

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships

<http://spr.sagepub.com/>

The parenting styles of divorced fathers and their predictors

Kim Bastaitis, Koen Ponnet, Christine Van Peer and Dimitri Mortelmans

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships published online 14 July 2014

DOI: 10.1177/0265407514541070

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://spr.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/07/10/0265407514541070>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:

International Association for Relationship Research

Additional services and information for *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://spr.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://spr.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

>> [OnlineFirst Version of Record](#) - Jul 14, 2014

[What is This?](#)

The parenting styles of divorced fathers and their predictors

Journal of Social and
Personal Relationships
1–23

© The Author(s) 2014
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0265407514541070
spr.sagepub.com



Kim Bastaits¹, Koen Ponnet¹, Christine Van Peer²,
and Dimitri Mortelmans¹

Abstract

Research on paternal parenting after divorce indicated that children benefit from authoritative parenting. Fathers are not equally likely to be authoritative. Research on differences in divorced fathers' parenting styles remains underdeveloped. We sought to address this gap, investigating the predictors of paternal parenting styles following divorce. First, latent class analysis was utilized to derive parenting styles for divorced fathers. Second, predictors of these styles were investigated with multinomial logistic regression. Analyses examined Belgian data on 404 children (49.01% girls) and their parents. Results reveal that important predictors include not only father and child characteristics but also mother characteristics and divorce-related characteristics. The findings therefore lend support to the idea of studying paternal parenting following divorce within a multilateral family framework.

Keywords

Children, divorce, fathers, mothers, parenting

In recent years, father involvement has attracted substantial interest in social science research due to demographic, attitudinal, and policy changes that relate to paternal roles (Coley & Hernandez, 2006). Paternal involvement after divorce is also coming under

¹ University of Antwerp, Belgium

² Flemish Government, Belgium

Corresponding author:

Kim Bastaits, Centre for Longitudinal and Life Course Studies (CELLO), University of Antwerp, Sint-Jacobstraat 2-4, Antwerp 2000, Belgium.

Email: kim.bastaits@uantwerpen.be

increasing scrutiny as legislators begin to adopt a more gender-neutral approach to parental rights and custody legislation, introducing concepts such as “equal parental rights” and “joint physical custody” (Sodermans, Matthijs, & Swicegood, 2013a). In spite of these changes, research conducted to date has paid far less attention to the involvement of divorced fathers than to that of divorced mothers. Until a few years ago, paternal involvement after divorce was primarily conceptualized in terms of the father’s economic support of the child or simply the father’s presence (e.g. Amato, Meyers, & Emery, 2009; King & Heard, 1999). In recent studies, researchers have also investigated the father’s parenting role. Still, these studies primarily examined the link between paternal parenting and children’s well-being (Booth, Scott & King, 2010; King & Sobolewski, 2006; Stewart, 2003). They also focused mainly on the parenting styles of nonresidential fathers. As a result, the differences in divorced fathers’ parenting and the characteristics of those fathers and their families remain understudied.

This article aims to contribute to the literature by investigating the predictors of divorced fathers’ parenting. Besides focusing on the characteristics of the father (e.g., educational level) and of the child (e.g., gender), we expand on previous studies (e.g. Henderson & Taylor, 1999; Pryor, 2004) by including additional characteristics related to the mother (e.g., maternal parenting) and to divorce (e.g., custodial arrangement) by means of the responsible fathering model developed by Doherty, Kouneski, and Erickson (1998). We investigate these predictors using multiactor data on both parents and children from the “Divorce in Flanders (DiF)” study (Flanders is the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium). These are exceptionally useful data, given the rise in divorce rates in Europe, a trend in which Belgium plays a leading role with a gross divorce rate of 2.5 per 1,000 residents (Eurostat, 2012). Moreover, Belgium is an excellent context in which to study divorced fathers as a legal preference for joint physical custody has been in place since 2006 (Sodermans et al., 2013a). Sodermans, Vanassche, and Matthijs (2013b) found that, in Flanders, 66% of divorced fathers are nonresidential, while 25% have joint physical custody, and 9% are residential. These authors also found that the number of children in joint physical custody arrangements has increased since 2006 (Sodermans et al., 2013a). Consequently, we can expand our focus beyond nonresidential fathers by also including fathers with joint physical custody and residential fathers. In sum, this study aims to provide greater insight into the predictors of divorced fathers’ parenting by applying the multilateral framework on responsible fathering developed by Doherty et al. (1998).

Theoretical framework for the predictors of paternal parenting styles

Baumrind (1991) defined parenting as the general emotional climate in which child rearing takes place, an idea also endorsed by Darling and Steinberg (1993). Parenting, according to Baumrind (1991), varies according to two independent dimensions: support, which relates to responsiveness and affection, and control, which relates to supervision and the imposition of rules. Relying on these underlying dimensions, Baumrind (1991) distinguished four key parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and uninvolved. Authoritative parents combine high levels of support and

control; this is considered the most effective parenting style for promoting children's well-being (Baumrind, 1991; Marsiglio, Amato, Day, & Lamb, 2000; Simons, & Conger, 2007). Authoritarian parents provide high control and low support, whereas permissive parents provide high support and low control. Uninvolved parents provide low support and low control. Although this model originated within research on married parents, it has also been applied frequently in research on divorced parents (Bronte-Tinkew, Scott & Lilja, 2010; Ozen, 2004; Stewart, 2003).

The probability of having a father with a certain parenting style, especially an effective, authoritative parenting style, is unlikely to be divided equally among all children. Moreover, particular father and family characteristics could be related to particular paternal parenting styles. In order to investigate these issues, we relied on the theoretical model for responsible fathering developed by Doherty et al. (1998). This model has been applied to fathering both inside and outside of marriage, regardless of the child's residence. The definition of responsible fathering provided in the model has also moved beyond financial support and mere presence to include parenting, which is defined as a social construction. According to Doherty et al. (1998), fathering is influenced by historical and social contexts and should therefore be examined in a multi-lateral framework that includes not only the characteristics of the father but also the characteristics of the child and the mother, the coparental relationship, and other contextual factors.

The model of Doherty et al. (1998) corresponds in some ways to the family system perspective. The key idea of this perspective is that a family is a multilateral, integrated structure in which family members are necessarily interdependent (Cox & Paley, 1997; Minuchin, 1974). Both the Doherty et al. (1998) model and the family system perspective endorse the idea that family members can mutually influence one another. Consequently, the parenting styles of fathers are unlikely to be influenced solely by the father's own characteristics and will also be affected by the characteristics of other family members.

Previous literature on the predictors of paternal parenting styles

This study aims to determine the predictors that affect divorced fathers' parenting. Given that previous studies on the determinants of parenting have focused predominantly on married fathers rather than divorced fathers (with a small number of exceptions for nonresidential fathers) and that this research has mainly concentrated on specific indicators related to the father, the child, or the mother, we decided to find the hypotheses of the current study on a combination of elements drawn from the existing literature.

