JENNY DE JONG GIERVELD *Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute*

EVA-MARIA MERZ *Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute**

Parents' Partnership Decision Making After Divorce or Widowhood: The Role of (Step)Children

Using data from the Netherlands Kinship Panel Surveys, this study investigated divorced and widowed parents' (N = 350) decision making about living arrangements after repartnering: Twenty-eight percent lived apart together (LAT) and others lived together (remarried or cohabiting). The focus was on determinants of LAT: Women, older respondents, residents of larger cities, and parents of 2 or more children are more apt to LAT. On the basis of additional qualitative interviews with LAT respondents (n = 25), the reasons for LAT were investigated. Data showed that many children are involved in pure boundary work in an effort to guarantee the continuation of their family. Other (step)children use the sabotage or refusal types of boundary work, not accepting the new partner or excluding a parent from contact, especially with grandchildren. Many of these efforts are successful. To preserve the ties with their children, parents often adapt their decision making about the living arrangements with a new partner accordingly.

Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, P.O. Box 11650, 2502 AR The Hague, the Netherlands (gierveld@nidi.nl).

*Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, P.O. Box 11650, 2502 AR The Hague, the Netherlands.

This article was edited by Deborah S. Carr.

Key Words: divorce, intergenerational relationships, living apart together, repartnering, (step)children, widowhood.

Longevity, higher divorce rates, and other demographic trends have led to a growing number of older adults who are unpartnered, either because of a breakup or the death of a partner. Divorced or widowed adults not only have to cope with grief and bereavement, but also have lost an important source of social support and daily companionship. They can remedy this absence of a significant other by establishing a new romantic bond (Carr, 2004). Widowed men in particular report an interest in getting remarried or living together (Moorman, Booth, & Fingerman, 2006). The demographic imbalance in the sex ratio makes it easier for men at advanced ages to find a new partner, whereas for women the pool of suitable men becomes smaller. This discrepancy is intensified because elderly men tend to prefer women who are younger than they (Morgan & Kunkel, 1998). Therefore, age at dissolution of the former partner relationship is a strong predictor of repartnering (de Jong Gierveld, 2004), although women with non-coresidential children have a higher probability of repartnering than do women with children still at home (de Graaf & Kalmijn, 2003). Men in better socioeconomic circumstances have more opportunities of finding a new partner, especially if they are involved in activities through which they meet other people, such as labor force participation (Chevan, 1996; de Jong Gierveld, 2004).

Sociostructural and cultural changes, such as emancipation and individualization, have altered

the family life and household composition of younger and older adults, and traditional biographies have been replaced by *choice biographies* (Brothers & de Jong Gierveld, 2011; Du Bois-Reymond, 1998), including various forms of repartnering and stepfamily arrangements. Many older adults are successful in finding a new partner. "Individuals select from a veritable smorgasbord of romantic options, including . . . entering into shared living" (Sassler, 2010, p. 557). Some remarry, others live together, and some start living-apart-together (LAT) relationships, although it is unclear whether each of these options are always freely chosen rather than a default option. In the current study, LAT relationships were defined as a living arrangement in which intimate partners (who regard themselves as a couple and are recognized as such by others) maintain separate households and finances and share living quarters on an intermittent or temporary basis (Haskey, 2005; Strohm, Seltzer, Cochran, & Mays, 2009).

REPARTNERING OF PARENTS

Repartnering at an older age, and living arrangements such as remarriage and living together or LAT, have already been the topic of ample research (e.g., de Jong Gierveld, 2002, 2004; Karlsson & Borell, 2002; Régnier-Loilier, Beaujouan, & Villeneuve-Gokalp, 2009). Studies have also examined the role children and stepchildren might play in influencing their parents' decision of whether to move in together (e.g., Goldscheider & Sassler, 2006; Graefe & Lichter, 1999), but these are still rather scarce, especially studies regarding middle-aged and older parents. This is unfortunate, because parents remain parents for a lifetime and it seems more than likely that, regardless of whether they still live at home, children play an important role in decision making about the new family constellation. Parents' lives are linked to those of their children, and parents remain concerned about their children's well-being even after those children are no longer living at home. A parent's new relationship may threaten the children's well-being or decrease the contact with adult children or grandchildren, particularly if the repartnering means that two households will merge. This may make parents more reluctant to invest in new partnerships not only when their children are younger and still part of the

household but also after their children have grown up and moved out of the home.

In the current study, we identified the ways children and stepchildren can have a positive or negative effect on their divorced or widowed parent's decision to remarry, live with a new partner, or have an LAT relationship. We asked two broad research questions: (a) Is having children directional in regard to remarrying or living together versus LAT? and (b) how do the characteristics of intergenerational relations determine the decision making of older adults in regard to getting married or living together versus LAT? To answer these two questions, we used quantitative data from a large-scale panel survey, the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (NKPS), especially data that focused on changes in family relationships across contexts and time. To examine the mechanisms behind certain choices, we used qualitative data collected in an in-depth study on repartnering that devoted special attention to changes in relationships with children and other kin. In this qualitative approach, we conducted interviews with 52 divorced or widowed NKPS respondents involved in a new romantic partnership and either living together or in an LAT relationship.

In the following sections, we sketch the societal background of current demographic and family behavior, with a focus on northern and western Europe. We discuss why children are apt to play an important role in influencing their parent's decision making about a new partner relationship and living arrangements.

LAT AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO COHABITATION IN EUROPE

The modernization and emancipation in western Europe that have been observed in recent decades are reflected in value changes emphasizing individualism, personal autonomy, gender equality, and detachment from traditional family roles (Lesthaeghe & Surkyn, 1988; Mills, 2007; Sobotka, 2004; van de Kaa, 1987). This has led to demographic changes in Europe and an increase in the number of adults who realize that LAT is one such trend. LAT is now sometimes a preferred alternative to married or unmarried cohabitation (de Jong Gierveld, 2004; Levin, 2004; Strohm et al., 2009), not merely a makeshift solution for individuals who cannot afford to get married and share a household. On the contrary, LAT relationships require that

one has the resources to live independently, such as a good education and the capacity to run an independent household. Since the introduction of more egalitarian ideas about men and women's position in society, the acceptance of new partnership forms and new living arrangements such as living together or LAT on the part of midlife and older adults is becoming more common, especially in northern and western Europe (Bumpass, Sweet, & Martin, 1990; Chevan, 1996; Davidson, 2002; de Jong Gierveld & Peeters, 2003; Régnier-Loilier et al., 2009; Stevens, 2002). A more modern orientation and emphasis on individualization has made the LAT arrangement more attractive. Research has shown that two groups—adults with a higher education level and women—more frequently exhibit a more modern value orientation (Merz & Liefbroer, 2012) and might thus be more likely to prefer LAT to cohabitation.

