partner and respondents who did not live with their partner, whereas for others there was. As the theoretical arguments for repartnering not only apply to respondents who co-reside with their new partner, but also

for those who do not co-reside, we decided to analyze respondents who do not co-reside with their new partner separately from respondents without a new partner. Additional analyses further showed that there was no difference on all parenting measures between unmarried and married co-residing partners. We therefore generated three dummy variables (1 = *Yes*): *no partner* (reference group), *LAT partner*, and *co-residing (unmarried/married) partner*.

**Stepchildren.** In case of repartnering, respondents were asked whether their current partner had children from a previous relationship, and if yes, with whom these children lived most of the time. We generated three dummies (1 = *Yes*): *no stepchildren* (respondents without a partner and respondents with a partner but without stepchildren) as the reference group, *co-residing partner with stepchildren* (co-residing with partner and stepchildren living with partner or elsewhere), and *LAT relationship with stepchildren* (LAT partner and stepchildren living with partner or elsewhere). We did not distinguish on the basis of whether these stepchildren were living with the partner or elsewhere because the number of cases was too low. Additional analyses, however, suggested no statistically significant differences in parenting between respondents with resident partners whose children lived in the household or elsewhere. Similarly, for respondents in a LAT relationship, we found no statistically significant differences in parenting depending on the residence of the stepchildren.

**Shared Children.** In case of repartnering, respondents were asked whether they had or adopted children with their current partner. A dummy indicating whether the respondent had shared children (1 “*Yes*”) was created. Note that the group of respondents who had shared children includes a small group of 21 respondents who did not live with their partner.

**Parent’s Gender.** A variable indicating whether the parent was a 0 “*Male*” or 1 “*Female*”.

### Measures of Control Variables

**Parent’s education** measures respondents’ highest obtained education (1 = *Primary school not finished* to 10 = *Postuniversity*). **Parent’s employment** indicates whether respondents had a paid job at the time of the survey (1 = *Yes*).

*Parent's work hours* refer to the work hours per week according to the contract. Work hours of over 80 were recoded to 80 to avoid too much influence of these extremes. Nonemployed parents were assigned the gender-specific mean. This implies that the effect of parent's employment indicates the difference between nonemployed people and people with average working hours (Poortman & Kalmijn, 2002). Because of small regression coefficients, we divided parent's work hours by 10. For *predivorce conflict*, respondents indicated how often (1 = *never* to 4 = *often*) five different conflict situations (e.g., heated discussions) happened between them and their ex-partner in the last year before divorce. If respondents had a non-missing value on at least one of the items, a scale was created by taking the mean (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.88$ ). For *predivorce involvement*, respondents reported who did most (1 = *ex-partner much more often than respondent* to 5 = *respondent much more often than ex-partner*) of six care tasks (e.g., changing diapers) during the relationship with their ex-partner. We computed the mean score if they had a non-missing value on at least one of the items (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.93$ ). *Child's gender* indicates whether the focal child was a 0 "Boy" or 1 "Girl." *Child's age* refers to the focal child's age measured in years. *Former union type* is a dummy for whether the parent's relationship with the ex-partner was 0 "Cohabitation" or 1 "Marriage / registered partnership." *Number of children* includes the number of children parents had or adopted with their ex-partner. *Parent's age* is measured in years. *Sample* is a dummy referring to the 0 "Original sample" or 1 "Refreshment sample." Note that information from Wave 1 was used for some control variables as this information was no longer asked in Wave 2 (i.e., parent's education, predivorce conflict and involvement, former union type and number of children). Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for all variables used in the analyses, for fathers and mothers separately; see Table S1 in the Supporting Information for cell sizes.

### *Analytical Strategy*

We performed linear regression analyses. To take into account that in our analytic sample both ex-partners participated for 18% of the former households, we clustered the standard errors on the level of the former household (using command "vce(cluster)" in Stata). For all parenting

behaviors, we estimated five models. Model 1 includes residence, repartnering, and the controls, showing the overall effects of residence and repartnering on parenting. To test whether effects of residence and repartnering differed depending on the type of parenting, Wald tests assessed for the equality of coefficients between equations (using command "Suest" in Stata). Significant differences were reported in the text and presented statistically in Table S2 in the Supporting Information. In Models 2 and 3, we examined whether it is additional caring responsibilities that matter most (rather than repartnering per se) by testing whether stepchildren and shared children have particularly strong effects. Model 2 only includes residence and the measures for additional children, whereas Model 3 also includes repartnering. Model 3 should be interpreted with care because the association between repartnering and additional children is strong (e.g., stepchildren are only applicable when there is a new partner). Note also that the number of respondents who have additional children is relatively low (see Table S1 in the Supporting Information). Model 4 includes interactions between residence and repartnering to test whether the role of repartnering depends on residence. Model 5 includes interactions with parent's gender to examine whether residence and repartnering play a different role for fathers and mothers. For Models 4 and 5, Wald tests assessed whether the interactions improved the model. We did not test whether interactions between residence and repartnering differed by parent's gender because of few cases in some groups (e.g., co-residing resident fathers:  $n = 25$ ). For similar reasons, we did not test interactions between additional children and residence, and between additional children and parent's gender (e.g., nonresident parents with LAT relationship and stepchildren:  $n = 76$ ).

