



STOCKHOLM UNIVERSITY

Dept of Sociology, Demography Unit / [www.suda.su.se](http://www.suda.su.se)

# Are Parents with Shared Residence Happier? Children's Postdivorce Residence Arrangements and Parents' Life Satisfaction

Franciëlla van der Heijden, Michael Gähler and  
Juho Härkönen

**Stockholm  
Research Reports  
in Demography  
2015: 17**

**Are Parents with Shared Residence Happier?**  
**Children's Postdivorce Residence Arrangements and Parents' Life**  
**Satisfaction**

*Franciëlla van der Heijden*  
Utrecht University

*Michael Gähler,*  
SOFI, Stockholm University

*Juho Härkönen,*  
Department of Sociology, Stockholm University

**Abstract:** This study investigates whether shared residence parents experience higher life satisfaction than sole and nonresident parents, and whether frequent visitation is similarly related to parents' life satisfaction as shared residence. Regression analyses on data from 4,175 recently divorced parents show that shared residence parents report higher life satisfaction than other, particularly nonresident, parents, but that this relationship can largely be explained by benefits and opportunity costs of parenthood. Shared residence fathers enjoy a better relationship with their child and their ex-partner and are more engaged in leisure activities than nonresident fathers. Shared residence mothers are more involved in leisure activities, employment, and romantic relationships than sole resident mothers. These differences contribute to the shared residence parents' higher life satisfaction. Frequent interaction between the nonresident father and the child could partly, but not completely, substitute for shared residence, increasing both nonresident fathers' and sole mothers' life satisfaction.

**Keywords:** Divorce, Joint physical custody, Life satisfaction, Living arrangements, Parents, Shared residence, Subjective well-being

**Acknowledgements**

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.

Shared residence (also called joint physical custody, shared placement, or alternating residence), in which children reside more or less equally with each parent, has become a popular post-dissolution residence arrangement in several Western countries (e.g., Bjarnason & Arnarsson, 2011; Cancian, Meyer, Brown, & Cook, 2014). This trend has sparked research interest into its consequences for children (Bauserman, 2012; Nielsen, 2014; Trinder, 2010). Arguments for its favorable effects have been used to promote shared residence in public policies and in family courts (e.g., Bartfeld, 2011; Fehlberg, Smyth, MacLean, & Roberts, 2011; Harris-Short, 2010; Sodermans, Matthijs, & Swicegood, 2013).

In this study, we analyze the effects of shared residence on parents' life satisfaction. The consequences of shared residence for parents have been almost neglected in previous research (exceptions being Botterman, Sodermans, & Matthijs, 2014; Fritzell & Gähler, 2014; Van der Heijden, Poortman, & Van der Lippe, 2015) and only one study has focused on well-being outcomes of parents (Sodermans, Botterman, Havermans, & Matthijs, 2015). A weakening of the parental role and of the relationship with the child are major mechanisms explaining the effects of divorce or relationship dissolution on nonresident fathers' psychological well-being, as are the direct and opportunity costs of sole parenthood on divorced sole resident mothers' well-being (Bakker & Karsten, 2013; Coysh, Johnston, Tschann, Wallerstein, & Kline, 1989; Shapiro & Lambert, 1999; Sodermans et al., 2015). Shared residence could even out these costs and benefits of post-dissolution parenting and affect how parents fare after relationship dissolution. Furthermore, how parents cope after the divorce might reflect on their children's well-being.

We address three main questions. First, are parents with shared residence more satisfied with their lives than sole and nonresident parents? Second, can frequent visitation of the nonresident parent reduce the life satisfaction differences between shared residence

parents on the one hand, and sole resident and nonresident parents on the other? Although frequent visitation increases the nonresident parent's involvement in the life of the child, shared residence is a more formalized and structural form of post-dissolution child care. Analysis of whether the well-being effects of these arrangements differ is thus of theoretical, practical, and policy relevance, but seldom done. Third, we analyze whether the quality of the relationship with the child and the other parent, and opportunity costs in terms of leisure, employment, and repartnering explain associations between residence and visitation arrangements and parental life satisfaction. We focus on life satisfaction as a cognitive assessment which includes all domains of life according to their importance for the individual (Diener, Inglehart, & Tay, 2013; Pavot & Diener, 2009).

We use data on 4,175 recently divorced and formerly cohabiting parents from the New Families in the Netherlands (2012/2013) survey, which allow us to examine the life satisfaction of a large number of parents approximately two years after their relationship dissolved. Around one fourth of parents in the sample have shared residence. To address the first question, we analyze life satisfaction differences between shared residence parents and sole and nonresident parents. To address the second question, we use a reduced sample of 1,559 nonresident and shared residence fathers, and 2,269 sole resident and shared residence mothers, to assess whether visitation frequency of the nonresident father decreases the life satisfaction differences between shared residence parents and parents with the most typical postdivorce residency arrangement, i.e., sole residency of the mother. Our analyses contribute to knowledge on the consequences of post-dissolution child care arrangements and, more broadly, to the understanding of the adjustment to divorce and variation therein.

## BACKGROUND

Parenthood is associated with various benefits and costs (McLanahan & Adams, 1987; 1989; Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2003). The most frequently found benefit of parenthood is the satisfaction derived from fulfilling the parental role and having a warm and rewarding relationship with one's child (Nomaguchi, 2012; Umberson & Gove, 1989). Although monetary costs of parenthood are obvious (Bird, 1997; Stanca, 2012), involved parents may also be limited by foregone labor market and leisure opportunities (McLanahan & Adams, 1987; Vanassche, Swicegood, & Matthijs, 2013). We expect the differences in these benefits and costs to play a central role in shaping differences in life satisfaction for divorced parents with different child residence arrangements (Van der Heijden et al., 2015). Additionally, we consider two divorce-specific factors, namely repartnering and conflict. We first discuss how these factors shape life satisfaction differences between sole resident and nonresident parents and then consider how shared residence arrangements and visitation frequency affect life satisfaction of divorced parents.

Sole resident parents may benefit more from active involvement in their child's life than nonresident parents, because they see the child on a daily basis. Involvement with the child might protect against feelings of disruption and loss after divorce or relationship dissolution. Previous studies have shown that nonresident fathers fare worse in terms of psychological well-being than coresident fathers, which has been attributed to a lack of involvement with the child (Bokker, Farley, & Bailey, 2006; Coysh et al., 1989; Evenson & Simon, 2005; Stone, 2001). Divorce can also lead to a decline in the quality of the relationship between the nonresident father and the child (Peters & Ehrenberg, 2008; Shapiro & Lambert, 1999), and parents who have a good relationship with their child report higher well-being (Nomaguchi, 2012; Umberson & Gove, 1989).

Whereas active involvement in their child's life can boost sole resident parents' life satisfaction due to the benefits from parenting, these parents can also be limited in their labor market participation and personal leisure activities because of the structural responsibility for their child. In addition, their child responsibility may make it difficult for them to find a new partner and maintain a romantic relationship (Beaujouan, 2012; Ivanova, Kalmijn, & Uunk, 2013), an important predictor of post-dissolution well-being (Soons, Liefbroer, & Kalmijn, 2009; Stone, 2002; Wang & Amato, 2000). Even if sole resident parents can rely on formal or informal child care, they may still have less opportunity for engaging in other life domains than nonresident parents.

If we place sole resident parents and nonresident parents at the two ends of a continuum regarding specific costs and benefits of parenthood, then shared residence parents could be placed somewhere in between. Shared residence parents have more opportunities than nonresident parents to benefit from the relationship with the child and more opportunities than sole resident parents to engage in employment and personal leisure activities when the child resides with the other parent (Bakker & Karsten, 2013). Moreover, they have more opportunities than sole resident parents for meeting a new partner and maintaining a new relationship, although these opportunities may be less than for nonresident parents.