PARENTS AND CHILDREN ACROSS THE LIFE COURSE: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Older people's social networks tend to be concentrated on the nuclear family and close kin (Carstensen, 1995; van Tilburg, 1998), and it is not uncommon for adult children to play a central role in their elderly parents' lives and even to function as attachment figures (Merz, Schuengel, & Schulze, 2009), although the parent's partner history affects the degree of contact and support exchanges (de Jong Gierveld & Peeters, 2003; van der Pas, Tilburg, & Knipscheer, 2007). Therefore, in this study we examined various kinds of interactions between repartnered parents and their children and stepchildren. Scholars have investigated the complex interrelationship between parents and children by focusing on various dimensions of solidarity (Bengtson, Giarrusso, Mabry, & Silverstein, 2002; Bengtson & Roberts, 1991; Silverstein & Bengtson, 1997; Silverstein, Burholt, Wenger, & Bengtson, 1998), but intergenerational relationships do not automatically continue to be relationships of solidarity, because parents as well as children may turn to other sources of social support or cease to act as sources of support. Lüscher and Pillemer (1998) and Giarrusso, Silverstein, Gans, and Bengtson (2005) have advocated including the possibility of mixed feelings, that is, an attraction–repulsion dynamic, ambivalence, or a model of both solidarity and conflict. Life course transitions,

children becoming adolescents, and parents getting divorced and repartnering might affect relationships between parents and children and lead to conflicts and contradictory feelings (Giarrusso et al., 2005). Studies conducted by Dykstra and Schenk (2012) and Connidis (2010) show that the repartnering of parents stimulates parents and children to renegotiate their relationships. According to the ambivalence type of intergenerational family relationships (de Graaf & Fokkema, 2007; de Jong Gierveld & Peeters, 2003), repartnered parents less frequently provide support for their children and are less frequently in contact with their children. Moreover, repartnering proves to be the major trigger for transforming child–parent relationships into discordant ones, with a higher likelihood of conflict and a lower likelihood of connectedness and support exchanges (Schenk & Dykstra, 2012).

AMBIVALENCE, BOUNDARY AMBIGUITY, AND BOUNDARY WORK

The complexity of repartnering and stepfamilies arrangements influences ambivalence and boundary ambiguity in families (Brown & Manning, 2009), whether because the structure of the family is unclear or because the new structure is clear but, for some reason, family members ignore or deny them. It is the perception, even more than the structure, that determines boundary ambiguity (Boss, 2007). Families who have suffered the death of a parent or the loss of a parent at dissolution of (parent's) marriage experience ambiguous loss situations or have a high potential for boundary ambiguity, which could present a barrier for postdivorce or postwidowhood reorganization. The inclusion of a new member in the family is one of these boundary changes that affects the risks for boundary ambiguity. The perception of a family member that the family boundaries are being intruded on by an outside person (or group of persons) is another important one (Carroll, Olson, & Buckmiller, 2007).

From a child's perspective, a parent's repartnering might involve an unpleasant feeling that someone is trying to take the father's or mother's place, trying to influence the family's daily life, or trying to replace the missing parent. Verbally, and via overt behavior, they try to guarantee the continuation of the family. Their explicit aim is to protect the family territory from intruders. Some researchers state that the risk of

boundary ambiguity is especially high for young children and adolescents (Brown & Manning, 2009), others have shown that, because of their cognitive capabilities, older children have a greater potential to experience family ambiguity (Fine, 1996; Stewart, 2005).

From a parent's perspective, having children might be an obstacle to any plan to start a new composite household. Parents—in particular, mothers—might be reluctant to start a new composite household because they do not want to confront their children with any more change (Karlsson & Borell, 2005). Perhaps observing a situation friends of theirs are in, parents might anticipate a possibly negative outcome of a new composite household that would combine their own and their partner's children. Complex households consisting of two partners and their children from former relationships are frequently characterized by more fragile and less robust intergenerational ties (Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1994; Stewart, 2005). One of the reasons people with children might opt for LAT relationships as opposed to coresidence is the issue of negotiating family boundaries with children. In the quantitative part of the current study, we differentiated between childless older adults and parents. In the qualitative part of the study, we intended to further elicit the attitudes and behaviour of the children, with specific attention given to the boundary work of children and their parents.

THE CURRENT STUDY

In this research, we explored the factors that can play a role in older adults' decision making about living arrangements after repartnering, in particular the role of boundary work of children. Research has shown that better educated adults, individuals who live in urbanized areas, and women are more frequently characterized by a more modern value orientation (Merz & Liefbroer, 2012). On the basis of these considerations, we formulated the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: Better educated adults, women, and residents of more urbanized areas are more likely to prefer LAT to cohabitation.

In addition, we examined the effects of parent–child and parent–stepchild relationships on parents' decision making about living arrangements after repartnering. Confronted with their children's comments and boundary

work, some parents will probably nevertheless start a composite household with the new partner, whereas others may be more cautious, give precedence to their children's feelings, and refrain from living together and continue maintaining separate households in an LAT relationship. We explicitly considered the specifics of parenthood, as they were neatly summarized in the subtitle of a recent article by Levitzki (2009): "Parents are always parents" (p. 226). Following the ample literature emphasizing the centrality of parenthood in the lives of aging individuals (see Dykstra & Hagestad, 2007, for an overview), we argue that taking the well-being of children into account nourishes older adults' identity and promotes their life satisfaction. Widowed or divorced parents with a new partner are likely to want to prevent negative outcomes for their children and consequently to prefer an LAT relationship to a new composite household. On the basis of these considerations, we formulated a second hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: In repartnering after widowhood or divorce, being childless increases the likelihood of coresidence, and having children increases the likelihood of LAT relationships.