## RESULTS

### *Hypotheses Testing*

Table 2 shows that residence was significantly related to all parenting behaviors. For Models 1 to 3, all residence effects were negative: parents in shared residence and nonresident parents spent less time on leisure, regular-, and irregular care and had a smaller influence on decision-making than resident parents. Changing the reference category (not shown) indicated



Table 1. Mean, Standard Deviation and Range of the Variables in the Analyses

	Fathers			Mothers		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range
Regular care	3.81	1.33	1–7	4.93	1.06	1–7
Leisure	3.65	1.34	1–7	4.30	1.19	1–7
Irregular care	3.38	1.11	1–5	4.48	0.65	1–5
Influence in decision-making	3.84	1.26	1–5	4.60	0.71	1–5
Residence						
Resident	0.10	a	0–1	0.69	a	0–1
Shared residence	0.38	a	0–1	0.26	a	0–1
Nonresident	0.52	a	0–1	0.05	a	0–1
Repartnering						
No partner	0.34	a	0–1	0.40	a	0–1
LAT partner	0.23	a	0–1	0.24	a	0–1
Co-residing partner	0.43	a	0–1	0.36	a	0–1
Stepchildren						
No stepchildren	0.63	a	0–1	0.62	a	0–1
Co-residing and stepchildren	0.20	a	0–1	0.21	a	0–1
LAT and stepchildren	0.17	a	0–1	0.17	a	0–1
Shared children						
No shared children	0.87	a	0–1	0.92	a	0–1
Shared children	0.13	a	0–1	0.08	a	0–1
Controls						
Parent's education	6.94	1.87	1–10	6.83	1.75	2–10
Parent's employment						
Not employed	0.10	a	0–1	0.14	a	0–1
Employed	0.90	a	0–1	0.86	a	0–1
Parent's work hours (×10)	3.88	0.69	0.2–8	2.78	0.77	0–7
Predivorce conflict	2.23	0.75	1–4	2.39	0.85	1–4
Predivorce involvement	2.85	0.65	1–5	4.27	0.65	2–5
Child's gender						
Boy	0.52	a	0–1	0.51	a	0–1
Girl	0.48	a	0–1	0.49	a	0–1
Child's age	12.91	3.19	2–18	12.56	3.28	3–18
Former union type						
Cohabitation	0.24	a	0–1	0.28	a	0–1
Marriage	0.76	a	0–1	0.72	a	0–1
Number of children	1.92	0.78	1–6	1.86	0.77	1–6
Parent's age	46.94	6.57	28–71	43.53	6.09	20–62
Sample						
Original sample	0.74	a	0–1	0.74	a	0–1
Refreshment sample	0.26	a	0–1	0.26	a	0–1
<i>N</i> of respondents	1,112			1,666		

Notes: a indicates standard deviation (SD) not presented for discrete variables. Source: New Families in the Netherlands, Wave 1, 2.

that nonresident parents were less involved in all parenting behaviors than shared resident parents (e.g., leisure  $b = -1.08$ , influence  $b = -1.24$ ;  $p < .001$ ). Residence effects were the strongest for regular care. When testing

for statistically significant differences between equations (Model 1), only the residence effects on regular care differed from the effects on the other parenting measures (see Table S2 in the Supporting Information). Effect sizes

were modest to large. Focusing on the largest effects for regular care (Model 1), the difference between shared and resident parents was modest ( $0.32 = 0.41/SD(Y)$  with  $SD(Y) = 1.29$ ) and the difference between nonresident and resident parents was large ( $1.46 = 1.88/1.29$ ).

Having new family responsibilities also mattered. Although shared children with a new partner were not found to be statistically significantly related to parenting (see Models 2 and 3), repartnering and stepchildren were related to parental engagement. Patterns differed, however, between parenting behaviors. For regular care, no statistically significant difference was found between repartnered and single parents (Model 1). Models 2 and 3, however, show that parents who co-resided with a new partner who had children engaged less in regular care. When parents were in a LAT relationship with their partner, there was no additional influence of having stepchildren. Also for leisure, stepchildren seemed to matter more than a new partner. Although parents co-residing with a new partner were less involved in leisure activities than single parents (Model 1), the negative impact of living with a new partner appeared to be particularly strong when this partner had children: the estimate referring to a co-resident new partner with children in Model 2 ( $b = -0.21$ ) was significant and double the size of the effect of merely co-residing with a new partner ( $b = -0.10$ ). The effect of co-residence was furthermore no longer significant once the presence of stepchildren was taken into account (Model 3). For irregular care, repartnered parents—be it co-residing or not—were less involved than their single counterparts (Model 1). When a distinction was made regarding the presence of stepchildren (Models 2 and 3), no stronger effects were found. Hence, repartnering rather than having additional caring responsibilities decreased parenting in irregular care. Similar results were found for parents' influence in decision-making: it was repartnering (Model 1) and not so much having additional children (Models 2 and 3) that affected parents' influence. Note though that repartnering was positively (instead of negatively) related to influence. Repartnered parents—be it co-residing or not—had more influence than single parents (Model 1: LAT partner  $b = 0.20$ , co-residing partner  $b = 0.11$ ).