Regarding the characteristics of the father, research on married fathers' parenting has demonstrated that age and educational level are important predictors. Studies show that older fathers are more likely to withdraw from child rearing, resulting in less involved fathering roles (Larson, 1993; Larson & Richards, 1994). We might therefore expect that as fathers grow older, they have a higher likelihood of having an uninvolved parenting style and a lower likelihood of having an authoritative parenting style. Paternal educational level is also an important predictor, as more highly educated fathers are better

aware of the importance of father figures and are therefore more involved and often more authoritative parents than less educated fathers (Amato & Sobolewski, 2004; Paquette, Bolté, Turcotte, Dubeau, & Bouchard, 2000; Peters & Ehrenberg, 2008). This trend was also confirmed by research on nonresidential fathers (Coley & Hernandez, 2006), leading us to expect that more highly educated fathers have a higher likelihood of having an authoritative parenting style and a lower likelihood of having an uninvolved parenting style than less educated fathers. Another important predictor for the parenting style of divorced fathers is the presence of a new partner in the household. New partners can compete with children for the time and resources of the father, which causes a role conflict among fathers (Adamson & Pasley, 2006) and leads them to be less involved with their child. In line with this view, a study by Pryor (2004) showed that adolescents who had experienced several parental partnership transitions reported lower levels of parental control and support. Similarly, parents were found to provide less parental control and support in remarried families (Henderson & Taylor, 1999; Pryor, 2004). As a consequence, it could be hypothesized that fathers who live with their new partners have a higher likelihood of having an uninvolved parenting style and a lower likelihood of having an authoritative parenting style than single fathers.

With reference to the characteristics of the child, age and gender appear to be essential predictors. In both intact and nonintact families, fathers are less involved with girls than with boys (Coley & Hernandez, 2006; Flouri & Buchanan, 2003; Hohman-Mariott, 2011; King, Harris, & Heard, 2004). Research reports that fathers share more common interests and identify more with their sons than with their daughters and therefore invest more in relationships with their sons (Marsiglio, 1991; Peters & Ehrenberg, 2008). We therefore expect that girls are more likely to have an uninvolved father than boys. Previous studies have indicated that a child's age has the same impact as a father's age; as children grow into adolescents, they have an increased desire for greater autonomy and time spent with peers, so fathers withdraw from parenting and become less involved as their child grows older (King, 2006; King et al., 2004; Larson, 1993; Larson & Richards, 1994). As a result, we expect that fathers are more likely to be uninvolved as children grow older.

Research among intact families has shown that maternal age, maternal educational level, and maternal parenting styles are important predictors of paternal parenting. Paquette, Bolté, Turcotte, Dubeau, and Bouchard (2000), for example, reported a negative association between a mother's age and the support provided by the father, leading us to hypothesize that fathers are less likely to be authoritative as mothers grow older. Paquette et al. (2000) also found that a lower educational level among mothers is related to fathers with a more authoritarian parenting style. Consequently, it could be expected that fathers have a higher likelihood of being an authoritative parent and a lower likelihood of being an uninvolved parent when mothers are more highly educated, as highly educated mothers may be more open toward father involvement than mothers with a lower educational level. With respect to maternal parenting as a predictor, links have been established between mother and father involvement which indicates that authoritative maternal parenting may be related to authoritative paternal parenting (Flouri, 2004; Flouri & Buchanan, 2003; Paquette et al., 2000). Mothers and fathers may even display negative parenting of similar types (Barnett, Deng, Mills-Koonce, Willoughby, &

Cox, 2008). [Simons and Conger \(2007\)](#) explain this similarity in the parenting styles of married parents by referring to the process of socialization. This process appears to endure even after divorce, as [Flouri \(2006\)](#) found that mother involvement is a positive predictor of nonresident father involvement. She explained this phenomenon by noting that nonresident fathers are more engaged with their child if they believe that the mother has their child's best interests at heart. Therefore, we might expect the parenting styles of a given child's mother and father to be similar. The presence of a new partner in the mother's household is also an important predictor. A study by Cooney, Hutchinson, and Leather (1995) indicated that the remarriage of a mother leads to reduced intimacy between father and son. [King \(2009\)](#), however, found no relationship between the entrance of a stepfather into the maternal household and adolescent closeness to a nonresidential father. Still, [Schrodt \(2011\)](#) pointed out that the relationship between a stepparent and a biological parent is often filled with ambivalence, as they have not only a common (ex-)partner but also common and sometimes competing interests in children. This leads us to expect that a father is less involved and less authoritative when the mother lives with her new partner.

Although the model of Doherty et al. (1998, p. 285) includes coparental relationship characteristics such as relationship commitment, mutual support, cooperation, earning situations, and custodial arrangements, it is only the latter which is applicable to divorced fathers and which can thus be considered a divorce-related characteristic. Furthermore, other divorce-related characteristics, such as time since divorce, may also influence paternal parenting styles after divorce. Existing studies on custodial arrangement and paternal parenting are somewhat scarce. The few results available indicate that residential fathers are less likely to be permissive parents than other types of fathers ([Bronte-Tinkew, Scott, & Lilja, 2010](#)) and that fathers who have joint physical custody tend to be more involved than nonresidential fathers ([Bastais, Ponnnet, & Mortelmans, 2012a](#)). [Campana, Henderson, Stolberg, and Schum \(2008\)](#) found that residential fathers were more likely to have an authoritative parenting style, whereas fathers who had joint physical custody were more likely to have a permissive parenting style. Other studies on contact between father and child after divorce have also shown that more frequent contact leads to more effective fathering, as postdivorce contact gives fathers the opportunity to provide resources, guidance, and affection to their child ([King, 2006](#); [King & Sobolewski, 2006](#); [Peters & Ehrenberg, 2008](#); [Thomson, Hanson, & McLanahan, 1994](#)). We might therefore predict that fathers who have custody arrangements that allow for more contact with their child (namely residential fathers and fathers with joint physical custody) are more likely to have an authoritative parenting style and less likely to have an uninvolved parenting style than fathers who have less contact with their child (namely nonresidential fathers). Moreover, we also expect nonresidential fathers to be more likely to have a permissive parenting style compared to residential fathers and fathers in joint custody as [Stewart \(1999\)](#) found that nonresidential fathers participate more in leisure activities during visitation than other parenting activities. These nonresidential fathers are the so-called "Disneyland dads" ([Stewart, 1999](#)). They have a specific parenting style (i.e., very permissive), as these fathers spend their limited time with their child doing amusing things together. Furthermore, they do not engage in disciplining their child as they are fearful of losing contact with the child when their father–

child time is troubled by conflict. So, Disneyland dads are highly supportive but show low control, which is in line with a permissive parenting style. As for time since divorce, Peters and Ehrenberg (2008) concluded that father-child ties grow weaker as time passes, following a parental divorce. As a result, it could be expected that fathers are less likely to have an authoritative parenting style as time since divorce increases.

Method and operationalization

Participants and procedure

Analyses were conducted on a subsample of the data set from the DiF study, which employed a unique multiactor design where both currently and formerly married partners and their residential children aged 10 years or older were interviewed face to-face using a questionnaire. In order to contact both currently and formerly married partners, addresses were selected at random from the Belgian National Register (where one third were the addresses of currently married partners and two thirds were the addresses of formerly married partners) with the approval of the Belgian Privacy Committee. These partners were required to have been married between 1971 and 2008 and divorced only once. Partner response was 42.2% ($N = 6,470$; [Pasteels, Mortelmans, & Van Bavel, 2011](#)), which is in line with other European multiactor studies ([Arránz Becker et al., 2012](#); [Dykstra et al., 2005](#)). When selecting children aged 10 or older for the sample, the current or former partner of the addressee was required to be the biological or adoptive parent of this child. In cases where there were multiple residential children of at least 10 years old, one child was selected at random. The parent was always asked for permission to interview the child during the parental interview. Of the 2,206 currently or formerly married couples with a residential child of at least 10 years old, 1,257 dyads of at least one parent and one child were questioned (response rate 56.98%). Data collection, carried out by means of computer-assisted personal interviews, began in October 2009 and ended in December 2010.