The NKPS survey data fail to provide sufficient details and nuances for a more thorough examination of children's attitudes and roles in the repartnering of older parents. The use of multiple methods in the study of these rather complicated issues has been advocated since Denzin's (1970) book was published. Miles and Huberman (1984) noted that "If you collect and double-check findings, using multiple sources and modes of evidence, the verification process will largely be built into the data-gathering process" (p. 235). This is why we combined quantitative and qualitative data analyses. This combination offers ample opportunity to investigate various aspects of family life via multivariate data analysis of the NKPS survey as well as in-depth interviewing of a selection of older NKPS repartnered respondents. The in-depth interviews were conducted with a semistructured interview scheme that included questions about children's reactions at the start of their parent's current relationship. This kind of interviewing, with its open structure of the questions and answers, offered us the opportunity to develop new theoretical ideas about children's attitudes

and behavior in relation to their parents' decision making about the preferred type of relationship.

METHOD

Participants in the Quantitative Analysis

The data in this study are from the NKPS. At Wave 1 (2003–2004), computer-assisted personal interviews were conducted with 8,161 men and women age 18 to 79 (Dykstra et al., 2005). The overall response rate of the NKPS was 45%. Response rates in the Netherlands tend to be lower than in other Western industrialized countries (de Leeuw & de Heer, 2002). At Wave 2 (2006–2007), 6,085 of the respondents were reinterviewed (Dykstra et al., 2007). Adults above age of 50 at Wave 2 with new partners after their divorce or widowhood ($N = 350$) were at the core of this study; these included 251 men and women who lived with a new partner (and children), were remarried (69%) or not (31%), and 99 men and women who had an LAT relationship with a new partner.

Measures in the Quantitative Analysis

The dependent variable indicated whether a respondent was in an LAT relationship or lived with the new partner. Answer categories were 1 = LAT and 0 = coresidence.

Sociodemographic characteristics. Previous research has shown that older people, especially older, more highly educated women in urban areas, more frequently have LAT relationships (de Jong Gierveld, 2004). This is why *age* and *gender* (1 = male, 2 = female), *education level* (1 = incomplete primary school–11 = postgraduate university level), *employment status* (1 = employed, 2 = retired, and 3 = other [e.g. housewives]) and *urbanization* of the area where the respondent lived (1 = not urbanized–5 = very strongly urbanized) were included as variables.

Life course characteristics. The reason for the termination of the former relationship was included as a dichotomous variable (divorced or separated and never widowed vs. ever confronted with the death of a [cohabiting] partner). The number of former partnership breaks was included in the set of predictors. We constructed a variable based on information

about the number of children born in former relationships; dummy variables indicate whether the respondent was childless or a parent of one or two or more children at the start of the current relationship.

Participants in the Qualitative Analysis

The current qualitative study addressed family bonds, in particular the quality of the family bonds of divorced or widowed adults above age 50 in new relationships, comparing remarried, cohabiting, and LAT relationships. The criteria for inclusion in this in-depth analysis were as follows: divorced or widowed respondents above age 50 at Wave 2 of the NKPS, who were either remarried, living together or in an LAT relationship. In order to investigate intergenerational bonds, adults with two or more children at the start of the current relationship were selected. At the end of the interviews at Waves 1 and 2, respectively, respondents were asked permission to approach them again to take part in a follow-up interview. Only respondents who gave permission were invited to be involved in this in-depth study; two refused because of health reasons. A university-educated interviewer and the first author conducted the interviews in 2008–2009. All the interviews were conducted at the respondents' homes, throughout the Netherlands. The mean duration of the interviews was 60 to 90 minutes. About half the interviews were with adults who were living together, and the other half were with adults in LAT relationships. Given the rich and abundant set of information gathered in the 52 interviews, for this study we decided to solely concentrate on the data from the 25 respondents in LAT relationships. We conducted 16 interviews with divorced adults and nine with widows or widowers; 11 were male and 14 were female, all of them in heterosexual relationships. Their age at the start of the LAT relationship varied: Twenty-four percent started the relationship before age 45, 12% started it between 45 and 49, and 64% started it after 50. A comparison of the NKPS Wave 2 composition with those of this qualitative study indicates that the percentage of respondents ever widowed, with 22% at Wave 2 and 36% represented in the qualitative interview, differed considerably. The portion of women was 59% versus 60%—totally comparable—and the mean age was 61 years in both samples.

Measures and Procedures of the Qualitative Analysis

Given that the researchers had ample information on the respondents' sociodemographics, partner status and history, children, social network, and health status, based on the data gathered at Waves 1 and 2 of the surveys, the semistructured interview guide included a specific series of topics that covered various aspects of the relationships with their children and other family members.

The open starting question was, "How did your children react when they learned about your new (current) partner?" The respondents had plenty of time to answer this question. If necessary, additional questions were formulated for clarification.

The information was audio-recorded and transcribed to prepare the data for entry into the qualitative data system. The analysis procedure started with the open coding of the texts of the interviews. This resulted in more than 30 different coding categories (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; LaRossa, 2005). Next, we examined and compared the coding categories to note similarities and differences. The coding categories were combined into clusters of related categories, including one that ordered all the coding categories on a continuum from very positive to very negative. As expected, parent-child bonds over time were not stable; they were created and re-created, they got better and they deteriorated. Introducing life course elements—such as children's marriages and associated needs and possibilities for broadening support for children and grandchildren—provided an opportunity to reassemble meaningful pieces of information (Elder, 1995). Coding schemes were revised and expanded as our interpretations and explanations progressed. There was, for example, a need to nuance the original concept of children's boundary work, differentiating the comments of children still at home and those who had grown up and left. We completed our analysis by formulating four broad types of parent-child interactions based on statements by our LAT respondents.

RESULTS

Quantitative Analyses

Descriptive Characteristics. Ninety-nine of the 350 older adults in new relationships (28%)

were in LAT relationships. This LAT living arrangement attracts many older adults. Two thirds of the coresident partners had remarried, and one third had not. The main characteristics of the LAT partners and the respondents who lived together are presented in Table 1. More women than men were in LAT relationships. The mean age of the LAT respondents was 60.9, significantly higher than the mean age of the coresident respondents (57.7). The mean age at the start of the current relationship differed significantly in the two groups: 39.0 for coresident respondents and 53.2 for LAT respondents. The education levels did not differ significantly. Coresident respondents were more frequently employed, and LAT respondents were more frequently retired. Most respondents in both groups had been divorced, and 1 out of 5 of the LAT respondents had experienced the death of a former partner.