When testing for statistically significant differences in the effects of repartnering between equations (Model 1), the effects of LAT and

co-residing on decision-making influence were different from effects on the other parenting measures (see Table S2 in the Supporting Information). The effect of co-residing with a partner also differed between regular care and leisure. When testing for statistically significant differences in the effects of having stepchildren between the dependent variables (Model 2), the effects of co-residing partner with stepchildren and LAT relationship with stepchildren on influence were different from the effects on the other parenting measures (see Table S2). The effect of co-residing partner with stepchildren also differed between regular care and leisure, and leisure and irregular care. Overall, effect sizes of repartnering and having stepchildren were small. One of the strongest effects was found for co-residing with a new partner who had children on parenting in leisure activities (e.g., Model 3,  $b = -0.23$ ), but this amounted to only a small effect size of  $0.18 (=0.23/1.29)$ . Moreover, Wald tests assessed that the effects of repartnering and having additional children were smaller than the effects of residence (not shown).

Model 4 in Table 3 includes interactions between residence and repartnering. With leisure, regular care, or irregular care as outcome variable, Wald tests showed that adding interactions did not improve the models, suggesting that the role of repartnering did not differ across residence arrangements for these activities. The association between repartnering and influence in decision-making depended on residence ( $\chi^2(4) = 2.55$ ;  $p = .037$ ). The estimates for having a LAT relationship did not vary across residence arrangements ( $b = 0.07$ ,  $b = -0.07$ ;  $p > 0.10$ ) and were positive for all residence arrangements. The estimates for a co-resident partner did vary, though. Compared with being single, living with a new partner was associated with greater influence for shared resident and resident parents, but less so for nonresident parents (statistically significant interaction effect:  $b = -0.33$ ). Additional analyses showed that for nonresident parents, the estimate for co-residing with a new partner was not statistically significant. So having a LAT relationship was associated with greater influence (as compared to being single) regardless of children's residence, whereas co-residing with a partner led to more influence only in case children (partly) lived with the parent.

Model 5 shows whether residence and repartnering played a different role for fathers and

Table 2. Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Parenting

	Regular care			Leisure			Irregular care			Influence in decision-making		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Residence (ref. = resident)												
Shared residence	-0.41** (0.04)	-0.41** (0.04)	-0.41** (0.04)	-0.26** (0.05)	-0.25** (0.05)	-0.25** (0.05)	-0.24** (0.03)	-0.25** (0.03)	-0.24** (0.03)	-0.18** (0.04)	-0.17** (0.04)	-0.18** (0.04)
Nonresident	-1.88** <sup>a</sup> (0.07)	-1.87** <sup>a</sup> (0.07)	-1.87** <sup>a</sup> (0.07)	-1.34** <sup>a</sup> (0.07)	-1.34** <sup>a</sup> (0.07)	-1.34** <sup>a</sup> (0.07)	-1.45** <sup>a</sup> (0.06)	-1.45** <sup>a</sup> (0.06)	-1.45** <sup>a</sup> (0.06)	-1.42** <sup>a</sup> (0.07)	-1.39** <sup>a</sup> (0.07)	-1.41** <sup>a</sup> (0.07)
Repartnering (ref. = no partner)												
LAT partner	-0.01 (0.05)	-0.01 (0.05)	0.00 (0.07)	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.08)	-0.08* (0.03)	-0.08* (0.03)	-0.09~ (0.05)	0.20** (0.04)	0.20** (0.04)	0.16* (0.07)
Co-residing partner	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.04)	0.08 (0.06)	-0.10* (0.05)	-0.10* (0.05)	0.02 (0.07)	-0.10** (0.05)	-0.10** (0.05)	-0.07 (0.04)	0.11** <sup>b</sup> (0.04)	0.11** <sup>b</sup> (0.04)	0.19** (0.05)
Stepchildren (ref. = no stepchildren)												
Co-residing and stepchildren	-0.12** (0.05)	-0.12** (0.05)	-0.18** (0.06)	-0.21** (0.05)	-0.21** (0.05)	-0.23** (0.07)	-0.08* (0.04)	-0.08* (0.04)	-0.05 (0.05)	0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	-0.09 (0.06)
LAT and stepchildren	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.08)	-0.07 <sup>c</sup> (0.05)	-0.07 <sup>c</sup> (0.05)	-0.05 (0.09)	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.04)	0.03 (0.06)	0.16** <sup>c</sup> (0.04)	0.16** <sup>c</sup> (0.04)	0.06 (0.07)
Shared children (ref. = no shared children)	0.08 (0.06)	0.08 (0.06)	0.04 (0.07)	0.04 (0.07)	0.04 (0.07)	0.03 (0.08)	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.03 (0.06)	-0.03 (0.06)	-0.03 (0.06)	-0.12~ (0.07)
Controls												
Parent's gender (ref. = male)	-0.01 (0.06)	0.00 (0.06)	0.00 (0.06)	-0.30** (0.07)	-0.28** (0.07)	-0.28** (0.07)	0.20** (0.05)	0.21** (0.05)	0.20** (0.05)	0.11* (0.05)	0.10~ (0.05)	0.11* (0.05)
Parent's education	0.05** (0.01)	0.05** (0.01)	0.05** (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.02* (0.01)	0.02* (0.01)	0.02* (0.01)	0.02* (0.01)	0.02* (0.01)	0.02* (0.01)
Parent's employment (ref. = non-employed)	-0.04 (0.06)	-0.04 (0.06)	-0.04 (0.06)	0.01 (0.07)	0.01 (0.07)	0.00 (0.07)	-0.17** (0.04)	-0.17** (0.04)	-0.17** (0.04)	0.11* (0.05)	0.11* (0.05)	0.10* (0.05)
Parent's work hours (x10)	0.02 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)	0.04 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)