Shared residence parents can furthermore benefit from engaging in multiple roles and life domains. Proponents of role expansion theories posit that fulfilling multiple roles lead to more role privileges, status security, resources, personal enrichment and fulfillment (Marks, 1977; Sieber, 1974), and several studies have indeed shown that multiple roles are associated with higher well-being (Ahrens & Ryff, 2006; Kulik, Shilo-Levin, & Liberman, 2014; Nordenmark, 2004; Prottas & Hyland, 2011). Shared residence parents can have more

opportunities than sole and nonresident parents to engage in active parenting but also in employment, personal leisure, and a new romantic relationship, and thus have a more complete set of roles. In addition, shared residence parents might benefit from knowing that their child is involved with both parents and has a good relationship with them.

Parents with shared residence may also have higher life satisfaction than sole and nonresident parents because of less conflict between the parents, which is an important determinant of postdivorce well-being (Symoens, Colman, & Bracke, 2014). Research has suggested that parents who had few predivorce conflicts are more likely to opt for shared residence and also maintain few conflicts after the divorce (e.g., Bakker & Mulder, 2013; Kelly, Redenbach, & Rinaman, 2005; Kitterød & Lyngstad, 2012; Melli & Brown, 2008).

Frequent visitation by the nonresident parent can have similar effects as shared residence on the life satisfaction of both parents, thus reducing the life satisfaction differences between shared residence parents on the one hand, and sole resident and nonresident parents on the other. Frequent visitation can allow the nonresident parent to have a rewarding relationship with the child and thus improve their life satisfaction (Bokker, Farley, & Denny, 2006; Shapiro & Lambert, 1999). Children may also benefit from frequent interaction with their nonresident parent which, in turn, may impact positively on the sole resident parent's well-being. An actively involved nonresident parent may likewise increase the sole resident parent's opportunities for actively engaging in other life domains, such as employment, leisure, and repartnering. Frequent visitation can benefit both parents by allowing them to engage in multiple roles and activities. However, because shared residence is a more structural and formalized postdivorce child care arrangement, frequent visitation may not have equally positive effects on parents' life satisfaction.



Based on the discussion above, we make a number of predictions. We expect that shared residence parents show higher life satisfaction than sole resident and nonresident parents. As parenthood might be more salient for mothers (Hughes, 1989; Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2003; Vanassche et al., 2013), and prior studies focusing on residence arrangements have indeed found stronger relationships between child residence and parental outcomes (i.e. time pressure, social contact, social activities) for mothers than for fathers (Botterman et al., 2014; Sodermans et al., 2015; Van der Heijden et al., 2015), we also expect the difference between shared residence parents and other residence arrangements to be more pronounced for mothers than for fathers.

Moreover, we expect that the differences in life satisfaction across residence arrangements can be largely explained by the relationship with the child, opportunities for leisure and employment, repartnering, conflict with the other parent, and nonresident parent-child visitation frequency. First, we expect that the higher life satisfaction of shared residence parents compared to sole and nonresident parents is partly due to lower levels of conflict among the former. Second, we expect that shared residence parents have a better relationship with their child than nonresident parents, which partly explains why shared residence parents have higher life satisfaction than nonresident parents (Nomaguchi, 2012; Umberson & Gove, 1989). Third, we expect that more active engagement in leisure activities and in employment, as well as a higher frequency of repartnering partly explain why shared residence parents have higher life satisfaction than sole resident parents (Schoon, Hansson, & Salmela-Aro, 2005 for employment; Brajša-Žganec, Merkaš, & Šverko, 2011; Newman, Tay, & Diener, 2014 for leisure; Amato, 2000; Pollmann-Schult, 2014; Vanassche et al., 2013; Wang & Amato, 2000 for repartnering). We expect these opportunity costs to play a bigger role for mothers than for fathers; previous studies have suggested that the opportunity costs of

motherhood weigh heavier than those of fatherhood (McLanahan & Adams, 1987), which is especially clear in terms of employment (Pollmann-Schult, 2014). Resident children can also reduce mothers' repartnering opportunities more than those of fathers (Beaujouan, 2012; Ivanova et al., 2013) and previous research has found that shared residence affects the leisure activities of mothers more than those of fathers (Botterman et al., 2014). Finally, we expect that frequent visitation reduces the life satisfaction differences between shared residence parents on the one hand, and sole resident and nonresident parents on the other.

Although the theory we have proposed suggests a causal effect of residence arrangements and visitation on the relationship with the child, employment, leisure, repartnering, and on parents' life satisfaction, reverse causation or an interplay between directions could be equally likely. For instance, parents who had a good relationship with their child or limited conflict with their partner prior to the family dissolution may be more likely to opt for sole or shared residence than for becoming a nonresident parent. Due to the cross-sectional data structure we are not able to determine the causal order. Nevertheless, we are mainly interested in whether these differences in circumstances, regardless of exactly how they emerge, can account for the relationship between residence arrangements and life satisfaction.

## METHOD

### *Data*

We used the first wave of the New Families in the Netherlands survey (NFN; Poortman, Van der Lippe, & Boele-Woelki, 2014), which was conducted in 2012/2013. The sample was randomly drawn by Statistics Netherlands and consisted of parents who dissolved their marriage or cohabitation in 2010 with children under the age of 18. Both former partners

were approached and in approximately 30% of former households both parents participated. Overall, approximately 39% of the approached parents participated and at least one parent participated in approximately 58% of former households. The response rates were relatively high for a web-based survey in the Netherlands, a country with generally low response rates (De Leeuw & De Heer, 2002). Men, younger persons, persons of non-Western descent, from highly urbanized areas, with low incomes and persons on welfare were slightly underrepresented. This indicates that the parents in the analytical sample are relatively advantaged and that life satisfaction may generally be slightly overestimated.

Information about child residence was requested for one particular child. This focal child was the respondent's oldest child if all children were younger than 10 and the youngest child older than 10 if at least one child was older than 10. From the initial sample of 4,481 parents, we excluded 30 parents whose focal child was older than 18, and 228 parents whose focal child was younger than 4, because parents with younger children did not report on the relationship with their child. Sensitivity analyses including parents with children under the age of 4 yielded similar results regarding the role of child residence, employment, leisure and repartnering (not shown).

We used Maximum Likelihood Missing Values (MLMV) to handle missing values. MLMV is a Full Information Maximum Likelihood (FIML) estimator in the SEM command in Stata 13 (Acock, 2013). In short, this approach computes a likelihood function for each case using all observed information for this case (Enders & Bandalos, 2001). FIML is found to perform well even under conditions of nonrandom missing patterns, and produces efficient and unbiased estimates (Arbuckle, 1996; Enders, 2001). Compared to multiple imputation of missing data, FIML is more efficient, always produces the same results, involves fewer decisions, and is incorporated in the regression analyses (Allison, 2012).

For the comparisons between shared residence parents and sole resident and nonresident parents, we had an analytical sample of 4,175 (1,769 fathers and 2,406 mothers), of whom 4,033 parents had complete information on all independent and dependent variables. Parents with older children more often had missing values on the residence arrangement of their child, possibly because their children had already moved out of the parental home or had a flexible arrangement. Including only those parents who had full information on all variables (i.e., listwise deletion) led to similar results (not shown). For the analyses of the role of visitation frequency by the nonresident father, we concentrated on the most typical child post-dissolution arrangement and included 1,559 nonresident and shared residence fathers and 2,269 sole resident and shared residence mothers. For these analyses we also used FIML to handle the missing values in visitation ( $n = 69$  for fathers and  $n = 78$  for mothers) or any of the other independent variables (between 1 and 8 missing values per variable).