For the present study, we used a subsample of the DiF data set that contained data on children of divorced partners aged between 10 and 18 years old (in line with [McLeod, Weisz, & Wood, 2007](#)) and on one formerly married partner, the parent of the child in question ($n = 503$). The selected parent could be either the mother or the father, and this was selected at random. Children who had no contact with one or both parents were excluded from the analysis ($n = 51$), as the core of this research is parenting. We also excluded children for whom information on custody arrangements was missing ($n = 33$) or filled out incorrectly ($n = 15$). This resulted in an analytic sample of 404 children and parents. Children reported on both maternal and paternal parenting styles, in line with the recent tendency to consider children active agents able to report on their own lives and experiences ([Ben-Arieh, 2005](#)). Moreover, research by [Pasley and Braver \(2004\)](#) has shown that parental answers on parenting are sensitive to social desirability; the use of child reporting therefore provides a unique perspective on this topic. The mother or father responded to questions on divorce-related characteristics and the characteristics of the father, child, and mother. The descriptive statistics of the divorce-related

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of mothers, fathers, children, and divorce-related characteristics.

Variables	M	SD
Age of father	44.48	4.32
Age of mother	42.40	4.25
Age of child	14.38	2.51
Time since divorce	7.76	3.81
	%	
Educational level of father		
Lower secondary or lower	21.91	
Higher secondary	47.61	
Higher education	30.48	
Educational level of mother		
Lower secondary or lower	16.25	
Higher secondary	43.25	
Higher education	40.50	
New partner of father		
Not living with a new partner	40.86	
Living with a new partner	59.14	
New partner of mother		
Not living with a new partner	49.25	
Living with a new partner	50.75	
Gender of child		
Boys	50.99	
Girls	49.01	
Custodial arrangement		
Father is residential	7.76	
Joint physical custody	34.16	
Father is nonresidential	58.17	

characteristics and the sociodemographic characteristics of the fathers, mothers, and children we analyzed are presented in Table 1.

Measures

Parenting style. The parenting style of the mother (predictor) and the parenting style of the father (dependent variable) were measured using the “Parenting Style Inventory II (PSI-II)” developed by Darling and Toyokawa (1997), which has also been used in other research on parenting styles and dimensions (Carlo, Mc Ginley, Hayes, Batenhorst, & Wilkinson, 2007; Nijhof & Engels, 2007). The PSI-II consists of two subscales: one on support and one on control. The support subscale contains 5 items, which the children rated on a Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*, for their mothers and fathers separately. Examples include “I can count on my mother/father to help me out if I have a problem” and “My mother/father and I do fun things together.” Three of the 5 items from the control subscale were

included, consistent with the previous research (Bastaits et al., 2012a; Ponnet et al., 2013), and the children also rated these on a Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree* for their mothers and fathers separately. Examples include “If I don’t behave myself, my mother/father will punish me” and “My mother/father really lets me get away with things.” Two of the 5 items from the control subscale were excluded for two reasons: first, the factor loadings of both excluded items were below .5 for mothers and fathers and second, internal consistency was better without these items for both mothers and fathers. With regard to the psychometric properties of the PSI-II subscales, internal consistency and discriminant validity were tested. Internal consistency (Cronbach’s α) for fathers was .82 for the support subscale and .77 for the control subscale; for mothers these figures were .82 and .68, respectively. The internal consistency of the paternal subscales is in line with other research that uses the Belgian version of the PSI-II; Bastaits, Ponnet, and Mortelmans (2012a), for example, measured internal consistencies of .80 for the support subscale and .73 for the control subscale in their sample of married and divorced fathers. Other research that uses the Dutch version of the PSI-II (Nijhof & Engels, 2007) has also produced comparable internal consistencies, namely .77 for the support subscale and .63 for the control subscale. This research did not distinguish between mothers and fathers but questioned adolescents about their parents as one unit. Darling and Toyokawa (1997) themselves recorded internal consistencies of .74 for the support subscale and .70 for the control subscale. Using a χ^2 difference test, discriminant validity was confirmed for paternal support and control ($\Delta\chi^2 = 314.03$, $\Delta df = 1$, $p < .001$) and for maternal support and control ($\Delta\chi^2 = 226.01$, $\Delta df = 1$, $p < .001$).

Characteristics of the father. The age of the father was measured by month and year of birth. The presence of a new partner in the household was measured in different ways depending on the respondent. If the father provided information on father characteristics, the presence of a new partner in the household was derived from a household grid filled out by the father; if the father defined a person within the household as a “partner” (either married or not married), the father was considered to be living with this new partner. If the mother provided information on father characteristics, she was asked whether the father was living with a new partner or not. Following imputation (using information from the other parent, if possible) of the 13.86% missing cases in the variable “presence of a new partner in the paternal household at the time of the interview,” missing values were reduced to 2.48%. The educational level of the father was measured as the highest level of education achieved, using 22 possible categories specific to the Belgian educational system. This was subsequently recoded into three categories: primary education or lower secondary education, higher secondary education, and higher education.

Characteristics of the child. Parents were asked to indicate whether the child was a boy or a girl. The age of the child was provided by the parent and measured by month and year of birth. During the interview with the child, these details were checked and, if necessary, corrected based on information provided by the child.

Characteristics of the mother. The age of the mother was measured by month and year of birth. The presence of a new partner in the household was measured in different ways depending on the respondent. If the mother provided information on mother characteristics, the presence of a new partner in the household was derived from a household grid filled out by the mother; if the mother defined a person within the household as a partner (either married or not married), the mother was considered to be living with her new partner. If the father provided information on mother characteristics, he was asked whether the mother was living with a new partner or not. Following imputation (using information from the other parent, if possible) of the 10.40% missing cases in the variable presence of a new partner in the maternal household at the time of the interview, missing values were reduced to 0.50%. The educational level of the mother was measured as the highest level of education achieved, using 22 possible categories specific to the Belgian educational system. Afterward, this was recoded into three categories: primary education or lower secondary education; higher secondary education; and higher education.

Divorce-related characteristics. Time since parental divorce was measured as the number of years that had passed since the two parents had begun to live apart. Custodial arrangements were measured using a double custody calendar; the parent being interviewed completed two custody calendars, the first of which indicated the days and nights that the child usually stayed with the mother in a normal month, while the second indicated the days and nights that the child usually stayed with the father in a normal month. Using this double calendar, a custodial arrangement was assigned to each child. Following other research on custodial arrangements (Melli, 1999; Smyth & Moloney, 2008), children who stayed with their fathers between 33% and 66% of all nights and otherwise with their mothers were classified as children in joint physical custody arrangements. Children who stayed with their fathers for more than 66% of all nights were classified as children with residential fathers. Children who stayed with their fathers for less than 33% of all nights were classified as children with nonresidential fathers.