Table 2. Continued

	Regular care			Leisure			Irregular care			Influence in decision-making		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Predivorce conflict	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.05 ~ (0.03)	-0.05 ~ (0.03)	-0.05 ~ (0.03)	-0.06** (0.02)	-0.06** (0.02)	-0.06** (0.02)	-0.08** (0.02)	-0.09** (0.02)	-0.08** (0.02)
Predivorce involvement	0.12** (0.03)	0.12** (0.03)	0.12** (0.03)	0.18** (0.03)	0.18** (0.03)	0.18** (0.03)	0.09** (0.02)	0.09** (0.02)	0.09** (0.02)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.03)
Child's gender (ref. = boy)	0.05 (0.03)	0.05 (0.03)	0.05 (0.03)	0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)
Child's age	-0.11** (0.01)	-0.11** (0.01)	-0.11** (0.01)	-0.13** (0.01)	-0.13** (0.01)	-0.13** (0.01)	-0.01* (0.01)	-0.01* (0.01)	-0.01* (0.01)	-0.05** (0.01)	-0.04** (0.01)	-0.05** (0.01)
Former union type (ref. = cohabitation)	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)
Number of children	-0.07* (0.03)	-0.06* (0.03)	-0.06* (0.03)	-0.09** (0.03)	-0.09** (0.03)	-0.09** (0.03)	-0.08** (0.02)	-0.08** (0.02)	-0.08** (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)
Parent's age	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	-0.01 ~ (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	-0.01 ~ (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	-0.01* (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Sample (ref. = original sample)	0.03 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.04 (0.05)	0.04 (0.05)	0.04 (0.05)	0.08** (0.03)	0.08** (0.03)	0.08** (0.03)	0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.506	0.507	0.508	0.339	0.342	0.342	0.530	0.529	0.530	0.376	0.374	0.377
N (respondents)	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778
N (households)	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363

Notes: <sup>a</sup>The difference between nonresident and shared residence is significant (two-sided  $p < .01$ ). <sup>b</sup>The difference between co-residing partner and L/AT partner is significant (two-sided  $p < .05$ ). <sup>c</sup>The difference between co-residing partner and stepchildren, and LAT partner and stepchildren is significant (two-sided  $p < .05$ ). ~ Two-sided  $p < .10$ . \*Two-sided  $p < .05$ . \*\*Two-sided  $p < .01$ . Source: New Families in the Netherlands, Wave 1, 2.

Table 3. Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Parenting, Interactions