The LAT respondents exhibited a higher mean number of breaks in partner relationships. The percentage of LAT respondents who were parents at the start of the current relationship was 79.8%, significantly higher than the 66.5% in the coresidence group. Respondents with two or more children were more frequently in LAT relationships. The oldest as well as the youngest children of the LAT respondents were significantly older at the start of their parents' new relationship than the children of coresident respondents. Table 1 shows an overrepresentation of LAT respondents in the urbanized and extremely urbanized areas of the Netherlands. We conclude that LAT respondents might not be a cross-section of repartnered older adults, but they do exhibit a wide variety of sociodemographics and life course histories. We needed to conduct the multivariate analysis to consolidate this preliminary finding.

Multivariate Analysis. The outcomes of the multivariate analysis focused on the probability of LAT as compared to coresidence (either as a married couple or in cohabitation) and are shown in Table 2. In Model 1, the sociodemographic variables are taken into account, and the numbers show significant odds ratios for gender as well as age. Women and older people were more frequently in LAT relationships than men and younger respondents. Significant odds ratios indicate that living in urbanized and extremely urbanized areas was more strongly associated with LAT than living in rural areas.

Table 1. Main Sample Characteristics for Respondents Age 50 and Over in Living Apart Together (LAT) or Coresidence With a New Partner After Divorce or Widowhood (N = 350)

Characteristic	Coresidence (n = 251)	LAT (n = 99)	χ^2 or F
Female (% yes)	48.2	58.6	$\chi^2 = 3.061, df = 1, p < .10$
Mean age	57.7	60.9	$F = 13.313, df = 1, p < .000$
Mean age at start current partner relation	39.0	53.2	$F = 130.491, df = 1, p < .000$
Type of union			
Married	68.9		
Cohabitation	31.1		
LAT		100.0	
Education level			$\chi^2 = 4.801, df = 4, ns$
Lower/lower professional	17.9	13.1	
Mid level/mid-level professional	37.1	35.4	
Higher secondary	2.4	6.1	
Higher professional	29.1	34.3	
University	13.5	11.1	
Employment status			$\chi^2 = 6.442, df = 2, p < .05$
Employed	53.8	40.4	
Retired	30.7	44.4	
Other (e.g., housewives)	15.5	15.2	
Urbanization municipality			$\chi^2 = 8.448, df = 4, p < .10$
Not or hardly urbanized	29.9	16.1	
Moderate	19.5	20.2	
(Very) strongly urbanized	50.6	63.6	
Type of break former partner relationship			
Divorced, never widowed	96.8	77.8	$\chi^2 = 32.825, df = 1, p < .000$
Ever widowed	3.2	22.2	
Mean number of breaks	1.2	1.4	$F = 5.168, df = 1, p < .05$
Mean duration of current partner relationship	18.7	7.6	$F = 87.174, df = 1, p < .000$
Parent at start current partner relationship?			$\chi^2 = 8.018, df = 2, p < .05$
0 children	33.5	20.2	
1 child	15.1	12.1	
2 children or more	51.4	67.6	
Age of oldest child at start of current partner relationship			$\chi^2 = 34.383, df = 2, p < .000$
Childless	33.5	20.2	
1 – 17 years	36.7	16.2	
18 years or above	29.9	63.6	
Age of youngest child at start of current partner relationship			$\chi^2 = 59.954, df = 2, p < .000$
Childless	33.5	20.2	
1 – 17	48.6	21.2	
18 or more	17.1	58.6	

Model 2 shows a greater likelihood that respondents who were widowed or had two or more children at the start of the current relationship would be in an LAT relationship than a coresidence one. To control for possible inter-relations among the predictors, we investigated

one full model that included all the predictors (cf. Model 3 in Table 2). The results revealed that having been widowed increased the likelihood of being in an LAT relationship. Living in a more urbanized area was also more associated with LAT than coresidence. Moreover, having

Table 2. Outcomes of Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Realizing Living Apart Together Versus Coresidence (N = 350)

Predictor	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	b	SE	e ^β	b	SE	e ^β	b	SE	e ^β
Gender (1 = female)	0.43	0.25	1.54 [†]	0.47	0.26	1.60 [†]	0.49	0.27	1.63 [†]
Age	0.05	0.02	1.05**				0.02	0.02	1.02
Lower & lower professional education (ref.)									
Mid-level & mid-level professional	0.43	0.41	1.54				0.66	0.45	1.94
Higher level, higher level professional, university	0.31	0.41	1.36				0.50	0.45	1.64
Not employed/retired (ref.)									
Employed	−0.24	0.31	0.79				−0.17	0.32	0.85
Urbanization community (low → high)	0.24	0.09	1.27**				0.35	0.10	1.42**
Experienced widowhood? (1 = yes)				1.98	0.45	7.22***	2.02	0.48	7.52***
Number of breaks				0.41	0.23	1.51 [†]	0.43	.24	1.53 [†]
Number of children at start current partner relationship (ref.: childless)									
1				0.24	0.43	1.27	0.23	0.44	1.26
2 or more				0.61	0.31	1.83*	0.78	0.33	2.18*
Nagelkerke R ²	.10			.15			.22		

Note: ref. = reference.
†p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

no children was a predictor of not being in an LAT relationship. Having two or more children significantly increased the likelihood of LAT. In the qualitative study, we intended to further elicit the attitudes and behavior of the children, with specific attention paid to boundary work.

Outcomes of the Qualitative Analysis

We asked the 25 LAT respondents to describe the bonds with their children at the moment when they were informed about the new partner. None of the respondents had difficulty answering the opening question or hesitated to do so. They were able to express themselves and speak more or less extensively about the bonds with their children.

Our analysis showed that the quality and changes in the quality of the bonds with children varied strongly in the starting phase of the current relationships. On the basis of the analysis, we differentiated the following main types: (a) positive comments made by children, reported

by one respondent; (b) neutral or indifferent comments, or never having experienced a guarded or negative interaction with the children about the current relationship, reported by seven LAT respondents; (c) serious problems with their own children or their partner’s children that strongly affected their well-being and in many cases forced them to redefine their plans for the future, reported by 13 respondents; (d) anticipating problems with the children and working hard to prevent them by designing their plans for the future in a certain way, reported by four respondents. In the next sections, we address each of these types of experiences in greater detail and illustrate them with quotes.