Control variable. As information on all predictors except the mother's parenting style was not provided exclusively by the father but sometimes also by the mother, we controlled all regression models for information provided by the mother (67.33%) or by the father (32.67%).

Analytic strategy

Before exploring the predictors of divorced fathers' parenting styles, we conducted a latent class analysis (LCA) in order to assess maternal and paternal parenting styles. This is a data reduction technique for categorical variables, comparable with factor analysis. Based on the scores of various items from one or more (sub)scales, the likelihood of belonging to a specific class of one latent variable can be generated for each respondent. Thus, relying on the "support" and "control" subscales of the PSI-II (Darling & Toyokawa, 1997), Baumrind's four parenting styles (1991) were derived from the LCA for the mothers and fathers we analyzed (with the exception of three respondents who had missing values for all PSI-II indicators).

Table 2. Goodness-of-fit statistics of latent class models.

Model	Number of latent classes	Father			Mother		
		G ²	df	BIC	G ²	df	BIC
1	1	4,091.55	390,592	4,283.35	3,108.07	390,592	3,300.11
2	2	3,598.47	390,559	3,988.08	2,483.25	390,559	2,873.35
3	3	3,310.48	390,526	3,897.88	2,265.01	390,526	2,853.15
4	4	3,132.39	390,439	3,917.60	2,135.60	390,493	2,921.78
5	5	3,029.10	390,460	4,012.11	2,041.84	390,460	3,026.07
6	6	2,929.12	390,427	4,109.93	1,935.86	390,427	3,118.17

Note. *df*: degree of freedom; BIC: Bayesian Information Criterion.

In the next step, the parenting styles were added to a multinomial logistic regression model to assess the predictors of paternal parenting styles after divorce. In order to perform this logistic regression, all independent metric variables were centered on the grand mean. This is necessary when interpreting the intercept in the regression equation as the expected value of the outcome variable when all independent metric variables have their own mean values (Hox, 2010). Before conducting the multinomial logistic regression, all assumptions about the model (e.g., multicollinearity) were tested and confirmed. Given that previous research carried out using the DiF data indicated that residential fathers and fathers who had joint physical custody did not differ statistically in their parenting styles and levels of support and control (Bastaits et al., 2012a; Bastaits, Ponnet, & Mortelmans, 2012b), the difficulty of zero cells (cells with zero respondents in a specific category of the dependent variable) was solved by combining fathers who had joint physical custody with residential fathers in one group: semi-residential fathers. Missing values for dependent and independent variables were excluded from the multinomial logistic regression using listwise deletion. Separate regressions were performed for father characteristics, child characteristics, mother characteristics, and divorce-related characteristics; we also performed a final model that included all of these characteristics. Odds ratios (ORs) were reported for each characteristic included in the final model. These ORs are symmetrical at about 1, where ratios under 1 indicate a negative association with paternal parenting styles, ratios of 1 indicate no relationship, and ratios over 1 indicate a positive association with paternal parenting styles. A thorough discussion of all models is unfortunately beyond the scope of this article. The Results section below therefore discusses only the final model performed, in which all characteristics were included and controlled for as predictors of divorced fathers' parenting styles.

Results

LCA of parenting styles

In order to determine the number of parenting styles exhibited by divorced fathers, we relied on the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), as shown in Table 2. This is

Table 3. Estimated relative size of the latent classes and conditional probabilities of parenting-style inventory II items.

	Father				Mother			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Relative size	.135	.328	.253	.284	.107	.145	.338	.409
Subscale support								
My father/mother doesn't really like me to tell him/her my troubles: (Strongly) agree ^a	.291	.779	.779	.848	.597	.982	.985	.928
My father/mother hardly ever praises me for doing well: (Strongly) agree ^a	.187	.676	.788	.826	.454	.922	1.000	.908
I can count on my father/mother to help me out if I have a problem: (Strongly) agree	.219	.769	.873	.989	.406	.999	.992	.994
My father/mother spends time just talking to me: (strongly) agree	.007	.579	.739	.953	.110	.930	1.000	.879
My father/mother and I do things that are fun together: (Strongly) agree	.076	.655	.788	.946	.155	.754	.912	.666
Subscale control								
My father/mother really lets me get away with things: (strongly) agree ^a	.524	.240	.803	.557	.628	.135	.674	.412
If I don't behave myself, my father/mother will punish me: (Strongly) agree	.348	.083	.846	.502	.353	.082	.608	.410
When I do something wrong, my father/mother does not punish me: (Strongly) agree ^a	.483	.119	.990	.525	.523	.004	.821	.453

^aReversed items.

an indication of the measurement model's goodness of fit. From the BIC, we concluded that a three- or four-latent class solution was optimal. In line with Baumrind's theoretical model (1991), we opted for a four-latent class solution. The four classes accounted for 14%, 33%, 25%, and 28% of the sample (see Table 3). The conditional probabilities of the fathers' levels of support shown in Table 3 shed light on the differences among the four classes, indicating that the children in Class 1 found their fathers to be less supportive than those in other classes. With regard to the conditional probabilities of the fathers' levels of control, we observed a distinction between Classes 1 and 2 and Classes 3 and 4. The children in Classes 3 and 4 found their fathers to be more controlling than those in Classes 1 and 2, especially in relation to Item 2, "If I don't behave myself, my father will punish me" (.348 and .083 vs. .846 and .502). Class 3 could also be distinguished from Class 4, in that the fathers in Class 3 appeared to be more controlling. Based on these conditional probabilities, we labeled the four latent classes as fathers with uninvolved, permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative parenting styles, respectively. It should be noted that the fathers with an authoritarian parenting style (Class 2) in this study were still reported as being supportive of their children. This finding is consistent with the results of a study conducted by [Chan and Koo \(2011\)](#) who also conducted an LCA based on child information on parenting and found authoritarian parents to

be similarly supportive (even to the same extent as permissive parents, though less than authoritative parents).

With respect to the parenting styles of divorced mothers, we concluded that a four-latent class solution was adequate, based on the BIC shown in Table 2. This four-latent class solution is also in line with Baumrind's theoretical model (1991) and the results achieved for the parenting styles of divorced fathers. The relative sizes shown in Table 3 indicate that the four classes account for 11%, 14%, 34%, and 41% of the sample. From the conditional probabilities recorded for each class, we can conclude that the children perceived the mothers in Class 1 as less supportive than those in other classes. The mothers in Class 2 were perceived as the least controlling. In relation to Item 2 ("If I don't behave myself, my mother will punish me"), the children found the mothers in Class 1 to be less controlling than those in Class 4, analogous to the LCA of fathers. The children perceived the mothers in Class 3 as the most controlling. On the basis of these conditional probabilities, we labeled the four latent classes as mothers with uninvolved, permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative parenting styles respectively. Like fathers with an authoritarian parenting style, mothers with an authoritarian parenting style were still found to provide support.

In sum, the two latent class analyses revealed that a classification based on four parenting styles was an adequate solution for both divorced fathers and divorced mothers. Of the fathers we analyzed, 55 or 13.7% had an uninvolved style, 130 or 32.4% had a permissive style, 103 or 25.7% had an authoritarian style, and 113 or 28.2% had an authoritative style. Of the divorced mothers in our sample, 42 or 10.4% were uninvolved, 55 or 13.6% were permissive, 134 or 33.2% were authoritarian, and 173 or 42.8% were authoritative.