	Regular care		Leisure		Irregular care		Influence in decision-making	
	Model 4	Model 5	Model 4	Model 5	Model 4	Model 5	Model 4	Model 5
Residence (ref. = resident)								
Shared residence	-0.53** (0.06)	-0.40** (0.08)	-0.31** (0.07)	-0.28* (0.11)	-0.20** (0.05)	-0.34** (0.07)	-0.22** (0.05)	-0.02 (0.08)
Nonresident	-1.84*** (0.11)	-1.82*** (0.09)	-1.29*** (0.12)	-1.33*** (0.12)	-1.42*** (0.09)	-1.50*** (0.08)	-1.24*** (0.11)	-1.23*** (0.09)
Repartnering (ref. = no partner)								
LAT partner	-0.09 (0.06)	-0.01 (0.08)	-0.07 (0.08)	-0.08 (0.09)	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.09 (0.07)	0.19** (0.04)	0.17* (0.08)
Co-residing partner	-0.05 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.08)	-0.12~ (0.07)	-0.14~ (0.08)	-0.07* (0.03)	-0.15* (0.07)	0.17** (0.03)	-0.03 <sup>b</sup> (0.08)
Parent's gender (ref. = male)	-0.01 (0.06)	0.01 (0.10)	-0.30** (0.07)	-0.35** (0.12)	0.20** (0.05)	0.08 (0.08)	0.11* (0.05)	0.18* (0.09)
Interactions of LAT with:								
• Shared residence	0.21* (0.09)		0.08 (0.11)		-0.11~ (0.07)		0.07 (0.07)	
• Nonresident	0.00 (0.16)		-0.08 (0.16)		-0.04 (0.12)		-0.07 (0.16)	
Interactions of co-residing with:								
• Shared residence	0.18* (0.08)		0.09 (0.10)		-0.05 (0.06)		0.05 (0.06)	
• Nonresident	-0.06 (0.12)		-0.06 (0.13)		-0.04 (0.10)		-0.33** (0.12)	
Interactions of parent's gender with:								
• Shared residence		0.00 (0.09)		0.04 (0.12)		0.13~ (0.08)		-0.18* (0.08)
• Nonresident		-0.23 (0.18)		-0.10 (0.21)		0.00 (0.16)		-0.36* (0.18)
• LAT		-0.01 (0.10)		0.04 (0.11)		0.02 (0.08)		0.04 (0.09)
• Co-residing		0.01 (0.09)		0.07 (0.10)		0.09 (0.07)		0.23** (0.08)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.507	0.506	0.339	0.339	0.530	0.531	0.380	0.379
N (respondents)	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778	2,778
N (households)	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363	2,363

Notes: Controls as in Table 2. <sup>a</sup>The difference between nonresident and shared residence is significant (two-sided  $p < .01$ ). <sup>b</sup>The difference between co-residing partner and LAT partner is significant (two-sided  $p < .05$ ). ~ Two-sided  $p < .10$ . \*Two-sided  $p < .05$ ; \*\*two-sided  $p < .01$ . Source: New Families in the Netherlands, Wave 1, 2.

mothers. No gender differences in residence and repartnering effects were found for parents' engagement in leisure, regular care, and irregular care, as adding interactions with gender did not improve model fit. For influence in

decision-making adding interactions improved model fit ( $\chi^2(4) = 3.47$ ;  $p = .008$ ). The main effects of residence showed that shared resident fathers had equal influence in decision-making as resident fathers, whereas nonresident fathers

had less influence than both resident and shared resident fathers. The statistically significant interaction effects showed that the (negative) effects of shared residence ( $b = -0.18$ ) and nonresidence ( $b = -0.36$ ) were stronger for mothers than for fathers. Additional analyses indicated that both shared resident mothers ( $b = -0.20$ ;  $p < .001$ ) and particularly nonresident mothers ( $b = -1.59$ ;  $p < .001$ ) were less successful than resident mothers in exerting influence. The association between repartnering and decision-making influence also differed between fathers and mothers. Although the effect of a LAT relationship was equally positively associated with influence for mothers and fathers, the association differed for having a co-residing partner. For fathers, the main effects showed that fathers co-residing with their partner had equal influence as single fathers, and both these types of fathers had less influence than fathers with a LAT relationship. The effect of co-residing was stronger and positive for mothers, as indicated by the interaction term ( $b = 0.23$ ;  $p = .005$ ). Additional analyses showed that both mothers with a LAT relationship ( $b = 0.21$ ;  $p < .001$ ) and mothers who did co-reside ( $b = 0.20$ ;  $p < .001$ ) had more influence than single mothers. Mothers who co-resided did not differ from mothers with a LAT relationship ( $b = -0.01$ ;  $p = .835$ ). So for fathers it is a LAT relationship that led to greater influence, whereas for mothers also a co-residing new partner was associated with greater decision-making influence.

#### *Robustness Analyses*

To check the robustness of our findings, we first conducted multilevel regression analyses to see whether our regression analyses with the cluster option were sufficient to take into account the participation of both ex-partners in 18% of former households. These analyses yielded similar results. Second, we analyzed repartnering and residence in separate models, as existing studies have often focused on either repartnering or residence. Without repartnering in Model 1, results for the effects of residence were similar. When residence was excluded from Model 1, we generally found stronger negative effects of repartnering on regular care, leisure, and irregular care, and weaker positive effects for decision-making influence (see Table S3 in the Supporting Information). Parents co-residing

with a new partner were less involved in all three types of parent-child activities ( $b =$  between  $-0.22$  and  $-0.26$ ;  $p < .001$ ), and they had equal influence in important decision-making as single parents. Parents with a LAT relationship were less involved in irregular care ( $b = -0.08$ ;  $p = .034$ ) and had more influence in decision-making than single parents ( $b = 0.19$ ;  $p < .001$ ). It is thus necessary to include both residence and repartnering in research to avoid overestimating the effects of repartnering. Third, scholars have distinguished regular care activities in routine activities from interactive activities (Kendig & Bianchi, 2008). Additional analyses showed that findings did not differ when distinguishing routine activities (i.e., dropping child off or picking child up from school or sports; having dinner together) and interactive activities (i.e., helping with school or homework; talking with child about issues in child's life; doing household tasks together). The correlation between these scales was also high ( $r = 0.70$ ).