### *Measures*

#### *Dependent variable: life satisfaction*

As dependent variable we used the Diener life satisfaction scale (see Table 1 for descriptives; for a review of the scale, see Pavot & Diener, 2009). This scale consists of the mean of participants' responses to 5 statements: *In most ways my life is close to my ideal; The conditions of my life are excellent; I am satisfied with my life; So far I have done the important things I want in life; If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.* The response categories included (0) 'strongly disagree', (1) 'disagree', (2) 'slightly disagree', (3) 'neither agree nor disagree', (4) 'slightly agree', (5) 'agree', and (6) 'strongly agree'. The items all loaded on a single principle component, and had a reliability of  $\alpha = .87$  for the overall sample. We treated this variable as continuous. Fathers and mothers were approximately equally satisfied with their life, with a mean satisfaction of around 3.4. The

life satisfaction is relatively low, perhaps unsurprising considering these parents recently experienced divorce.

*Main independent variables: child residence and parental visitation*

Table 1 shows the descriptives for the independent variables. We asked with which parent the focal child resided the majority of the time, which could be with (1) *'the respondent'*, (2) *'the ex-partner'*, or (3) *'both parents an (approximately) equal amount of time'* (shared residence). These responses were coded into dichotomous variables, where we took shared residence as the reference category. Sole mother residence clearly dominates the sample: 61% of fathers and 71% of mothers reported mother residence, followed by shared residence, reported by 32% of fathers and 24% of mothers. Sole father residence is the least common arrangement, reported only by 8% of the fathers and by 4% of the mothers.

For the additional analyses on nonresident father visitation frequency that compared nonresident fathers with shared residence fathers, we computed a measure for visitation frequency with four categories: *'nonresident father sees the child less than once per month'*; *'nonresident father sees the child less than once per week, but more than once per month'*; *'nonresident father sees the child once per week'*; and *'nonresident father sees the child multiple times per week'*. This variable was constructed by using information from a question asking respondents how frequently the nonresident parent sees their child and a residential calendar in the case that the nonresident parent saw the child at least once per month. On the residential calendar respondents could indicate for each day and each night of four weeks of a month with which parent the child was staying (see also Sodermans, Vanassche, Matthijs, & Swicegood, 2014). We counted how many days and nights the child spent with each parent and divided this figure by 2, which resulted in a number of days per four weeks, weighing days and nights equally. In the resulting categorical variable, visitation could thus entail any

visit ranging from minutes or hours to overnight stays. Most fathers see their child multiple times per week, which was reported by 37% of fathers, and 34% of mothers, followed by shared residence, which was reported by 36% of fathers and 26% of mothers (Table 1).

#### *Other independent variables*

The quality of the relationship with the child was measured by asking respondents to indicate how they would describe the relationship with their child on a scale of 0 to 9, where 0 indicated that the relationship is *'very poor'*, and 9 indicated that the relationship with the child is *'excellent'* (Rogers & White, 1998). Parents reported high relationship quality: on average approximately 7 for fathers and 7.4 for mothers (Table 1).

Regarding employment after the divorce, a dichotomous variable indicated whether the respondent is *'non-employed'* (0) or *'employed'* (1). The majority of parents were employed: 90% of fathers and 84% of mothers. Sensitivity analyses revealed that the number of working hours or whether parents worked part-time were not associated with life satisfaction. These indicators were therefore excluded from our final models.

Leisure activities were measured by summing up how frequently respondents engage in seven types of leisure activities: team sports; individual sports; going to restaurants, bars, or parties; outdoor life, cycling, or taking a stroll; visiting an event, amusement park, or zoo; cultural activities, such as visiting a theater, concert or museum; hobby activities, such as singing, music, acting, painting. The possible answering categories included (0) *'never'*, (1) *'once a year'*, (2) *'a few times per year'*, (3) *'once per month'*, (4) *'a few times per month'*, (5) *'once per week'*, (6) *'a few times per week'*, and (7) *'(almost) every day'*. The composite measure (theoretically) ranged from 0 to 49 (7 times 7), with a mean value of 15.7 for fathers and 14.1 for mothers (Table 1). Including alternative specifications of this measure in the models yielded similar results (not shown).

Two dichotomous variables indicated whether respondents had a new nonresident or coresident partner, where *'no new partner'* was used as the reference category. A little more than half of the parents had a new partner: 29% of fathers and mothers had a new nonresident partner, whereas 28% of fathers and 22% of mothers had a new coresident partner.

Conflict after relationship dissolution was measured by asking respondents to indicate how frequently there are conflicts or tensions between them and their ex-partner, on a four-point scale: (0) *'never'*, (1) *'sometimes'*, (2) *'often'* or (3) *'very often'*. On average, respondents reported rather low conflict: 0.83 for fathers and 0.91 for mothers (Table 1). The mean level of conflict is lower among parents who reported shared residence than among parents with a different arrangement (not shown in the Table).

Each model included the following control variables, also shown in Table 1. The age of the focal child was measured in years ranging from 4 to 18 years. The number of children was measured as a count variable ranging from 1 to 7. The pre-divorce problems of children were controlled for by a dichotomous variable, coded as '1' when the respondent indicated that any of the children experienced a serious illness, handicap, or social or psychological problem prior to the divorce or cohabitation dissolution. We also computed a variable coded as '1' when the respondent had (adopted) children with their new partner.

Education was measured by asking respondents to indicate their highest attained level of education: (0) *'unfinished primary school'*, (1) *'primary school'*, (2) *'lower vocational education'*, (3) *'lower secondary education'*, (4) *'intermediate secondary education'*, (5) *'higher secondary education'*, (6) *'intermediate vocational education'*, (7) *'higher vocational education'*, (8) *'university graduate'*, and (9) *'postgraduate'*. We treated this variable as continuous because alternative specifications yielded similar results.

Predivorce parental problems were controlled for by a variable coded '1' when the respondent or the ex-partner experienced severe physical illness, a handicap, psychological problems, violence, drug or alcohol abuse, or was in contact with the police. Unfortunately, we were unable to distinguish which parent experienced this problem, which might imply that we underestimate the role of personal pre-dissolution problems in life satisfaction. Being freed of the ex-partner's problems might increase life satisfaction, whereas the respondent's own problems might decrease life satisfaction.

Predivorce conflict consisted of the mean of a scale of 5 items with a reliability of  $\alpha = .87$  for the overall sample. Respondents indicated how often there was '*tension*', '*heated discussion*', '*strong accusations were made*', '*partners were not on speaking terms*', or '*arguments got out of hand*'. The possible answers included (0) '*never*', (1) '*sometimes*', (2) '*frequently*' and (3) '*often*'.

#### *Analytical strategy*

We estimated grouped linear regression models separately for men and women in Stata 13. The models were estimated with clustered standard errors at the former household level, to take into account the possible dependency between former partners (N= 1,032, approximately 30% of former households). Gender differences for the estimates were tested with Wald tests.

To assess the robustness of our findings, we also estimated path analyses where we specified the relationship with the child, opportunity costs and interparental conflict as mediators (not shown). Although these analyses were not directly comparable to the analyses presented here (i.e., use of ML instead of MLMV, including repartnering only as an independent variable instead of a mediator), the results were similar and the conclusions identical. We present linear regression because this is more familiar to most readers, allows



for handling missing data more elegantly, and allows for including a categorical variable with more than two categories more easily (i.e., repartnering).

Sensitivity analyses including the gender of the child, whether the residence arrangement had been stable since the relationship dissolution, the age of the respondent, the number of working hours, and whether the former union concerned a marriage or cohabitation revealed that these variables were not significantly related to life satisfaction and that including them yielded similar results for the main independent variables. For reasons of parsimony and because these variables were not of central interest to the study, we excluded them from the analyses presented here.

## RESULTS

### *Post-dissolution residence arrangements and parents' life satisfaction*

Tables 2 and 3 present the comparison of fathers' and mothers' life satisfaction by post-dissolution child residence arrangement. The first model supports our first expectation: shared residence parents have higher life satisfaction than nonresident parents. Sole resident mothers are, additionally, less satisfied with their lives than shared residence mothers, but sole residence fathers' and shared residence fathers' life satisfaction levels are similar. Compared with the traditional arrangement of sole mother residence of the child, shared residence has somewhat more positive effects on mothers' than on fathers' life satisfaction, approximately one-fourth of a unit (one-fifth of a standard deviation) for the former and one-fifth of a unit (less than one-sixth of a standard deviation) for the latter.