Predictors of divorced fathers' parenting

The multinomial logistic regression model shown in Table 4 represents the final model, which included all of the predictors of divorced fathers' parenting styles. The goodness-of-fit measures indicate that the estimated model fitted the data well. The likelihood ratio test reveals that the final model fitted the data statistically better than the intercept-only model ($\chi^2 = 142.45$, $df = 48$, $p < .001$). Moreover, the various pseudo- R^2 measures also demonstrate adequate fit.

When discussing the results of the multinomial logistic regression, we will focus on effect sizes as well as statistical differences. Therefore, we will discuss the most prominent ORs. With regard to the characteristics of the father, less educated fathers were .43 times less likely to have an authoritarian parenting style than an authoritative parenting style, whereas more highly educated fathers were .46 times less likely to have a permissive parenting style than an authoritative parenting style. Only the latter had a p value of .05, a borderline statistical difference. Other ORs for the educational level of the father were closer to 1. All ORs for the father's age were close to 1, so we can conclude that this is not an important predictor of paternal parenting styles after divorce. The presence of a new partner in the household had a high OR of 2.09, revealing that fathers who were living with a new partner were 2.09 times more likely to be an

Table 4. Multinomial logistic regression models for all predictive factors of divorced fathers' parenting styles.

B s(b)	Uninvolved versus Authoritative			Permissive versus Authoritative			Authoritarian versus Authoritative		
	b	OR	p	b	OR	p	b	OR	p
Intercept	-2.50		.01	-.92		.15	-.33		.61
Information provided by mother (Ref: Father)	.96	1.18	.72	.64			.65		
Characteristics of the father									
Father's education: higher secondary (ref)									
Father's education: Lower or lower secondary education	.17		.72	-.12		.88	.20		.57
Father's education: Higher Education	.46			.34			.36		
Age of father									
New partner of father (Ref: None)									
Characteristics of the child									
Gender of child (Ref: Boy)									
Age of child									
Characteristics of the mother									
Mother's education: higher secondary (ref)									
Mother's education: Lower or lower secondary education	-.15	.86	.78	.60	1.83	.18	-.07	.93	.90
Mother's education: Higher Education	.56			.45			.52		
Age of mother	.04	1.05	.92	1.13	3.08	.00	1.02	2.78	.01
	.47			.38			.37		
	.04	1.04	.57	-.02	.98	.72	-.03	.97	.59

(continued)

Table 4. (continued)

B s(b)	Uninvolved versus Authoritative			Permissive versus Authoritative			Authoritarian versus Authoritative		
	b	OR	p	b	OR	p	b	OR	p
New partner of mother (Ref: None)	.07 -.91 .42	.40	.03	.06 .20 .33	1.22	.55	.06 -.36 .34	.70	.30
Mother's parenting style: uninvolved (ref)									
Permissive mother	.32	1.38	.70	-.15	.86	.79	-1.87	.15	.01
	.84			.58			.73		
Authoritarian mother	.36	1.44	.64	-.60	.55	.26	-.58	.56	.28
	.77			.54			.53		
Authoritative mother	.89	2.45	.26	1.11	3.03	.04	.64	1.90	.23
	.79			.53			.54		
Divorce-related characteristics									
Custody: Father nonresidential (Ref: Father semi-residential)	1.31 .42	3.71	.00	.95 .34	2.58	.01	.29 .35	1.34	.40
Time since divorce	.03 .06	1.03	.58	-.06 .04	.94	.22	.00 .05	1.00	.95

Note. N = 378; -2LL intercept and covariates = 870.00 (intercept only = 1,012.45); Cox & Snell R² = .31; Nagelkerke R² = .34.

uninvolved father than an authoritative father, but the results did not reveal a statistical difference.

With respect to the characteristics of the child, the results in Table 4 reveal that both the gender and age of the child are important predictors. All child gender models had ORs above 1, the highest being 2.55, meaning that fathers of girls were 2.55 times more likely to have an uninvolved parenting style than an authoritative parenting style in comparison with fathers of boys. This OR had a p value of .01, indicating a statistical difference. For each additional year in child's age, fathers were 1.17 times more likely to be uninvolved, 1.32 times more likely to be permissive, and 1.24 times more likely to be authoritarian than to be authoritative. Only the latter two demonstrated statistical difference, however.

Regarding the characteristics of the mother, the educational level of the mother was found to be important as two ORs exceeded 2.00 and indicated a statistical difference. Fathers were 3.08 times more likely to be permissive and 2.78 times more likely to be authoritarian when the mother was more highly educated. Other ORs for the educational level of the mother were close to 1, with the exception that fathers were 1.83 times more likely to be permissive when the mother was less educated. Nevertheless, there was no indication of a statistical difference for this OR. The age of the mother was not found to be an important predictor of paternal parenting styles after divorce, as all ORs were close to 1. As far as the presence of a new partner in the maternal household is concerned, fathers were .40 times less likely to be uninvolved and .70 less likely to be authoritarian than authoritative if the mother was living with a new partner. Then again, they were 1.22 times more likely to be permissive than authoritative if the mother was living with a new partner. Still, only the former result was found to be statically different from one. The parenting style of the mother also appears to be an essential predictor, as fathers were 0.15 times less likely to have an authoritarian parenting style than an authoritative parenting style when the mother was permissive. When divorced mothers were authoritative parents, fathers were 2.45 times more likely to be uninvolved, 3.03 times more likely to be permissive, and 1.90 times more likely to be authoritarian than authoritative. Only the OR of 3.03, for permissive, was found to be statistically different from 1. Compared with the ORs produced for other types of mothers, those for authoritarian mothers were closer to 1 and therefore less important for paternal parenting styles after divorce.

Regarding divorce-related characteristics, the results illustrate that custodial arrangement is the only important predictor, as ORs for time since divorce were all very close to 1. Custodial arrangement ORs indicated that nonresidential fathers were 3.71 times more likely to have an uninvolved parenting style and 2.58 times more likely to have a permissive parenting style than an authoritative parenting style in comparison with semi-residential fathers. Both differed statistically from one.

Discussion

In recent decades, social science research has developed an increasing interest in father involvement (Coley & Hernandez, 2006). When investigating the parenting of divorced fathers, the primary focus lies on the link between fathers' parenting styles (especially

those of nonresidential fathers) and the well-being of their child following parental divorce (Booth et al., 2010; King & Sobolewski, 2006; Stewart, 2003). This study has extended our knowledge of the parenting styles of divorced fathers by exploring the predictors of these parenting styles. We investigated the predictors from within a multilateral framework using the theoretical model developed by Doherty et al. (1998) while focusing on four groups of predictors, namely the characteristics of the father, the child, and the mother as well as divorce-related characteristics.