#### DISCUSSION

Because of the rise in divorce and remarriage, parenting has become increasingly complex: parents live in separate households after divorce and new (step/half) family members may enter people's lives. Extending the body of research on parenting in postdivorce families, we simultaneously focused on the role of children's residence arrangements (including shared residence), repartnering (including LAT relationships), and additional children. We went beyond prior research by studying whether the role of repartnering varied across residence arrangements and whether patterns differed by gender and type of parenting behavior.

Using recent Dutch data, this study first showed that residence was highly relevant for parents' engagement with their children. Resident parents were more involved in regular care, leisure and irregular care, and had greater decision-making influence than nonresident parents. These findings were in line with findings from previous research (e.g., Bastaitis et al., 2014; Hawkins et al., 2006). Shared resident parents' level of involvement was in between that of resident parents and nonresident parents. Parents in shared residence have more opportunities to actively participate in their child's life and to take on the role of primary

caregiver than nonresident parents. Nonresident parents are constrained in their access to and time with their child because of limited visitation schedules or negative gatekeeping behavior of resident parents. Note that nonresident parents may also separate themselves from the parental role, as feeling no longer obligated to be involved with their child (Amato et al., 2009).

Second, having new family responsibilities was generally associated with lower parental engagement. Although having shared children with a new partner bore no relation with parenting, repartnering or stepchildren led parents to spend less time on parent-child activities. This was in line with the (small) majority of studies showing negative effects of repartnering on parenting (e.g., Hawkins et al., 2006; Tach et al., 2010). For leisure activities and particularly regular care activities—which are more frequent and less discretionary—it was living with a partner who had children (i.e., stepchildren) rather than a new partner as such that mattered. For irregular care activities, repartnering irrespective of whether they co-resided with the new partner or whether the new partner had children decreased parental engagement. These findings could indicate that a new partner and stepchildren absorb parents' time at the cost of spending time with their biological children or that children distance themselves from their parents in case of repartnering (Manning et al., 2003; Manning & Smock, 2000). A more optimistic interpretation is that parenting tasks are shared with the new partner, which decreases the biological parent's involvement.

This study, however, nuances the conclusion that new family responsibilities reduce parental engagement in two ways. A first nuance is that repartnering and stepchildren were found to be less important for parents' engagement with their children than residence: effect sizes were small—and smaller than those for residence. A second nuance is that it mattered which type of parenting behavior was considered. As discussed earlier, the strength and statistical significance of the negative effects of repartnering and stepchildren depended on the type of parent-child activity (i.e., regular care, leisure, irregular care). As expected, repartnering was least consequential for the more frequent and less discretionary parent-child activities, that is, regular care. This suggests that time spent on these activities is more difficult

to reduce as they constitute an important part of a child's routine care. Furthermore, repartnering was positively associated instead of negatively associated with parents' influence in child-related decision-making. Because such influence is less time demanding than the other parenting behaviors, we would expect a smaller (negative) effect. A positive association, however, was not expected. We may speculate that a new partner empowers parents, leading to a greater say in decision-making, or that they perceive having greater influence.

Third, little support was found for the idea that it is easier for nonresident parents to shift their focus to the new partner because they have less parenting responsibilities toward the original family than (shared) resident parents. Only for influence, we found some support as the observed positive effect of repartnering was not found for nonresident parents who lived with a partner. The fact that the effect of repartnering was similar across residence arrangements for most types of parenting might be related to a relatively high frequency of visitation by some nonresident parents. A substantial number of nonresident parents in our sample saw their child quite often and this is in line with studies showing that nonresident parents, usually fathers, nowadays have more contact with their children than in the past (Amato et al., 2009), also in the Netherlands (Nikolina, 2015). Also, fathers are being increasingly expected to contribute to parenting. Nonresident parents may therefore be less able to reduce their parenting time in case of repartnering or be more motivated to stay involved.

Finally, this study provided little support for the idea that variations in parenting across residence arrangements or between repartnered and single parents would be less pronounced for mothers than fathers, because of stronger motherhood norms. Only for influence, gender differences were found, but these were contrary to expectations. Although resident mothers had a greater say than resident fathers, shared resident mothers and nonresident mothers were more rather than less likely to lose their influence than shared resident fathers and nonresident fathers. Mothers possibly have less power than fathers to maintain exerting influence in important child-related decisions when they do not have sole-custody. Furthermore, the positive effect of co-residing with a new partner was stronger for mothers than fathers, suggesting

that repartnering empowers women to a greater extent.