What explains these differences in life satisfaction? First, we review the results for fathers (Table 2) and focus on the comparison between shared residence and nonresident fathers. The quality of the relationship with the child is the single most important variable for

explaining why nonresident fathers are less satisfied with their lives than shared residence fathers, explaining around 40% of this difference (see Model 3). In other words, shared residence fathers have a better relationship with their child than nonresident fathers do, which boosts the formers' life satisfaction. Shared residence fathers also engage in more leisure activities than nonresident fathers, which is the second most important factor explaining the formers' higher life satisfaction and explains approximately one third of the difference (Model 5). Closer bivariate inspection of the leisure activity items shows that shared residence fathers play more individual sports, go out more frequently, and that they are slightly more inclined to attend events and cultural activities (not shown), suggesting that the fathers who are actively involved in the life of their child are also active in other domains. As expected, shared residence parents have less conflict with their ex-partner, which explains approximately one fourth of the life satisfaction advantage of shared residence fathers compared to nonresident ones (Model 2). Differences in employment play no role (Model 4), but the life satisfaction gap between shared residence and nonresident fathers increases when we control for new partnerships: were it not for the higher prevalence of new partnerships among nonresident fathers, their life satisfaction would be at even lower levels compared to shared residence fathers (Model 6). Altogether, the variables explain about half of the life satisfaction gap between shared residence and nonresident fathers, leaving the estimate of interest significant at the 10% level (Model 7).

Table 3 shows the results for mothers. Our primary interest is in comparing sole resident mothers to shared residence mothers, which are the dominant arrangements. Shared residence mothers' higher engagement in leisure activities is the single most important factor, explaining approximately 30% of their higher life satisfaction compared to sole resident mothers (Model 5). In other words, sole resident mothers miss out on leisure activities, which

decreases their life satisfaction. Differences in conflict with the ex-partner, i.e., the father of the child (Model 2), and in employment (Model 4) are less important explanations for life satisfaction differences between sole resident and shared residence mothers. The quality of the relationship with the child does not differentiate these groups (Model 3), and shared residence mothers' higher likelihood of having a new partner explains approximately one-eighth of the life satisfaction gap (Model 6). Altogether, these variables explain around two thirds of the difference.

Nonresident mothers' lower levels of life satisfaction are primarily explained by the quality of the relationship with the child (which alone accounts for up to half of the difference; Model 3) and conflicts with the child's father (which explains around one fifth of the difference; Model 2). The other variables have small or no explanatory power, but nonresident mothers' higher likelihood of being in a new relationship increases their life satisfaction relative to shared residence mothers (Model 6).

#### *Can frequent visitation substitute for shared residence?*

Results for the analyses of this question are shown in Table 4 for fathers and 5 for mothers. We compare the visitation frequency of the nonresident father (who is more likely to be the nonresident parent) to shared residence. The estimates from Model 1 show that parents report higher life satisfaction when the nonresident father sees the child more often. There is a clear gradient-like association between visitation frequency and fathers' life satisfaction, and fathers who see their child several times a week are as satisfied with their lives as fathers who have shared residence. The relationship is generally weaker, and not gradient-like, for mothers and shared residence mothers are more satisfied with their lives than sole resident mothers, regardless of the nonresident fathers' visitation frequency. The relationship between

residence arrangements, visitation, and parental life satisfaction highlights the heterogeneity in life satisfaction within residence arrangements and among divorcees in general.

Unsurprisingly, the factors that explain the differences in life satisfaction between parents with shared residence and parents with sole mother residence but with different paternal visitation frequencies are generally similar as in the results shown in Tables 2 and 3. For fathers in Table 4, quality of the relationship with the child is clearly the single most important factor (Model 3), followed by leisure activities (Model 5) and conflict with the mother (Model 2), as shown by the changing coefficient estimates for visitation frequency. For mothers in Table 5, leisure activities is the single most important factor (Model 5), whereas employment (Model 4) and conflict with the father (Model 2) explain less of the difference. Controlling for repartnering increases the life satisfaction differences by visitation frequency for fathers, but decreases them for mothers (Model 6). These results suggest that fathers who visit their child less frequently have a less good relationship with their child, but are more likely to be in a new relationship than shared residence fathers and nonresident fathers who see their child more often. Involvement with the child and a new relationship can thus compete for fathers' time and attention, but both can improve his life satisfaction. A frequently visiting father, on the other hand, allows the sole resident mother to engage in a new relationship, leisure activities, and employment.

## DISCUSSION

Previous research has found substantial variation in adults' post-dissolution well-being (e.g., Gähler, 2006; Härkönen, 2014; Lucas, 2005). Our analysis focused on how post-dissolution child residence and visitation arrangements affect parental life satisfaction. Divorced fathers have become increasingly involved in their children's lives during the last decades, as

indicated by increasing father-child contact and shared residential custody of the child (Bjarnason & Arnarsson, 2011; Cancian et al., 2014). This was also shown in our data on Dutch parents who had divorced or separated from a cohabiting relationship; while approximately two thirds of the post-dissolution families had resorted to the traditional arrangement of a sole resident mother and a nonresident father, approximately one fourth reported shared residence.

Parents with shared residence reported higher life satisfaction, on average, than parents resorting to the traditional sole mother residence arrangement. As expected, these differences are bigger among mothers than among fathers. Shared residence is thus associated with the well-being not only of the children of divorce, as has been documented in several previous studies (Bauserman, 2012; Nielsen, 2014; Trinder, 2010), but also of their parents. Our analyses of the reasons for life satisfaction differences by residence arrangement showed that the relationship with the child, engagement in leisure activities, conflict with the ex-partner, being in a new relationship, and visitation of the nonresident father are the most important explanations. Together, they explained most of the life satisfaction differences.

Shared residence fathers had a better relationship with their child, which boosted their life satisfaction compared to nonresident fathers. On the other hand, sole resident and shared residence mothers did not differ in how good their relationship with the child was. An inferior relationship with the child has been pointed out as an important explanation for divorced fathers' worse psychological well-being (Bokker et al., 2006; Coysh et al., 1989; Shapiro & Lambert, 1999; Stone, 2001) and our results point to shared residence as a way to improve father-child relationships and, consequently, paternal postdivorce well-being.

The life satisfaction of both shared residence mothers and fathers was additionally promoted by their higher engagement in leisure activities. Shared residence can lower the

opportunity costs for mothers' engagement in these activities, whereas shared residence fathers' higher engagement is more difficult to explain. One possibility is that shared residence allows for more structured lives, which can include common leisure activities with the child. Fathers opting for shared residence could, however, also have led more active lives before the dissolution. Shared residence fathers tend to be positively selected, among other factors, by socioeconomic status (Bakker & Mulder, 2013; Bauserman, 2012; Kelly et al., 2005). This might extend to leisure activities, as indeed suggested by our inspection of the leisure activities these fathers engage in. Another possible explanation is that nonresident fathers are more likely to have a new partner, which leads to a "dyadic withdrawal" from many leisure activities (e.g., Kalmijn, 2012).

Parents with shared residence are also less likely to have conflict with their former partner (Bauserman, 2012; Westphal, Poortman, & Van der Lippe, 2015), which contributes to their higher post-dissolution life satisfaction. Nevertheless, conflict with the ex-partner explains less of the differences by residence arrangements than leisure activities for both fathers and mothers, and less than relationship quality with the child for fathers. Whereas employment explains part of the difference for mothers, its importance is—perhaps surprisingly—rather limited. Having a new relationship also matters. Shared residence mothers are more likely to be in a new relationship than are sole resident mothers, promoting the life satisfaction of the former compared to the latter. On the other hand, shared residence fathers were less often in a new relationship than nonresident fathers. When new relationships were taken into account, the positive effect of being a shared residence father became even stronger.