The results provide evidence to suggest that the Doherty et al. (1998) theoretical model of responsible fathering also applies to the parenting styles of divorced fathers. The parenting styles of divorced fathers are predicted not only by the characteristics of the father but also by the characteristics of the child and the mother and divorce-related characteristics. With regard to the characteristics of the father, our results suggest that more highly educated fathers have a higher likelihood of having an authoritative parenting style. This is consistent with our hypothesis and with previous literature, which states that more highly educated fathers tend to be more aware of the importance of father figures (Peters & Ehrenberg, 2008). Still, this finding demonstrated only a borderline statistical difference; this might be due to the inclusion of the mother's educational level, as these two factors were found to be associated ($\chi^2 = 112.13$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$). In a model that contained only father characteristics, the educational level of the father revealed a statistical difference in the same direction. Contrary to what we expected, no parenting associations were found concerning the age of the father and the presence of a new partner in the paternal household. As far as age is concerned, this may be due to the fact that we also included the age of the child, which was indeed associated with the parenting style of divorced fathers in the expected direction. Bivariate analysis indicates that the age of the father and the age of the child are statistically positively correlated (correlation = .50, $p < .001$). However, no multicollinearity (as measured by tolerance and the variation inflation factor) was found in our multinomial logistic regression model. The multinomial logistic regression model that included only the characteristics of the father as predictors did indicate that older fathers were statistically more likely to have a permissive or an authoritarian parenting style than to have an authoritative parenting style. Still, taking into account the ages of both the child and the father might cause the statistical difference for father's age to disappear, as part of that effect is ruled out by taking the child's age into account. One explanation for the lack of statistical difference for the presence of a new partner in the father's household might be that the length of the new relationship plays a role. It is plausible that competition and role conflict (Adamson & Pasley, 2006) decline over time as the child, new partner, and father become accustomed to the new division of roles and time. Furthermore, it might also be the case that the new partner engages in family and household tasks and provides support, which influences the parenting of divorced parents in a positive way (Hetherington, 2006). The lack of an association between living with a new partner and paternal parenting styles after divorce may therefore be due to the fact that both mechanisms (role conflict and household support of father) play a role. Hetherington (2006) found that relationship duration and the presence of step- and half-siblings might be important in this regard, so future research should investigate this.

Regarding the characteristics of the child, the results of this study are consistent with our hypotheses and with previous research. Girls were found to be more likely to have a father with an uninvolved parenting style; previous literature has suggested that this might be related to the notion that fathers have more in common and identify more with their sons than with their daughters (Marsiglio, 1991; Peters & Ehrenberg, 2008). Older children were more likely to have a father with a permissive or authoritarian parenting style; Larson (1993) and Larson & Richards (1994) found that fathers withdraw from parenting as they and their child grow older. Children may also have an increased desire for autonomy as they grow over and thus detach themselves from their parents to some extent (King et al., 2004).

With respect to the characteristics of the mother, all effects were found to be associated with paternal parenting styles with the exception of the mother's age. Contrary to what we expected, our findings indicate that fathers have a higher likelihood of having an authoritative parenting style when mothers have a permissive parenting style, while the likelihood of fathers having a permissive parenting style is higher when mothers have an authoritative parenting style. Instead of having similar parenting styles, then, divorced parents seem to exhibit somewhat opposing parenting styles. The compensation mechanism (Simons & Conger, 2007) might provide a possible explanation. For example, it might be that a father attempts to compensate for a perceived lack of control or support on the mother's part by maintaining an authoritative parenting style. Similarly, if a mother herself is authoritative, the father may be permissive, as the mother's role compensates for the father's lack of control. Another explanation might be that divorced parents had different parenting styles when they were married and that their differences (among other things) actually contributed to the divorce. Previous research has indicated that differences between spouses are often among the main causes of divorce (Amato & Previti, 2003; De Graaf & Kalmijn, 2006). Consequently, further research using longitudinal data is necessary in order to establish whether compensation or selection mechanisms can provide an explanation. Regarding mothers' new partners, divorced fathers have a lower likelihood of being uninvolved than authoritative when mothers have a new partner. This unexpected result could be ascribed to potential rivalry and/or jealousy between the father and the stepfather which causes the father to become more involved when another father figure enters the child's life following parental divorce (Ganong, Coleman, & Hans, 2006). Another unexpected result was the finding that fathers are more likely to exhibit a permissive or authoritarian parenting style when mothers are more highly educated. As our results on the maternal characteristics that influence paternal parenting after divorce contradict our hypotheses, further research is needed to clarify the mechanisms underpinning these relationships.

Regarding divorce-related characteristics, no evidence was found at that time since divorce acts as a predictor, contrary to what we expected. It may well be, as Peters and Ehrenberg (2008) suggested, that father-child ties weaken as time since divorce increases due to loss of contact. Our analyses focused exclusively on children who were in contact with their divorced fathers, and this might explain the lack of a relationship between time since divorce and paternal parenting styles. Custodial arrangement was an important predictor of the parenting style of divorced fathers; however, as the findings reveal that nonresidential fathers are more likely to have an uninvolved or permissive

parenting style than residential fathers and fathers who have joint physical custody, even when other predictors of parenting styles are controlled for. This is in line with the parental resource theory (Thomson et al., 1994), which states that time is an important resource for parents to demonstrate support and control, the two underlying dimensions of parenting styles. A plausible explanation for the difference in parenting styles among divorced fathers with different custodial arrangements might be that divorced fathers tend to be more distressed about loss of contact with their child than about loss of contact with their ex-wives (Jacobs, 1983). This distress might function as a stressor, and stressors have a negative impact on fathers' parenting (Degarmo & Forgatch, 1999). This may lead nonresidential fathers to have a less involved or more permissive parenting style. Another plausible explanation for the overrepresentation of permissive parenting among the group of nonresidential fathers might be that these fathers attempt to compensate for the parental divorce and loss of contact with their child by investing in their parenting in a way that could be seen as overindulgent and lacking in control. This finding is in line with the concept of Disneyland dads, referring to nonresidential fathers who are very permissive as they are afraid to lose contact with their child when they discipline their child (Stewart, 1999). It is important to note that a selection mechanism cannot be ruled out, as fathers who had a permissive or uninvolved parenting style during the marriage might be more likely to opt for a nonresidential custody arrangement. Further research using longitudinal data is therefore necessary.

Research on the predictors of paternal parenting after divorce can be extended in various ways. First, although the number of nonmarried parents in Western societies is increasing, information on separated fathers who have never been married is lacking in the DiF data set. Future research would benefit from having greater insight into the parenting of separated, never married fathers. Second, the crosssectional DiF data set used in this study did not allow us to include more psychological predictors in our model. An investigation of psychological predictors, perhaps starting from Belsky's (1984) social-contextual model for determinants, which includes both parental and child characteristics as well as the social context of parenting, could provide new and insightful results. Future research could focus more on the psychological attributes of parents and children such as temperament, emotional states, and marital processes. Third, as mentioned above, future research on the mechanisms underpinning the influence of maternal predictors on paternal parenting styles after divorce might provide deeper insight into the unexpected results produced in this study concerning maternal characteristics. Researchers could focus on the mechanisms of maternal gatekeeping after divorce (i.e., gate closing and gate opening in Trinder, 2008) but might also take into account the mother-father parental relationship during marriage and the cooperative coparental relationship after divorce.

This study has important implications for civil society. As we know from previous research, an authoritative parenting style can act as an important protective factor for children's well-being after divorce (Amato, 2000; Lansford, 2009). There is no single way to promote authoritative parenting, and our study indicates that the likelihood of having a father with an authoritative parenting style after divorce is not distributed randomly among children. Girls, older children, children with nonresidential fathers, and children with more highly educated mothers are all less likely to have a father with an

authoritative parenting style. This may have negative consequences for their well-being after parental divorce. Parenting programs that focus on divorced fathers should therefore acknowledge this unequal distribution and pay special attention to divorced fathers of girls, fathers of older children, and fathers who have nonresidential custodial arrangements. Furthermore, these programs should acknowledge the existence of a link between maternal characteristics and fathers' parenting after divorce and concentrate on the parental unit, despite the fact that the parents are divorced. It is essential that parenting programs and other initiatives that promote authoritative parenting recognize this diversity in parenting styles and acknowledge the different aspects not only of fathers' lives but also of children's lives and of the broader family context. Parenting programs and other initiatives that take familial diversity as a point of departure can adapt themselves better to individual cases and promote authoritative parenting in more appropriate ways.