Despite the insights provided by our study, it is also limited because of its cross-sectional nature; solid causal claims cannot be made. For instance, repartnering may be selective of better resourced parents or parents with certain attitudes or personality traits (De Graaf & Kalmijn, 2003; Pasteels & Mortelmans, 2017), which may also lead them to have a greater say in decision-making than single parents. Future research would thus ideally use panel data. Second, because the survey took place in the first years after parents divorced, our conclusions may only apply to the period shortly after divorce. Differences in parenting across postdivorce families may decrease as time passes, as parents and children adjust to the new situation. Alternatively, differences may increase over time, as nonresident parents or repartnered parents may become less committed to remain involved or due to attempts by their ex-partners to minimize parent–child contact (Cheadle et al., 2010). Third, although the used data were of large scale, the number of cases in some postdivorce family types was low. We particularly had few resident fathers and nonresident mothers in our sample, and this group may also be selective (e.g., mother’s low mental health). This may have decreased the likelihood of finding gender differences in the effects of residence and repartnering. Future research should further investigate the role of gender across postdivorce families, as evidence is mixed that mothers, irrespectively of their residence arrangements and regardless of new relationships, are more involved in parenting than fathers (Dufur et al., 2010; Kielty, 2006). Fourth, some groups were underrepresented in our data, such as immigrants and people with low income. In addition, there might not only be selection on observed characteristics, but also on unobserved characteristics (e.g., less involved parents might be underrepresented). This may have decreased the variation in both independent and dependent variables, possibly leading to less statistically significant findings. Fifth, parents may have overestimated their involvement as they felt ashamed of their actual involvement (i.e., social desirability bias) or may not have an accurate view of their actual involvement. We recommend using time diaries for future research (Kendig & Bianchi, 2008).

Overall, our study emphasizes the value of including both residence and repartnering and of examining not only regular care—as most previous studies—but various parenting behaviors. We showed that residence was more strongly related to parenting than repartnering, and that the strength and nature of associations varied between types of parenting. Influence in decision-making in particular stood out as a distinct parenting behavior, and also the frequency and obligatory nature of parent–child activities mattered.

#### NOTE

This study is part of the research program Sustainable Cooperation—Roadmaps to Resilient Societies (SCOOP). The authors are grateful to the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW) for generously funding this research in the context of its 2017 Gravitation Program (grant number 024.003.025). The NFN data were collected by Utrecht University in collaboration with Statistics Netherlands (CBS) and were funded by grant 480-10-015 from the Medium Investments Fund of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) and by Utrecht University.

#### SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

**Supplemental Table 1.** Cell Sizes for Residence, Repartnering, Additional Children, Residence \* Gender, Repartnering \* Gender, and Residence \* Repartnering

**Supplemental Table 2.** Results of Testing Equality of Coefficients across Models, for Residence, Repartnering, and Additional Children

**Supplemental Table 3.** Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Parenting, Excluding Residence

#### REFERENCES

- Amato, P. R. (2000). The consequences of divorce for adults and children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(4), 1269–1287. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01269.x>.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2008.00533.x>.
- Bastais, K., & Mortelmans, D. (2017). Parenting and family structure after divorce: Are they related? *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 58(7), 542–558. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10502556.2017.1345200>.