Finally, we analyzed whether frequent visitation of the nonresident father can substitute for shared residence in terms of parental life satisfaction. For fathers, there was a

clear gradient. Fathers who see their child several times a week are as satisfied with their lives as shared residence fathers and fathers' life satisfaction decreases the less they see their child. There is, however, a caveat for concluding that frequent visitation can replace shared residency as a provider of life satisfaction: nonresident fathers' child visitation seems to compete with involvement in a new romantic relationship (which increases life satisfaction). Once repartnering was controlled for, even frequently visiting fathers had lower life satisfaction than shared residence fathers. Shared residence fathers thus benefit from having a better relationship with their child even compared to frequently visiting nonresident fathers.

Father visitation is likewise positively associated with sole resident mothers' life satisfaction, but even if the father sees the child several times per week, mothers still report a significantly lower life satisfaction than mothers with shared residence. Our conclusion, thus, is that even though frequent visitation of the nonresident father improves both his and his ex-partner's life satisfaction, it is nevertheless not as satisfying as being a shared residence parent. Shared residence provides a more structured and predictable form of postdivorce childcare, with positive effects on parental well-being. This conclusion is of theoretical, practical and policy relevance. It also suggests that parents clearly distinguish between shared residence and visitation practices when reporting on post-dissolution arrangements.

The third family type in our analyses, sole resident fathers/nonresident mothers, is much smaller than the two family types previously discussed and account for only around 6 percent of our sample. Nonresident mothers are much less satisfied with their lives than shared residence and sole resident mothers—and the difference is bigger than among fathers—but sole resident fathers are as satisfied as shared residence fathers. The difference between mothers could be largely explained by higher conflict with the other parent, lower relationship quality with the child, and fewer leisure activities whereas nonresident mothers'

higher probability of having a new partner hid some of the difference in life satisfaction. Whether these factors preceded the divorce or whether mothers react more negatively to this type of post-dissolution child arrangement than fathers (parenthood may be more salient for mothers: Hughes, 1989; Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2003; Vanassche et al., 2013) is left for future research to address. Sole resident fathers' relatively high life satisfaction is not due to nonresident mothers taking larger responsibility for their children: nonresident mothers are even less involved than nonresident fathers in our sample (the average nonresident mother sees her child 3.2 times per month, compared to 5.5 for fathers; not shown).

Altogether, these results provide some support for the idea of role expansion: shared residence parents seem to be in a more favorable position to fulfill multiple roles, which results in higher life satisfaction. They are actively involved in their child's life, which accompanies the rewards of parenthood (Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2003), but they are less constrained by child responsibility, which allows them to also engage in leisure activities, employment, and a new romantic relationship (for mothers). These results align with prior qualitative research: shared residence parents take leave of parental duties when their children are absent, which allows them to devote time to other life domains (Bakker & Karsten, 2013). The results also suggest that the favorable position to fulfill multiple roles of shared residence parents (partially) extends to some extent to sole residence arrangements with frequent visitation by nonresident parents. Nonetheless, frequent visitation does not fully compensate for shared residence.

Our findings are generally similar to those by Sodermans and colleagues (2015), the only previous study to analyze residence arrangements' importance for parental well-being. We, too, found that the parent-child relationship and leisure activities account for an important share of the life satisfaction differences by residence arrangements. In addition, we



analyzed the importance of repartnering, parental conflict, and employment as explanations and importantly, showed that frequent visitation of the nonresident parent cannot fully substitute for shared residence in shaping parental well-being.

It is important to note that these results stem from cross-sectional data, which means that the selection of certain parents into shared residence may be the cause of their higher life satisfaction. We know from previous work that shared residence parents are generally quite advantaged in terms of socio-economic status and the relationship with their former partner (e.g., Bakker & Mulder, 2013; Bauserman, 2012; Melli & Brown, 2008; Sodermans et al., 2013). Although we attempted to take these differences into account, there could be additional unobserved differences that we could not account for. One of these unobserved differences could reside in personality: shared residence parents may be more outgoing, resilient, able to cope and in better control of their lives, which may also result in higher self-reported life satisfaction. Finally, our data only include a measurement of residence arrangements for one child. Although this is a common strategy (see e.g., Kitterød & Lyngstad, 2012), additional children, as well as their relationship with their parent, could affect parents' life satisfaction. For instance, a good relationship with an unmeasured child could compensate for the less good relationship with the focal child (or vice-versa). Therefore, we are likely to underestimate the associations between the presence of children, the relationship with the child and life satisfaction.

Despite these limitations, our study has shown that parents with shared residence are more satisfied with their lives than parents with a different arrangement because they can engage in a larger number of satisfying activities. It also showed that while frequent visitation of the nonresident parent has similar life satisfaction effects, it is not a perfect substitute for

shared residence. Our findings have thus added to the literature suggesting that shared residence is a favorable post-family dissolution arrangement for children and adults alike.

## References

- Acock, A. C. (2013). *Discovering structural equation modeling using stata*. Texas: Stata Press.
- Ahrens, C. J. C., & Ryff, C. D. (2006). Multiple roles and well-being: Sociodemographic and psychological moderators. *Sex Roles*, 55(11-12), 801-815.
- Allison, P. D. (2012). Handling missing data by maximum likelihood. *Paper presented at the SAS Global Forum 2012*, Orlando, Florida. <http://www.statisticalhorizons.com/wp-content/uploads/MissingDataByML.pdf> Accessed February 17 2015.
- Amato, P. R. (2000). The consequences of divorce for adults and children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(4), 1269-1287.
- Arbuckle, J. L. (1996). Full information estimation in the presence of incomplete data. In: Marcoulides, G.A. and Schumacker, R.E. (Eds.). *Advanced structural equation modeling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.: 243-277.
- Bakker, W., & Karsten, L. (2013). Balancing paid work, care and leisure in post-separation households: A comparison of single parents with co-parents. *Acta Sociologica*, 56(2), 173-187.
- Bakker, W., & Mulder, C. H. (2013). Characteristics of post-separation families in the Netherlands: Shared residence versus resident mother arrangements. *GeoJournal*, 78(5), 851-866.
- Bartfeld, J. (2011). *Shared placement: An overview of prevalence, trends, economic implications, and impacts on child well-being*. Report to the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families. Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin–Madison.
- Bauserman, R. (2012). A meta-analysis of parental satisfaction, adjustment, and conflict in joint custody and sole custody following divorce. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 53(6), 464-488.
- Beaujouan, É. (2012). Repartnering in France: The role of gender, age and past fertility. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 17(2), 69-80.
- Bird, C. E. (1997). Gender differences in the social and economic burdens of parenting and psychological distress. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 809-823.
- Bjarnason, T., & Arnarsson, A. M. (2011). Joint physical custody and communication with parents: A cross-national study of children in 36 western countries. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 42(6), 871-890.
- Bokker, L. P., Farley, R. C., & Bailey, W. (2006). The relationship between custodial status and emotional well-being among recently divorced fathers. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 44(3-4), 83-98.
- Bokker, L. P., Farley, R. C., & Denny, G. (2006). The relationship between father/child contact and emotional well-being among recently divorced fathers. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 45(1-2), 63-77.
- Botterman, S., Sodermans, A. K., & Matthijs, K. (2014). The social life of divorced parents. Do custody arrangements make a difference in divorced parents' social participation and contacts? *Leisure Studies*, 34(4), 487-500.
- Brajša-Žganec, A., Merkaš, M., & Šverko, I. (2011). Quality of life and leisure activities: How do leisure activities contribute to subjective well-being? *Social Indicators Research*, 102(1), 81-91.