It is important to note the limitations of this study. First, analyses were conducted on cross-sectional data, so no causal conclusions can be drawn and selectivity cannot be ruled out. This fact prevented us from including previous coparental relationship indicators such as marital quality and marital conflict, which are important indicators as a study by Krishnakumar, Buehler, and Barber (2003) indicated that interparental conflict has an important impact on parental control and support. Future research might therefore make use of longitudinal data in order to establish whether coparental relationship indicators measured at one point in time (e.g., when the couple is still married) can predict the parenting style of a divorced father at a later point in time. Second, due to the use of cross-sectional, single-region data, we were unable to investigate the contextual predictors of father involvement, such as cultural or economic changes. In order to investigate changes over time (caused by factors such as legislation on joint custody) and cultural differences as predictors of divorced fathers' parenting styles, a longitudinal, cross-national data set is required. Nevertheless, we know from previous research that fathering, more than mothering, is sensitive to context (Doherty, Kouneski, & Erickson, 1998). For example, White, Roosa, Weaver, and Nair (2009) found that residential neighborhood affects fathers' parenting. Widmer, Le Goff, Levy, Hammer, and Kellerhals (2006) also revealed that broader conjugal networks of family and friends play a role in parenting and the parent-child relationship. Furthermore, several studies have indicated that economic hardship has a negative impact on fathering, resulting in less involved fathers (Thomson et al., 1994; White, Roosa, Weaver, & Nair, 2009). Third, the authoritarian fathers and mothers of our sample scored highest in control but were also supportive to some extent. Although this was also found in other research (Chan & Koo, 2011), it is a result that is not entirely in line with Baumrind's theoretical classification (1991). This discrepancy could be attributed to the use of three rather than 5 items of the control subscale, as those 3 items focus mostly on punishment. Due to low factor loadings and low internal consistency, however, the 5-item subscale could not be used in this study.

Despite these limitations, this study has a number of key strengths, including its focus on the parenting of divorced fathers, the inclusion of residential fathers and fathers who have joint physical custody arrangements, the use of multiactor data, and the multilateral framework employed to assess the predictors of divorced fathers' parenting styles. The results of this study indicate that, when examining the parenting styles of divorced

fathers, it is not only the father's characteristics that should be taken into account but also the child's characteristics, the mother's characteristics, and divorce-related characteristics. Evidently, paternal parenting after divorce does not take place in a social vacuum but is influenced by other family members. In summary, our findings lend support to investigations of divorced fathers' parenting that employ a multilateral family framework and include information on other family members.

Funding

This work was supported by the Agency for Innovation by Science and Technology.

References

- Adamson, K., & Pasley, K. (2006). Coparenting following divorce and relationship dissolution. In M. A. Fine & J. H. Harvey (Eds.) *Handbook of divorce and relationship dissolution* (pp. 241–261). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Amato, P. R. (2000). The consequences of divorce for adults and children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *62*, 1269–1287.
- Amato, P. R., Meyers, C. E., & Emery, R. E. (2009). Changes in non-resident father-child contact from 1976 to 2002. *Family Relations*, *58*, 41–53.
- Amato, P. R., & Previti, D. (2003). People's reasons for divorcing: Gender, social class, the life course and adjustment. *Journal of Family Issues*, *24*, 602–626.
- Amato, P. R., & Sobolewski, J. M. (2004). The effect of divorce on fathers and children: Non-residential fathers and stepfathers. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development: Fourth edition* (pp. 341–367). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Arránz Becker, O., Brüderl, J., Buhr, P., Castiglioni, L., Fuß, D., Ludwig, V., . . . Schumann, N. (2012). The German family panel: Study design and cumulated field report (Waves 1 to 3). *Pairfam Technical paper 01*. Germany: Pairfam.
- Barnett, M. A., Deng, M., Mills-Koonce, W. R., Willoughby, M., & Cox, M. (2008). Interdependence of parenting of mothers and fathers of infants. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *22*, 561–573.
- Bastaits, K., Ponnet, K., & Mortelmans, D. (2012a). Parenting of divorced fathers and the association with children's self-esteem. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *41*, 1643–1656.
- Bastaits, K., Ponnet, K., & Mortelmans, D. (2012b). Doen gescheiden vaders ertoe? De impact van opvoedingsstijlen van gescheiden vaders op het welbevinden van het kind. *Tijdschrift voor Sociologie*, *33*, 239–266.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *11*, 56–95.
- Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child Development*, *55*, 83–96.
- Ben-Arieh, A. (2005). Where are the children? Children's role in measuring and monitoring their well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, *74*, 573–596.
- Booth, A., Scott, M. E., & King, V. (2010). Father residence and adolescent problem behaviour: Are youth always better off in two-parent families? *Journal of Family Issues*, *31*, 585–605.
- Bronte-Tinkew, J., Scott, M. E., & Lilja, E. (2010). Single custodial fathers' involvement and parenting: Implications for outcomes in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*, 1107–1127.

- Campana, K. L., Henderson, S., Stolberg, A. L., & Schum, L. (2008). Paired maternal and paternal parenting styles, child custody and children's emotional adjustment to divorce. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 48, 1–20.
- Carlo, G., Mc Ginley, M., Hayes, R., Batenhorst, C., & Wilkinson, J. (2007). Parenting styles or practices? Parenting, sympathy and prosocial behaviors among adolescents. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 168, 147–176.
- Chan, T. W., & Koo, A. (2011). Parenting style and youth outcomes in the UK. *European Sociological Review*, 27, 385–399.
- Coley, R. L., & Hernandez, D. C. (2006). Predictors of parental involvement for resident and non-resident low-income fathers. *Developmental Psychology*, 42, 1041–1056.
- Cooney, T. M., Hutchinson, M. K., & Leather, D. M. (1995). Surviving the breakup? Predictors of parent-adult child relations after parental divorce. *Family Relations*, 44, 153–161.
- Cox, M. J., & Paley, B. (1997). Families as systems. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, 243–267.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 487–496.
- Darling, N., & Toyokawa, T. (1997). *Construction and validation of the Parenting Style Inventory II (PSI-II)*. Pennsylvania, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, department of human development and family studies.
- DeGarmo, D. S., & Forgatch, M. S. (1999). Context as predictors of changing maternal parenting practices in diverse family structures: A social interactional perspective of risk and resilience. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Coping with divorce, single parenting and remarriage: A risk and resiliency perspective* (pp. 227–252). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- De Graaf, P. M., & Kalmijn, M. (2006). Divorce motives in a period of rising divorce: Evidence from a Dutch life-history survey. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 483–505.
- Doherty, W. J., Kouneski, E. F., & Erickson, M. F. (1998). Responsible fathering: An overview and conceptual framework. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 60, 277–292.
- Dykstra, P. A., Kalmijn, M., Knijn, T. C. M., Komter, A. E., Liefbroer, A. C., & Mulder, C. H. (2005). Codebook of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study, a multi-actor, multi-method panel study on solidarity in family relationships, Wave 1. *NKPS Working Paper No. 4*. The Hague: Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute.
- Eurostat. (2012). *Divorces per 1 000 persons*. Retrieved from http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/population/data/main_tables
- Flouri, E. (2004). Correlates of parents' involvement with their adolescent children in restructured and biological two-parent families: The role of child characteristics. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28, 148–156.
- Flouri, E. (2006). Non-resident fathers' relationships with their secondary school age children: Determinants and children's mental health outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29, 525–538.
- Flouri, E., & Buchanan, A. (2003). What predicts fathers' involvement with their children? A prospective study of intact families. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 21, 81–98.
- Ganong, L., Coleman, M., & Hans, J. (2006). Divorce as prelude to stepfamily living and the consequences of redivorce. In M. A. Fine & J. H. Harvey (Eds.) *Handbook of divorce and relationship dissolution* (pp. 409–434). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Henderson, S. H., & Taylor, L. C. (1999). Parent-adolescent relationships in nonstep-, simple step- and complex stepfamilies, *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 64, 79–100.