- Bastais, K., Ponnet, K., & Mortelmans, D. (2014). Do divorced fathers matter? The impact of parenting styles of divorced fathers on the well-being of the child. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 55(5), 363–390. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10502556.2014.920682>.
- Bulanda, R. E. (2004). Paternal involvement with children: The influence of gender ideologies. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(1), 40–45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-2455.2004.00003.x>.
- 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(4), 1381–1396. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-014-0307-8>.
- Carlson, M. J., & Berger, L. M. (2013). What kids get from parents: Packages of parental involvement across complex family forms. *Social Service Review*, 87(2), 213–249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730902873927>.
- Castillo, J., Welch, G., & Sarver, C. (2011). Fathering: The relationship between fathers' residence, fathers' sociodemographic characteristics, and father involvement. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 15(8), 1342–1349. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-010-0684-6>.
- Cheadle, J. E., Amato, P. R., & King, V. (2010). Patterns of nonresident father contact. *Demography*, 47(1), 205–225. <https://doi.org/10.1353/dem.0.0084>.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S95–S120. <https://doi.org/10.1086/228943>.
- Coleman, M., Ganong, L., & Fine, M. (2000). Reinvestigating remarriage: Another decade of progress. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(4), 1288–1307. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01288.x>.
- De Graaf, P. M., & Kalmijn, M. (2003). Alternative routes in the remarriage market: Competing-risk analyses of union formation after divorce. *Social Forces*, 81(4), 1459–1498. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2003.0052>.
- Dufur, M. J., Howell, N. C., Downey, D. B., Ainsworth, J. W., & Lapray, A. J. (2010). Sex differences in parenting behaviors in single-mother and single-father households. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(5), 1092–1106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.17413737.2010.00752.x>.
- Furstenberg, F. F., Jr., & Nord, C. W. (1985). Parenting apart: Patterns of childrearing after marital disruption. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 47(4), 893–904. <https://doi.org/10.2307/352332>.
- Golombok, S., & Tasker, F. (2015). Socio-emotional development in changing family contexts. In R. M. Lerner & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science* (pp. 419–463). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hawkins, D. N., Amato, P. R., & King, V. (2006). Parent-adolescent involvement: The relative influence of parent gender and residence. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(1), 125–136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00238.x>.
- Juby, H., Billette, J.-M., Laplante, B., & Le Bourdais, C. (2007). Nonresident fathers and children: Parents' new unions and frequency of contact. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28(9), 1220–1245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X07302103>.
- Kalmijn, M. (2015). Relationships between fathers and adult children: The cumulative effects of divorce and repartnering. *Journal of Family Issues*, 36(6), 737–759. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X13495398>.
- Kendig, S. M., & Bianchi, S. M. (2008). Single, cohabitating, and married mothers' time with children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(5), 1228–1240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00562.x>.
- Kielty, S. (2006). Similarities and differences in the experiences of non-resident mothers and non-resident fathers. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family*, 20(1), 74–94. <https://doi.org/10.1093/lawfam/ebi033>.
- King, V. (2007). When children have two mothers: Relationships with nonresident mothers, stepmothers, and fathers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(5), 1178–1193. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00440.x>.
- Kitterød, R. H., & Lyngstad, J. (2014). *Characteristics of parents with shared residence and father sole custody. Evidence from Norway 2012*. Discussion Paper 780, Research Department, Statistics Norway.
- Lee, Y., & Hofferth, S. L. (2017). Gender differences in single parents' living arrangements and child care time. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 26(12), 3439–3451. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0850-1>.
- Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (2000). “Swapping” families: Serial parenting and economic support for children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(1), 111–122. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00111.x>.
- Manning, W. D., Stewart, S. D., & Smock, P. J. (2003). The complexity of fathers' parenting responsibilities and involvement with nonresident children. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24(5), 645–667. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X03252573>.
- McGene, J., & King, V. (2012). Implications of new marriages and children for coparenting in non-resident father families. *Journal of Family Issues*, 33(12), 1619–1641. <https://doi.org/10.1038/jid.2014.371>.
- Meggiolaro, S., & Ongaro, F. (2015). Non-resident parent-child contact after marital dissolution and parental repartnering: Evidence from Italy.

- Demographic Research*, 33(40), 1137–1152. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2015.33.40>.
- Nielsen, L. (2011). Shared parenting after divorce: A review of shared residential parenting research. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 52(8), 586–609. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10502556.2011.619913>.
- Nikolina, N. (2015). *Divided parents, shared children. Legal aspects of (residential) co-parenting in England, the Netherlands and Belgium. [Dissertation]. Intersentia*. Cambridge, UK.
- Pasteels, I., & Mortelmans, D. (2017). The socio-economic determinants of repartnering after divorce or separation in Belgium. *Demographic Research*, 36, 1785–1812. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2017.36.58>.
- Poortman, A., & Kalmijn, M. (2002). Women's labour market position and divorce in The Netherlands: Evaluating economic interpretations of the work effect. *European Journal of Population*, 18(2), 175–202. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015520411449>.
- Poortman, A., Stienstra, K., & De Bruijn, S. (2018). *Codebook of the survey New Families in the Netherlands (NFN). Second wave*. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Poortman, A., Van der Lippe, T., & Boele-Woelki, K. (2014). *Codebook of the survey New Families in the Netherlands (NFN). First wave*. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Poortman, A., & Van Gaalen, R. (2017). Shared residence after separation: A review and new findings from The Netherlands. *Family Court Review*, 55(4), 531–544. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fcre.12302>.
- Poortman, A., & Van Gaalen, R. (2019a). *New Families in the Netherlands (NFN): Wave 1*. DANS. <https://doi.org/10.17026/dans-xj8-83k7>.
- Poortman, A., & Van Gaalen, R. (2019b). *New Families in the Netherlands (NFN): Wave 2*. DANS. <https://doi.org/10.17026/dans-24y-n8s4>.
- Pruett, M. K., Arthur, L. A., & Ebling, R. (2006). The hand that rocks the cradle: Maternal gatekeeping after divorce. *Pace Law Review*, 27(4), 709–739. <https://doi.org/10.3868/s050-004-015-0003-8>.
- Scott, M. E., Booth, A., King, V., & Johnson, D. R. (2007). Postdivorce father-adolescent closeness. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(5), 1194–1209. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00441.x>.
- Stewart, S. D. (1999). Disneyland dads, Disneyland moms? How nonresident parents spend time with absent children. *Journal of Family Issues*, 20(4), 539–556. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251399020004006>.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1353/dem.0.0096>.
- Thomson, E., Mosley, J., Hanson, T. L., & McLanahan, S. S. (2001). Remarriage, cohabitation, and changes in mothering behavior. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(2), 370–380. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00370.x>.