- 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.
- Coysh, W. S., Johnston, J. R., Tschann, J. M., Wallerstein, J. S., & Kline, M. (1989). Parental postdivorce adjustment in joint and sole physical custody families. *Journal of Family Issues*, 10(1), 52-71.
- De Leeuw, E. D. & De Heer, W. (2001). Trends in household survey nonresponse: A longitudinal and international comparison. In Groves, R. M., Dillman, D. A., Eltinge, J. L. & Little, R. J. A. (Eds) *Survey Nonresponse* (pp. 41 – 54). New York: Wiley.
- Diener, E., Inglehart, R., & Tay, L. (2013). Theory and validity of life satisfaction scales. *Social Indicators Research*, 112(3), 497-527.
- Enders, C. K. (2001). The performance of the full information maximum likelihood estimator in multiple regression models with missing data. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 61(5), 713-740.
- Enders, C. K., & Bandalos, D. L. (2001). The relative performance of full information maximum likelihood estimation for missing data in structural equation models. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 8(3), 430-457.
- Evenson, R. J., & Simon, R. W. (2005). Clarifying the relationship between parenthood and depression. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 46(4), 341-358.
- Fehlberg, B., Smyth, B., MacLean, M., & Roberts, C. (2011). Legislating for shared time parenting after separation: A research review. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family*, 25(3), 318-337.
- Fritzell, S., & Gähler, M. (2014). Family structure, child living arrangement and mothers' self-rated health in Sweden. Paper presented at the 7th European Public Health Conference, Glasgow, 19-22 November 2014.
- Gähler, M. (2006). "To divorce is to die a bit...": A longitudinal study of marital disruption and psychological distress among Swedish women and men. *Family Journal*, 14(4), 372-382.
- Härkönen, J. (2014). Divorce: Trends, patterns, causes, consequences. Pp. 303-322 in Treas, J.K., Scott, J. & Richards, M. (eds.) *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Families*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Harris-Short, S. (2010). Resisting the march towards 50/50 shared residence: Rights, welfare and equality in post-separation families. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 32(3), 257-274.
- Hughes, M. (1989). Parenthood and psychological well-being among the formerly married: Are children the primary source of psychological distress? *Journal of Family Issues*, 10(4), 463-481.
- Ivanova, K., Kalmijn, M., & Uunk, W. (2013). The effect of children on men's and women's chances of re-partnering in a European context. *European Journal of Population/Revue Européenne De Démographie*, 29(4), 417-444.
- Kalmijn, M. (2012). Longitudinal analyses of the effects of age, marriage, and parenthood on social contacts and support. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 17(4), 177-190.
- Kelly, R. F., Redenbach, L., & Rinaman, W. C. (2005). Determinants of sole and joint physical custody arrangements in a national sample of divorces. *American Journal of Family Law*, 19(1), 25-43.
- Kitterød, R. H., & Lyngstad, J. (2012). Untraditional caring arrangements among parents living apart: The case of Norway. *Demographic Research*, 27(5), 121-152.

- Kulik, L., Shilo-Levin, S., & Liberman, G. (2014). Multiple roles, role satisfaction, and sense of meaning in life: An extended examination of role enrichment theory. *Journal of Career Assessment*, doi:1069072714523243.
- Lucas, R. E. (2005). Time does not heal all wounds: A longitudinal study of reaction and adaptation to divorce. *Psychological Science*, 16(12), 945-950.
- Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 921-936.
- McLanahan, S., & Adams, J. (1987). Parenthood and psychological well-being. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 13, 237-257.
- McLanahan, S., & Adams, J. (1989). The effects of children on adults' psychological well-being: 1957–1976. *Social Forces*, 68(1), 124-146.
- Melli, M. S., & Brown, P. R. (2008). Exploring a new family form—The shared time family. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family*, 22(2), 231-269.
- Newman, D. B., Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2014). Leisure and subjective well-being: A model of psychological mechanisms as mediating factors. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15(3), 555-578.
- Nielsen, L. (2014). Shared physical custody: Summary of 40 studies on outcomes for children. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 55(8), 613-635.
- Nomaguchi, K. M. (2012). Parenthood and psychological well-being: Clarifying the role of child age and parent-child relationship quality. *Social Science Research*, 41(2), 489-498.
- Nomaguchi, K. M., & Milkie, M. A. (2003). Costs and rewards of children: The effects of becoming a parent on adults' lives. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65(2), 356-374.
- Nordenmark, M. (2004). Multiple social roles and well-being a longitudinal test of the role stress theory and the role expansion theory. *Acta Sociologica*, 47(2), 115-126.
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (2009). Review of the satisfaction with life scale. In *Assessing well-being* (pp. 101-117). Springer Netherlands.
- Peters, B., & Ehrenberg, M. F. (2008). The influence of parental separation and divorce on father-child relationships. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 49(1-2), 78-109.
- Pollmann-Schult, M. (2014). Parenthood and life satisfaction: Why don't children make people happy? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(2), 319-336.
- 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.
- Prottas, D. J., & Hyland, M. M. (2011). Is high involvement at work and home so bad? Contrasting scarcity and expansionist perspectives. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 14(1), 29-51.
- Rogers, S. J., & White, L. K. (1998). Satisfaction with parenting: The role of marital happiness, family structure, and parents' gender. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60(2), 293-308.
- Schoon, I., Hansson, L., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2005). Combining work and family life: Life satisfaction among married and divorced men and women in Estonia, Finland, and the U.K.. *European Psychologist*, 10(4), 309-319.
- Shapiro, A., & Lambert, J. D. (1999). Longitudinal effects of divorce on the quality of the father-child relationship and on fathers' psychological well-being. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61(2), 397-408.
- Siebert, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review*, 39(4), 567-578.

- Sodermans, A. K., Botterman, S., Havermans, N., & Matthijs, K. (2015). Involved fathers, liberated mothers? Joint physical custody and the subjective well-being of divorced parents. *Social Indicators Research*, 122(1), 257-277.
- Sodermans, A. K., Matthijs, K., & Swicegood, G. (2013). Characteristics of joint physical custody families in Flanders. *Demographic Research*, 28, 821-848.
- Sodermans, A. K., Vanassche, S., Matthijs, K., & Swicegood, G. (2014). Measuring postdivorce living arrangements: Theoretical and empirical validation of the residential calendar. *Journal of Family Issues*, 35(1), 125-145.
- Soons, J. P., Liefbroer, A. C., & Kalmijn, M. (2009). The long-term consequences of relationship formation for subjective well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(5), 1254-1270.
- Stanca, L. (2012). Suffer the little children: Measuring the effects of parenthood on well-being worldwide. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 81(3), 742-750.
- Stone, G. (2001). Father postdivorce well-being: An exploratory model. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 162(4), 460-477.
- Stone, G. (2002). Nonresidential father postdivorce well-being: The role of social supports. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 36(3-4), 139-150.
- Symoens, S., Colman, E., & Bracke, P. (2014). Divorce, conflict, and mental health: How the quality of intimate relationships is linked to post-divorce well-being. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 44(3), 220-233.
- Trinder, L. (2010). Shared residence: A review of recent research evidence. *Child and Family Law Quarterly*, 22(4), 475-498.
- Umberson, D., & Gove, W. R. (1989). Parenthood and psychological well-being theory, measurement, and stage in the family life course. *Journal of Family Issues*, 10(4), 440-462.
- Van der Heijden, F. I., Poortman, A., & Van der Lippe, T. (2015). *Children's postdivorce residence arrangements and parental experienced time pressure*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Vanassche, S., Swicegood, G., & Matthijs, K. (2013). Marriage and children as a key to happiness? Cross-national differences in the effects of marital status and children on well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 14(2), 501-524.
- Wang, H., & Amato, P. R. (2000). Predictors of divorce adjustment: Stressors, resources, and definitions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(3), 655-668.
- Westphal, S. K., Poortman, A., & Van der Lippe, T. (2015). What about the grandparents? children's postdivorce residence arrangements and contact with grandparents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77(2), 424-440.