- Hetherington, E. M. (2006). The influence of conflict, marital problem solving and parenting on children's adjustment in nondivorced, divorced and remarried families. In A. Clarke-Stewart & J. Dunn (Eds.), *Families count. Effects on child and adolescent development* (pp. 203–237). Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hohman-Mariott, B. (2011). Coparenting and father involvement in married and unmarried co-resident couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73, 296–309.
- Hox, J. J. (2010). *Multilevel analysis. Techniques and applications*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jacobs, J. (1983). Treatment of divorcing fathers: Social and psychotherapeutic considerations. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 140, 1294–1299.
- King, V. (2006). The antecedents and consequences of adolescents' relationships with stepfathers and nonresident fathers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 910–928.
- King, V. (2009). Stepfamily formation: Implications for adolescent ties to mothers, nonresident fathers, and stepfathers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71, 954–968.
- King, V., Harris, K. M., & Heard, H. E. (2004). Racial and ethnic diversity in nonresident father involvement. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 1–21.
- King, V., & Heard, H. E. (1999). Nonresident father visitation, parental conflict and mother's satisfaction: What's best for child well-being? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61, 385–396.
- King, V., & Sobolewski, J. M. (2006). Nonresident fathers' contributions to adolescent well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 537–557.
- Krishnakumar, A., Buehler, C., & Barber, B. K. (2003). Youth perceptions of interparental conflict, ineffective parenting, and youth problem behaviors in European-American and African-American families. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 20, 239–260.
- Lansford, J. E. (2009). Parental divorce and children's adjustment. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4, 140–152.
- Larson, R. W. (1993). Finding time for fatherhood: The emotional ecology of adolescent-father interactions. In S. Shulman & W. A. Collins (Eds.), *Father-adolescent relationships* (pp. 7–25). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Larson, R. W., & Richards, M. H. (1994). *Divergent realities: The emotional lives of mothers, fathers and adolescents*. New York: Basic Books.
- Marsiglio, W. (1991). Paternal engagement activities with minor children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 53, 973–986.
- Marsiglio, W., Amato, P. R., Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Scholarship on fatherhood in the 1990s and beyond. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62, 1173–1191.
- McLeod, B. D., Weisz, J. R., & Wood, J. J. (2007). Examining the association between parenting and childhood depression: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 27, 986–1003.
- Melli, M. S. (1999). Guideline review: Child support and time sharing by parents. *Family Law Quarterly*, 33, 219–234.
- Minuchin, S. (1974). *Families and Family therapy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nijhof, K. S., & Engels, R. C. M. E. (2007). Parenting styles, coping strategies and the expression of homesickness. *Journal of Adolescence*, 30, 709–720.
- Ozen, D. S. (2004). The impact of interparental divorce on adult attachment styles and perceived parenting styles of adolescents. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 40, 129–149.
- Paquette, D., Bolté, C., Turcotte, G., Dubeau, D., & Bouchard, C. (2000). A new typology of fathering: Defining and associated variables. *Infant and Child Development*, 9, 213–230.

- Pasley, K., & Braver, S. L. (2004). Measuring father involvement in divorced, non-resident fathers. In R. D. Day & M. E. Lamb (Eds.) *Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement* (pp. 217–240). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pasteels, I., Mortelmans, D., & Van Bavel, J. (2011). Steekproef en dataverzameling. In D. Mortelmans, I. Pasteels, P. Bracke, K. Matthijs, J. Van Bavel, & C. Van Peer (Eds.), *Scheiding in Vlaanderen* (pp. 85–112). Leuven, Belgium: Acco.
- Peters, B., & Ehrenberg, M. F. (2008). The influence of parental separation and divorce on father-child relationships. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, *49*, 78–109.
- Ponnet, K., Mortelmans, D., Wouters, E., Van Leeuwen, K., Bastaits, K., & Pasteels, I. (2013). Parenting stress and marital relationship as determinants of mothers' and fathers' parenting. *Personal Relationships*, *20*, 259–276.
- Pryor, J. (2004). Parenting in reconstructed and surrogate families. In M. Hoghughy & N. Long (Eds.) *Handbook of parenting: Theory and research for practice* (pp. 110–129). London, England: Sage.
- Schrodtt, P. (2011). Stepparents' and nonresidential parents' relational satisfaction as a function of coparental communication in stepfamilies. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *28*, 983–1004.
- Simons, L. G., & Conger, R. D. (2007). Linking mother-father differences in parenting to a typology of family parenting styles and adolescent outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues*, *28*, 212–241.
- Smyth, B., & Moloney, L. (2008). Changes in patterns of post-separation parenting over time: A brief review. *Journal of Family Studies*, *14*, 7–22.
- Sodermans, A. K., Matthijs, K., & Swicegood, G. (2013a). Characteristics of joint physical custody families in Flanders. *Demographic Research*, *28*, 821–848.
- Sodermans, A. K., Vanassche, S., & Matthijs, K. (2013b). Post-divorce custody arrangements and binuclear family structures of Flemish adolescents. *Demographic Research*, *28*, 421–432.
- Stewart, S. D. (1999). Disneyland dads, Disneyland moms? How nonresident parents spend time with absent children. *Journal of Family Studies*, *20*, 539–556.
- Stewart, S. D. (2003). Nonresident parenting and adolescent adjustment. The quality of nonresident father-child interaction. *Journal of Family Issues*, *24*, 217–244.
- Thomson, E., Hanson, T. L., & McLanahan, S. S. (1994). Family structure and child well-being: Economic resources vs. parental behaviors. *Social Forces*, *73*, 221–242.
- Trinder, L. (2008). Maternal gate closing and gate opening in postdivorce families. *Journal of Family Issues*, *29*, 1298–1324.
- White, R. M. B., Roosa, M. W., Weaver, S. R., & Nair, R. L. (2009). Cultural and contextual influences on parenting in Mexican American families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *71*, 61–79.
- Widmer, E., Le Goff, J. M., Levy, R., Hammer, R., & Kellerhals, J. (2006). Embedded parenting? The influence of conjugal networks on parent-child relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *23*, 387–406.