Positive Comments by Children. In this category we included the only respondent who spoke in positive terms about her children’s comments and behavior, a 65-year-old divorced woman who met her current partner when she was 54, 7 years after her divorce. She and her partner had had an LAT relationship for 11 year:

My kids evaluated the new situation as fantastic. Yes, because my son William called immediately and said, "Oh, Mom, just go for living together!" I said, "No, I will not do that yet." I said "First I'll wait and see how things go." And then, later on . . . he said, "Yes, Mom now I understand why you don't share a house." . . . My daughter said, "Well done, Mom, I think you did the right thing." . . . And no, no, she did not talk about sharing a house. I think women have a feeling for this. . . . At the start one of [my partner's] children was not that glad about the new situation. His daughter thought I was squandering her dad's money. When she saw I continued to live in my own house and pay for myself, it went better. . . . Now we are on good terms.

This respondent combined the positive comments of her own children with the more reserved ones of his. All in all, she provided one of the most favorable pictures of the interaction with her and his children. She relates how after a period with guarded comments by his children, the situation became more positive.

Indifferent, Neutral, or No Comments by Children. Several respondents did not get either positive or negative comments from their children; the parents and children each went their own way. A 74-year-old divorced man in an LAT relationship for 14 years described it as follows:

My kids, er . . . it does not interest them that much, no, er . . . I have my own life, my kids have their own lives . . . This is what they said, "Dad, you lead your own life, what do you want to do with your life?" And it does not matter whether I do good or bad things . . . as long as it does not harm my health . . . I don't need to tell them everything, they don't tell me everything either.

However, this example of parents and children leading their own lives in a harmonious way is not the same as the situation of respondents who reported their children's comments in neutral terms because the intergenerational bonds are so weak. Three respondents noted that their ties with their children had been virtually nonexistent for years, long before the LAT relationship started. This is especially true of two divorced men and one older widow who had no contact with her daughter after her daughter's marriage. A 55-year-old divorced man put it as follows:

Nearly no contact . . . My new partner, she saw my daughter and my son, may be, two or three times. I

did not see them more frequently . . . but this does not keep haunting me. So, no contact anymore.

It is not surprising that these respondents did not discuss the details of their new relationship with their children and did not hear any negative or positive comments.

Predominantly Negative Comments by Children.

In analyzing children's negative reactions, the data show that the concept of boundary work is helpful in this context but requires further differentiation. We needed additional nuancing, for example, between the comments of children who were still at home and those who were not. The following three types of reactions were observed: (a) the *pure boundary work* type, most frequently observed in biological children who still lived at home; (b) the *refusal* type, observed in (young) adult children who had left home; and (c) the *sabotage* type, most frequently observed in the children of the new partner, whose rejecting comments and behavior represent an effort to prevent the intrusion of a new person into their family household. Below, we describe the three types of reactions and illustrate them with examples from the in-depth interviews.

The pure boundary work type. With this type of reaction, parents are confronted with the comments and behavior of their biological children, who are trying to establish boundaries around their current family home. In doing so, they try to influence their parent to continue the situation as it was before the arrival of the new partner. Nearly all these children have memories of the old situation with both biological parents present. Missing a parent and being confronted with a parent's new partner is a very emotional experience for children. This is illustrated by the following statements by the children of a divorced 53-year-old father with two sons at home:

"Take it or leave it; either she leaves or I leave" (10-year-old son).

His 19-year-old brother said

"She may be your girlfriend, but I don't want to have anything more to do with her" (this son left the home as soon as the woman arrived).

A divorced 57-year-old mother in a long-term LAT relationship shared the following:

After 18 years of marriage, I got divorced and lived with my three teenage children. I had a new

partner . . . but we seldom had contact because of my children. It was too difficult for them (to deal with my new relationship). And I had to put my children first . . . especially my daughter had a lot of issues (with my new partner) at the time. It is only recently that they have come to accept this relationship.

The children quoted here are successful in the sense that their parents refrain from starting a composite household.

The refusal type. For children who have already left home, the pure concept of boundary work no longer applies. These older children nonetheless comment on the behavior of their parent, and many do so by not approving of the new partner situation. Adult children sometimes reduce the frequency of visits to their parents and explicitly deny the new partner bond. A 78-year-old woman in a long-term LAT relationship noted, "My daughters refused to come visit me on Sundays if Henry, my new partner, was in my house . . . and . . . I was not invited to the wedding of his granddaughter."

A similar situation was described by a 74-year-old widower who was 62 at the start of a new relationship:

My son . . . comes to visit me every Monday evening. And I am very happy about that. This guy, I can talk to him so pleasantly, sometimes at the computer if I have problems with it, I am learning . . . No, that's fine. I have more problems with my daughter, I have not seen her in years, although I did not put anything in her way . . . I wrote her a letter, but no answer. In the letter I told her that if I did something wrong at the start of my new relationship, I am willing to have a heart-to-heart talk. But I never got a response. And that's a pity, . . . I will be 75 next year and I am planning a big party . . . It would be so lovely to have her here.

These two respondents clearly show the consequences of children's comments and behavior. They were very unhappy about losing regular contact with children who had grown up and left home.

The sabotage type. The comments and behavior in this subgroup are characteristic of a situation in which it is not a parent's biological children, but the children of the new partner, who are obstructive. In other words, "his" or "her" children stand in the way of the respondent's well-being. Some examples of

these comments are presented below. First, a 68-year-old divorced man who had been in an LAT relationship for 3 years described his situation:

My grown-up kids were happy when they heard about my new partner. But her son (age 18) . . . is a bit odd, and behaves as if he is the boss at home . . . He could not stand to have another man . . . me . . . in the house. And he influenced his mother to do exactly what he wanted. That's why I am happier living on my own.

A 62-year-old man in a long-term LAT relationship put it as follows:

We, my new partner and I, tried sharing a household. Her daughter reacted very strongly. "What's that guy doing in our house?" And her son didn't say a word to me at breakfast, not even "Good morning" or anything . . . that feels awful . . . not good. So I decided to move out and live separately again.