Table 1

*Descriptives of the Dependent, Independent, and Control Variables for Fathers and Mothers*

	Fathers			Mothers			Range
	Obs	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Obs	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Life satisfaction <sup>a</sup>	1767	3.37	1.32	2397	3.42	1.30	0-6
Main residence							
Nonresident parent	1725	0.61		2370	0.04		0-1
Shared residence parent	1725	0.32		2370	0.24		0-1
Sole resident parent	1725	0.08		2370	0.71		0-1
Visitation nonresident fathers							
Father sees child less than once per month	1526	0.09					0-1
Father sees child less than once per week	1526	0.05					0-1
Father sees child once per week	1526	0.13					0-1
Father sees child multiple times per week	1526	0.37					0-1
Shared residence	1526	0.36					0-1
Visitation ex-partner sole resident mothers							
Ex-partner sees child less than once per month				2191	0.15		0-1
Ex-partner sees child less than once per week				2191	0.09		0-1
Ex-partner sees child once per week				2191	0.16		0-1
Ex-partner sees child multiple times per week				2191	0.34		0-1
Shared residence				2191	0.26		0-1
Relationship with the child	1762	7.05	1.57	2398	7.39	1.13	0-9
Employed <sup>b</sup>	1766	0.90		2403	0.84		0-1
Leisure activities	1767	15.74	6.20	2403	14.14	5.76	0-45
Nonresident new partner <sup>c</sup>	1767	0.29		2404	0.29		0-1
Resident new partner <sup>d</sup>	1767	0.28		2404	0.22		0-1
Current conflict with ex-partner	1767	0.83	0.97	2400	0.91	0.96	0-3
Age focal child	1769	10.69	3.58	2406	10.53	3.69	4-18
Number of children	1767	1.97	0.79	2403	1.94	0.80	1-10
Children's predivorce problems	1766	0.33		2400	0.39		0-1
Children with new partner <sup>e</sup>	1769	0.05		2406	0.04		0-1
Education	1760	5.58	2.03	2397	5.54	1.86	0-9
Parental predivorce problems	1767	0.34		2402	0.41		0-1
Predivorce conflict <sup>a</sup>	1769	1.25	0.75	2405	1.45	0.85	0-3

<sup>a</sup> These scales have a reliability of  $\alpha = .87$  for the overall sample and were coded from low to high. <sup>b</sup> Employed: 0 = unemployed, 1 = employed. <sup>c</sup> Nonresident new partner: 0 = no partner, 1 = nonresident new partner. <sup>d</sup>

Resident new partner: 0 = no partner, 1 = new resident partner. <sup>e</sup> Children with new partner: 0 = no children with the new partner, 1 = at least one child with the new partner.

Table 2  
*Linear Regression Models of Residence Arrangements on Life Satisfaction for Fathers (N = 1,769)*

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4			Model 5			Model 6			Model 7		
	B	SE		B	SE		B	SE		B	SE		B	SE		B	SE		B	SE	
Intercept	<sup>b</sup> 3.156	**	.156	<sup>b</sup> 3.175	**	.155	1.939	**	.253	<sup>b</sup> 2.683	**	.183	<sup>b</sup> 2.519	**	.167	<sup>b</sup> 2.879	**	.151	1.013	**	.257
Nonresident parent <sup>a</sup>	-.202	**	.066	-.150	*	.065	-.116	~	.066	-.199	**	.066	-.132	*	.065	-.289	**	.063	-.105	~	.060
Sole resident parent <sup>a</sup>	-.018		.129	.025		.130	-.019		.127	.005		.131	<sup>b</sup> .093		.126	-.042		.127	.110		.123
Age focal child	.020	*	.009	.018	~	.009	.031	**	.009	.019	*	.009	.019	*	.009	.022	*	.009	.029	**	.008
Number of children	-.017		.041	-.012		.041	.005		.041	-.022		.041	-.003		.040	-.027		.038	.004		.037
Children's predivorce problems	-.115		.071	-.091		.071	-.081		.071	-.104		.071	-.089		.069	-.084		.067	-.002		.064
Children with new partner <sup>f</sup>	.722	**	.113	.730	**	.111	.730	**	.112	.713	**	.112	.727	**	.113	.237	*	.116	.239	*	.112
Education	.067	**	.016	.069	**	.016	.067	**	.016	.058	**	.016	.019		.016	.057	**	.015	.013		.015
Parental predivorce problems	-.428	**	.068	-.403	**	.068	-.413	**	.068	<sup>b</sup> -.395	**	.068	-.376	**	.066	-.354	**	.065	-.246	**	.062
Predivorce conflict	-.050		.042	.022		.043	-.035		.042	-.049		.042	-.061		.042	-.079	*	.040	-.005		.039
Current conflict with ex-partner				-.193	**	.035													-.195	**	.032
Quality relationship child							.137	**	.023										.114	**	.021
Employed <sup>c</sup>										.579	**	.109							.379	**	.102
Leisure activities													.052	**	.005				.045	**	.005
Nonresident new partner <sup>d</sup>																.457	**	.071	<sup>b</sup> .446	**	.066
Coresident new partner <sup>e</sup>																<sup>b</sup> .973	**	.071	<sup>b</sup> .992	**	.069
R2	.069			.086			.092			.086			.120			.152			.248		

<sup>a</sup> In all models shared residence was taken as the reference category. The difference in life satisfaction between nonresident and sole resident parents was significant in Model 6 (B=.247, SE=.123,  $p < .05$ ) and marginally significant in Model 5 (B=-.225, SE=.121,  $p < .10$ ) and in Model 5 (B=-.215, SE=.119,  $p < .10$ ). <sup>b</sup> The gender difference in estimates for men and women is significant ( $p < .05$ ). <sup>c</sup> Employed: 0 = *unemployed*, 1 = *employed*. <sup>d</sup> Nonresident new partner: 0 = *no partner*, 1 = *nonresident new partner*. <sup>e</sup> Resident new partner: 0 = *no partner*, 1 = *new resident partner*. <sup>f</sup> Children with new partner: 0 = *no children with the new partner*, 1 = *at least one child with the new partner*.

~  $p < .1$ ; \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$  two-tailed.



Table 3  
*Linear Regression Models of Residence Arrangements on Life Satisfaction for Mothers (N = 2,406)*

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4			Model 5			Model 6			Model 7		
	B	SE		B	SE		B	SE		B	SE		B	SE		B	SE		B	SE	
Intercept	<sup>b</sup> 3.649	**	.145	<sup>b</sup> 3.643	**	.143	2.247	**	.254	<sup>b</sup> 3.264	**	.153	<sup>b</sup> 3.071	**	.155	<sup>b</sup> 3.368	**	.143	1.354	**	.246
Nonresident parent <sup>a</sup>	-.491	**	.163	-.401	*	.159	-.256		.163	-.460	**	.161	-.441	**	.164	-.572	**	.165	-.211		.161
Sole resident parent <sup>a</sup>	-.260	**	.063	-.221	**	.062	-.256	**	.062	-.222	**	.062	<sup>b</sup> -.183	**	.061	-.228	**	.062	-.083		.058
Age focal child	.012		.008	.010		.008	.018	*	.008	.008		.008	.009		.008	.015	*	.007	.010		.007
Number of children	-.072	*	.033	-.059	~	.034	-.068	*	.033	-.065	*	.033	-.067	*	.033	-.077	*	.032	-.051		.031
Children's predivorce problems	-.240	**	.058	-.204	**	.057	-.184	**	.057	-.227	**	.056	-.222	**	.056	-.233	**	.056	-.125	*	.053
Children with new partner <sup>f</sup>	.697	**	.125	.650	**	.123	.656	**	.124	.725	**	.126	.717	**	.123	.293	*	.130	.274	*	.124
Education	.052	**	.014	.060	**	.014	.056	**	.014	.033	*	.014	.016		.015	.056	**	.014	.018		.014
Parental predivorce problems	-.262	**	.059	-.237	**	.059	-.246	**	.059	<sup>b</sup> -.206	**	.058	-.241	**	.058	-.241	**	.058	-.136	*	.056
Predivorce conflict	-.085	*	.033	-.026		.033	-.068	*	.033	-.082	*	.033	-.070	*	.033	-.085	**	.032	.005		.031
Current conflict with ex-partner				-.199	**	.029													-.200	**	.027
Quality relationship child							.169	**	.025										.139	**	.024
Employed <sup>c</sup>										.554	**	.080							.511	**	.074
Leisure activities													.050	**	.005				.044	**	.005
Nonresident new partner <sup>d</sup>																.277	**	.063	<sup>b</sup> .264	**	.059
Coresident new partner <sup>e</sup>																<sup>b</sup> .691	**	.066	<sup>b</sup> .656	**	.062
R2	.066			.085			.084			.089			.111			.105			.198		