It is clear from these comments how sad and disappointed the respondents were. Several respondents confirmed that the comments and behavior of their partners' children affected their lives. The very start of a coresidence situation was wrecked. The respondents returned to their own homes and continued to have an LAT relationship. A special type of sabotage is illustrated by a 67-year-old man in an LAT relationship. His partner was terminally ill, and he took care of her. He was not only the principal caregiver, he was the only one, because her children did not get involved. During the terminal period of her illness, he took care of her 24 hours a day. His status as partner and primary caregiver was denied by her children, even in the preparations for her funeral:

I was the only one who took care of my (LAT) partner when she was dying of cancer, but I was not included in the preparations for the funeral, and her children did not even put my name on the memorial card.

A total of 12 respondents mentioned children's strong negative comments about their parents' new relationship. Four were the pure boundary type, three were the refusal type, and five were the sabotage type. The comments and behavior of children were taken very seriously by divorced and widowed adults. Some older adults even anticipated their children's negative comments

and behavior and did their best to avoid conflicts. Their situation is described below.

Anticipating problems and negative comments.

Four LAT respondents were categorized as anticipating. A 56-year-old widow in a long-term LAT relationship with three teenage children at home anticipated problems if she and her partner set up a new composite household with her and his children.

I did not think it was a good idea to . . . go live with my three children in his house or for him and his daughter to come live here, no . . .

Interviewer: So it was a conscious choice to become LAT partners?

Respondent: Yes, in the beginning, yes, neither of us ever considered living together. I like it the way it is now. No, I never wanted to combine the households. His daughter is totally different from my children and I did not like the sound of the idea. They have contact on birthdays and so on, but . . . she is just another type of child. Nothing wrong with her, um . . . don't get me wrong. It just would not be a good match if they all had to live in one house . . . we never even thought about it that much. So that is why I live here with three children; I don't want another man around the house.

In anticipating possible conflicts with children, some parents ruled out a composite household from the start and simply had an LAT relationship. As one widow noted,

It's quite something that I have been living on my own for years. It is in total awareness that as long as my children live here . . . I will never share a household with a new partner . . . I see my female friends [with a composite household], it means so much fuss in the house, no . . . I think it's not my piece of cake.

More specifically, some respondents opted for an LAT relationship in which they saw each other only when the children were not around, for example, in the evening or, in cases of marital dissolution, on weekends when the children were with the former spouse. The anticipating respondents very explicitly mentioned their intention from the start to not have a composite household.

DISCUSSION

The current study expands the prior knowledge on the role of children and stepchildren in their

divorced or widowed parent's decision making about living arrangements after repartnering, especially if the parents are middle-aged or older adults. By combining quantitative and qualitative data, the study enriches the empirical results of a logistic regression analysis with in-depth data to add details and contexts to the quantitative results. We expected children and stepchildren to play an important role in influencing their widowed or divorced parents' decision making about living arrangements with a new partner.

As expected (Hypothesis 2), parenthood, especially with more than one child, means a greater likelihood of LAT, and childless individuals more often live together after repartnering. Using qualitative data, we showed why and how children affect their parents' decision making and identified several types of behavior children can adopt. We showed that older female adults living in more urbanized areas were more likely to maintain separate households after repartnering than younger male ones (partly in accordance with Hypothesis 1). We discuss the results in greater detail below and consider possible mechanisms underlying the supporting, neutral, and constraining role children may play in the repartnering of their divorced or widowed parents.

Sociodemographic Factors and Value Modernization Predicting LAT

As predicted, older women living in more urbanized areas more often had LAT relationships, and higher education levels were associated with realizing LAT intimate partnerships (although not significantly). Standard biographies have been replaced by the lifestyle choices (Du Bois-Reymond, 1998) of individuals who plan, reflect, and negotiate (Rijken & Knijn, 2009) with their significant others in the context of value modernization, longevity, and higher divorce rates. These characteristics have previously been associated with less traditional attitudes and demographic behavior (e.g., Keizer, Dykstra, & Jansen, 2008; Merz & Liefbroer, 2012) in Dutch and cross-national studies.

It is interesting that older ages were associated with LAT relationships. This contradicts the earlier findings on the association between modernization and lifestyles and is not easy to interpret. Older ages at the start of relationships are indicative of individuals who want to preserve

their personal lifestyles, habits, and households. Older women are especially inclined to protect their income and pension schemes and safeguard their future position by not merging households with a new partner (de Jong Gierveld, 2002).

At the same time, societal value changes affecting demographic behavior and family life might also mean that a decade or two ago, repartnered individuals did not spontaneously mention their children as a reason not to move in with a new partner. The current interviews explicitly included questions about the role children and stepchildren played in the decision making of repartnered adults and clearly demonstrated the centrality of children to the current cohort of parents. Perhaps disclosing the constraining role of children in the decision-making of older adults about living arrangements was not done some 20 years ago, but nowadays the existence of ambivalence is acknowledged, even in the best families (cf. Bengtson et al., 2002; Connidis & McMullin, 2002), no matter how central intergenerational relationships are to parents and children.

Intergenerational Solidarity and Ambivalence

The divorce or death of one's parents can be a major negative life event in a child's life. Their parents' divorce can be particularly disturbing for children because it means a partial loss of the affective tie with one parent and is often accompanied by changes at home, such as a decrease in the quality of the relationship with the other parent (Crowell, Treboux, & Brockmeyer, 2009) as well as other short- and long-term negative effects (Riggio, 2004). Children might see a parent's new partner as a threat to the fragile ties they have with their parents. Children and parents can differ significantly about seeing a newly constructed household as a family (Brown & Manning, 2009). Apparently, children sometimes engage in strong boundary work in an effort to prevent their parents from establishing a new composite household with a new partner and secure their own position in the household. Insecurity about the relationship with the custodial parent may be one reason for engaging in boundary work so as not to have to share the parent with a new partner on a daily basis. Parents, however, might want to share a home with a new partner to provide their children with a complete family and guarantee greater resources. At the same

time, as is clear from the qualitative data in the current study, parents are aware of—or even anticipate—their children's boundary work and sometimes refrain from sharing a home with a new partner to protect their children.

The direction of dependence and providing and receiving support in intergenerational relationships beyond childhood is strongly linked to the age of parents as well as children even if the children are adults themselves. In older dyads, children can be a source of support and advice for their elderly parents (Merz, Schuengel, & Schulze, 2008). However, the intergenerational relationship is central, especially for young adult–parent dyads, who continue to rely on their parents for support and advice. In younger child–parent relationships in particular, a parent's new partner might be viewed as a threat to young adult children and lead to boundary work by them to protect the intergenerational relationship as a central source of advice and care, as is illustrated in the in-depths interviews in the pure boundary type of children's involvement. Earlier empirical research (e.g., de Graaf & Kalmijn, 2003; Sweeney, 1997) has shown that parents with children still living at home are less likely to repartner, largely because they have fewer opportunities to meet a new partner. In addition, the qualitative part of this study also noted that parents with children are frequently confronted with constraints in the sense that, via boundary work, as shown in their comments and behavior, children serve as obstacles to the start of a composite household with their parent's new partner. In this context, the concept of boundary work needs nuancing; we differentiated among the pure type of boundary work, the refusal type, and the sabotage type. The pure boundary type is characteristic of the comments and behavior of biological children who are trying to establish boundaries around their current family home. Also, outcomes of the qualitative part of our research showed that several children who had already left home commented extensively on the behavior of their parent in not approving the new partner situation and sometimes reducing the frequency of visits to their parents (the refusal type of boundary work). The outcomes of the qualitative part of this study additionally show the specific type of sabotage boundary work as elicited in the comments and behavior of the children of the new partner. Several quotes illustrated that the very start of a coresidence

situation was wrecked by the comments and behavior of "his" or "her" children.

On the other hand, adult children whose divorced or widowed older parents are unpartnered might have a positive view of the new partner as a new and extra source of companionship and support, as illustrated in this study. Most children provide support and care for their parents if necessary, motivated in part by a sense of filial obligation and in part by true affection and love. Nonetheless, earlier studies on intergenerational support have noted that providing support for parents can have negative effects on children's well-being (Merz, Consedine, Schulze, & Schuengel, 2009). Some adult children, as is illustrated in the qualitative examples in our study, experience a parent's new partnership as a relief and a good addition to their relationship and support exchange with their parents. Other children, as is also illustrated in the qualitative examples, experience the new partnership as something negative and a reason to terminate their own relationship with their parent. So, depending on the life stage of adult children and their parents, children can act as an obstacle to a parent's intention to move in with a new partner.

In this study, we reported on the experiences and evaluations of 25 divorced or widowed older adults in LAT relationships. The experiences of divorced or widowed older adults who decide to live together will be the central topic of another study. We make one exception and include a comment by a 65-year-old woman who remarried after a long LAT relationship:

I announced my new relationship to the kids (who were around 20 at the time) by saying, "I have met someone and I'm worried that you might not like it. For the time being we don't intend to get married." My oldest son said, "Why are you doing this? Isn't it nice with just the three of us?" That is what he said . . . really. It took them a long time to get used to it. My youngest son in particular could not deal with it. And my daughter was a little bit . . . eh, hmm, very much an obstacle. So we waited and waited (in an LAT relationship) and in the end . . . we decided. Then it took me more than half a year to move my stuff to his house. You start in a totally different . . . every family has its own culture. But now we are married.

This illustrates the close interconnectedness between LAT and living together. We conclude that the great majority of LAT partners say their children were an important element in the

decision to being an LAT relationship versus coresidence. The children stimulated them to either opt for LAT instead of living together or to postpone living together.

Limitations and Concluding Remarks

We hope we have made an interesting contribution to the understanding of aspects of the repartnering of divorced or widowed middle-aged and older adults by explicitly addressing the role of children and stepchildren. The use of qualitative interviews in addition to quantitative analyses has been explorative but clearly demonstrates the central role children play in their parent's decision making. However, the current study is not without weaknesses.

It should be noted that although the NKPS is a panel survey, no clear longitudinal analyses have been conducted. The quantitative and qualitative data are based on retrospective interviews. Studying older adults in the midst of decision making about living arrangements with a new partner could be a valuable elaboration on the current study.

In the current analyses, no distinctions were drawn between divorced and widowed adults with regard to their living arrangements after repartnering. However, literature on children addresses the various effects parents' divorce or death can have on children (e.g., Spruijt, de Goede, & van der Valk, 2001). The differences may not only influence the adaptive outcome in children but can also play a role in children's attitudes to parents' repartnering and decision making with respect to living arrangements.

The current study is a first step toward elucidating some of the complex associations intergenerational relations can have with adult decision making after repartnering. Because our quantitative as well as qualitative results showed that children clearly influence older adults to choose LAT relationships rather than coresidence ones, future studies might more structurally investigate which aspects of intergenerational relationships discourage or encourage parents to choose either LAT or coresidence with new partners.

NOTE

The Netherlands Kinship Panel Study is funded by Grant 480-10-009 from the Major Investments Fund of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research and by the Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute,

Utrecht University, the University of Amsterdam, and Tilburg University.