<sup>a</sup> In all models shared residence was taken as the reference category. The difference in life satisfaction between nonresident and sole resident mothers was significant in Model 6 (B=.344, SE=.160, P<.05). <sup>b</sup> The gender difference in estimates for men and women is significant (p < .05). <sup>c</sup> Employed: 0 = *unemployed*, 1 = *employed*. <sup>d</sup> Nonresident new partner: 0 = *no partner*, 1 = *nonresident new partner*. <sup>e</sup> Resident new partner: 0 = *no partner*, 1 = *new resident partner*. <sup>f</sup> Children with new partner: 0 = *no children with the new partner*, 1 = *at least one child with the new partner*.

~ p < .1; \* p < .05; \*\* p < .01 two-tailed.

Table 4  
*Linear Regression Models of Visitation Frequency on Life Satisfaction for Nonresident and Shared Residence Fathers (N = 1,559)*

	Model 1		Model 2 full		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Intercept	3.084 **	.165	3.120 **	.163	2.029 **	.255	2.601 **	.185	2.478 **	.174	2.795 **	.158	.974 **	.259
Father sees the child less than once per month <sup>a</sup>	-.464 **	.124	-.363 **	.124	-.110	.141	-.378 **	.124	-.374 **	.121	-.551 **	.117	.007	.130
Father sees the child less than once per week <sup>a</sup>	-.405 *	.159	-.307 ~	.159	-.285 ~	.159	-.411 **	.158	-.247	.156	-.461 **	.151	-.118	.145
Father sees the child once per week <sup>a</sup>	-.251 *	.106	-.166	.106	-.203 ~	.105	-.243 *	.105	-.134	.104	-.378 **	.101	-.141	.097
Father sees the child multiple times per week <sup>a</sup>	-.111	.078	-.078	.078	-.091	.077	-.125	.077	-.077	.076	-.203 **	.074	-.133 ~	.070
Age focal child	.020 *	.010	.017 ~	.010	.024 *	.010	.018 ~	.010	.020 *	.010	.022 *	.009	.021 *	.009
Number of children	.001	.044	.003	.044	.017	.044	-.005	.044	.011	.043	-.005	.042	.015	.040
Children's predivorce problems	-.056	.071	-.033	.071	-.028	.071	-.054	.070	-.038	.069	-.021	.068	.047	.064
Children with new partner <sup>c</sup>	.689 **	.143	.690 **	.142	.690 **	.142	.683 **	.142	.692 **	.140	.181	.142	.172	.134
Education	.070 **	.016	.072 **	.016	.071 **	.016	.062 **	.016	.028 ~	.016	.058 **	.015	.019	.015
Parental predivorce problems	-.448 **	.070	-.427 **	.069	-.448 **	.069	-.408 **	.069	-.401 **	.068	-.357 **	.067	-.261 **	.063
Predivorce conflict	-.044	.044	.026	.045	-.031	.043	-.043	.043	-.060	.043	-.069 ~	.042	.003	.041
Current conflict with ex-partner			-.200 **	.035									-.206 **	.032
Quality relationship child					.128 **	.024							.117 **	.022
Employed <sup>b</sup>							.596 **	.108					.426 **	.099
Leisure activities									.049 **	.005			.044 **	.005
Nonresident new partner <sup>c</sup>											.460 **	.073	.467 **	.069
Coreresident new partner <sup>d</sup>											1.007 **	.077	1.024 **	.074
R2	.079		.097		.096		.096		.126		.170			.259

<sup>a</sup> Shared residence was taken as the reference category. <sup>b</sup> Employed: 0 = *unemployed*, 1 = *employed*. <sup>c</sup> Nonresident new partner: 0 = *no partner*, 1 = *nonresident new partner*. <sup>d</sup> Resident new partner: 0 = *no partner*, 1 = *new resident partner*. <sup>e</sup> Children with new partner: 0 = *no children with the new partner*, 1 = *at least one child with the new partner*.

~  $p < .1$ ; \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$  two-tailed.

Table 5  
*Linear Regression Models of Visitation Frequency on Life Satisfaction for Sole resident and Shared Residence Mothers (N = 2,269)*

	Model 1		Model 2 full		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Intercept	3.584 **	.149	3.587 **	.148	2.198 **	.266	3.234 **	.157	3.010 **	.155	3.309 **	.148	1.331 **	.257
Ex-partner sees the child less than once per month <sup>a</sup>	-.331 **	.089	-.290 **	.089	-.342 **	.089	-.269 **	.095	-.222 *	.088	-.264 **	.088	-.075	.085
Ex-partner sees the child less than once per week <sup>a</sup>	-.373 **	.106	-.337 **	.105	-.357 **	.105	-.323 **	.100	-.279 **	.104	-.321 **	.104	-.140	.099
Ex-partner sees the child once per week <sup>a</sup>	-.291 **	.086	-.245 **	.086	-.281 **	.085	-.253 **	.086	-.185 **	.085	-.281 **	.084	-.093	.081
Ex-partner sees the child multiple times per week <sup>a</sup>	-.169 *	.070	-.132 ~	.070	-.163 *	.070	-.150 *	.069	-.115 ~	.069	-.147 *	.069	-.038	.066
Age focal child	.014 ~	.008	.012	.008	.019 *	.008	.008	.008	.010	.008	.016 *	.008	.009	.008
Number of children	-.067 ~	.035	-.055	.034	-.061 ~	.034	-.062 ~	.034	-.065 ~	.034	-.071 *	.034	-.046	.032
Children's predivorce problems	-.259 **	.056	-.223 **	.056	-.207 **	.057	-.243 **	.057	-.243 **	.055	-.258 **	.055	-.150 **	.053
Children with new partner <sup>c</sup>	.723 **	.137	.679 **	.136	.686 **	.136	.736 **	.119	.747 **	.134	.299 *	.141	.269 *	.134
Education	.054 **	.015	.060 **	.014	.055 **	.014	.035 *	.015	.021	.015	.058 **	.014	.019	.014
Parental predivorce problems	-.256 **	.058	-.236 **	.057	-.231 **	.057	-.207 **	.059	-.236 **	.056	-.243 **	.057	-.138 *	.054
Predivorce conflict	-.063 ~	.034	-.010	.034	-.052	.033	-.063 ~	.033	-.052	.033	-.063 ~	.033	.012	.032
Current conflict with ex-partner			-.184 **	.029									-.192 **	.027
Quality relationship child					.170 **	.027							.141 **	.025
Employed <sup>b</sup>							.536 **	.083					.504 **	.069
Leisure activities									.049 **	.005			.044 **	.004
Nonresident new partner <sup>c</sup>											.275 **	.060	.266 **	.057
Coreident new partner <sup>d</sup>											.706 **	.070	.683 **	.066
R2	.069		.085		.085		.091		.114		.111		.199	

<sup>a</sup> Shared residence was taken as the reference category. <sup>b</sup> Employed: 0 = *unemployed*, 1 = *employed*. <sup>c</sup> Nonresident new partner: 0 = *no partner*, 1 = *nonresident new partner*. <sup>d</sup> Resident new partner: 0 = *no partner*, 1 = *new resident partner*. <sup>e</sup> Children with new partner: 0 = *no children with the new partner*, 1 = *at least one child with the new partner*.

~  $p < .1$ ; \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$  two-tailed.