REFERENCES

- Bengtson, V. L., Giarrusso, R., Mabry, J. B., & Silverstein, M. (2002). Solidarity, conflict, and ambivalence: Complementary or competing perspectives on intergenerational relationships? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 568–576. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00568.x
- Bengtson, V. L., & Roberts, R. E. (1991). Intergenerational solidarity in aging families: An example of formal theory construction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 856–870.
- Boss, P. (2007). Ambiguous loss theory: Challenges for scholars and practitioners. *Family Relations*, 56, 105–111. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2007.00444.x
- Brothers, D. R., & de Jong Gierveld, J. (2011). Challenges and opportunities for relationships in the era of the Third Age. In D. C. Carr & K. S. Komp (Eds.), *Gerontology in the era of the Third Age: Implications and next steps* (pp. 189–205). New York: Springer.
- Brown, S. L., & Manning, W. D. (2009). Family boundary ambiguity and the measurement of family structure: The significance of cohabitation. *Demography*, 46, 85–101.
- Bumpass, L., Sweet, J., & Martin, T. C. (1990). Changing patterns of remarriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 747–756.
- Carr, D. (2004). The desire to date and remarry among older widows and widowers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 1051–1068. doi:10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00078.x
- Carroll, J. S., Olson, C. D., & Buckmiller, N. (2007). Family boundary ambiguity: A 30-year review of theory, research, and measurement. *Family Relations*, 56, 210–230. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2007.00453.x
- Carstensen, L. L. (1995). Evidence for a life-span theory of socioemotional selectivity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4, 151–156.
- Cherlin, A., & Furstenberg, F. F. (1994). Stepfamilies in the United States: A reconsideration. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 20, 359–381.
- Chevan, A. (1996). As cheaply as one: Cohabitation in the older population. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 656–667.
- Connidis, I. A. (2010). *Family ties and aging* (2nd ed.). London: Pine Forge Press.
- Connidis, I. A., & McMullin, J. A. (2002). Sociological ambivalence and family ties: A critical perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 558–567. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00558.x
- Crowell, J. A., Treboux, D., & Brockmeyer, S. (2009). Parental divorce and adult children's attachment representations and marital status. *Attachment & Human Development*, 11, 87–101. doi:10.1080/14616730802500867
- Davidson, K. (2002). Gender differences in new partnership choices and constraints for older widows and widowers. *Ageing International*, 27, 43–60.
- de Graaf, P. M., & Fokkema, T. (2007). Contacts between divorced and non-divorced parents and their adult children in the Netherlands: An investment perspective. *European Sociological Review*, 23, 263–277. doi:10.1093/esr/jcl032
- de Graaf, P. M., & Kalmijn, M. (2003). Alternative routes in the remarriage market: Competing-risk analyses of union formation after divorce. *Social Forces*, 81, 1459–1498.
- de Jong Gierveld, J. (2002). The dilemma of repartnering: Considerations of older men and women entering new intimate relationships in later life. *Ageing International*, 27, 61–78.
- de Jong Gierveld, J. (2004). Remarriage, unmarried cohabitation, living apart together: Partner relationships following bereavement or divorce. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 236–243. doi:10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00015.x
- de Jong Gierveld, J., & Peeters, A. (2003). The interweaving of repartnered older adults' lives with their children and siblings. *Ageing & Society*, 23, 187–205. doi:10.1017/S0144686X02001095
- de Leeuw, E. D., & de Heer, W. (2002). Trends in household survey nonresponse: A longitudinal and international comparison. In R. M. Groves, D. D. Dillman, J. L. Eltinge, & R. J. Little (Eds.), *Survey nonresponse* (pp. 41–54). New York: Wiley.
- Denzin, N. K. (1970). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Chicago: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Du Bois-Reymond, M. (1998). “I don't want to commit myself yet”: Young people's life concepts. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 1, 63–79.
- Dykstra, P. A., & Hagestad, G. O. (2007). Roads less taken: Developing a nuanced view of older adults without children. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28, 1275–1310.
- Dykstra, P. A., Kalmijn, M., Knijn, T., Komter, A., 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*. The Hague, the Netherlands: Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute.
- Dykstra, P. A., Kalmijn, M., Knijn, T., Komter, A. E., Liefbroer, A. C., & Mulder, C. H. (2007). *Codebook of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study: A multi-actor, multi-method panel study on solidarity in family relationships, Wave 2*. The Hague, the Netherlands: Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute.
- Elder, G. H. J. (1995). Life trajectories in changing societies. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in*

- changing societies (pp. 46–68.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fine, M. A. (1996). The clarity and content of the stepparent role: A review of the literature. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 24, 19–34.
- Giarrusso, R., Silverstein, M., Gans, D., & Bengtson, V. L. (2005). Ageing parents and adult children: New perspectives on intergenerational relationships. In M. L. Johnson, V. L. Bengtson, P. G. Coleman, & T. B. Kirkwood (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of age and ageing* (pp. 413–421). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Goldscheider, F., & Sassler, S. (2006). Creating step-families: Integrating children into the study of family formation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 275–291. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00252.x
- Graefe, D. R., & Lichter, D. T. (1999). Life course transitions of American children: Parental cohabitation, marriage, and single motherhood. *Demography*, 36, 205–217.
- Haskey, J. (2005). Living arrangements in contemporary Britain: Having a partner who usually lives elsewhere and living apart together (LAT). *Population Trends*, 122, 35–45.
- Karlsson, G. S., & Borell, K. (2002). Intimacy and autonomy, gender and ageing: Living apart together. *Ageing International*, 27, 11–26.
- Karlsson, G. S., & Borell, K. (2005). A home of their own: Women's boundary work in LAT relationships. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 19, 73–84. doi:10.1016/j.jaging.2004.03008
- Keizer, R., Dykstra, P. A., & Jansen, M. D. (2008). Pathways into childlessness: Evidence of gendered life course dynamics. *Journal of Biosocial Sciences*, 40, 863–878.
- LaRossa, R. (2005). Grounded theory methods and qualitative family research. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 837–857. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00179.x
- Lesthaeghe, R., & Surkyn, J. (1988). Cultural dynamics and economic theories of fertility change. *Population and Development Review*, 14, 1–45.
- Levin, I. (2004). Living apart together: A new family form. *Current Sociology*, 52, 223–240.
- Levitzki, N. (2009). Parenting of adult children in an Israeli sample: Parents are always parents. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 23, 226–235. doi:10.1037/a0015218
- Lüscher, K., & Pillemer, K. (1998). Intergenerational ambivalence: A new approach to the study of parent–child relations in later life. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 413–425.
- Merz, E.-M., Consedine, N. S., Schulze, H.-J., & Schuengel, C. (2009a). Wellbeing of adult children and ageing parents: Associations with intergenerational support and relationship quality. *Ageing & Society*, 29, 783–802. doi:10.1017/S0144686X09008514
- Merz, E.-M., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2012). The attitude toward voluntary childlessness in Europe: Cultural and institutional explanations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74, 587–600. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00972.x
- Merz, E.-M., Schuengel, C., & Schulze, H.-J. (2008). Inter-generational relationships at different ages: An attachment perspective. *Ageing & Society*, 28, 717–736. doi:10.1017/S0144686X08007046
- Merz, E.-M., Schuengel, C., & Schulze, H.-J. (2009). Intergenerational relations across 4 years: Well-being is affected by quality, not by support exchange. *The Gerontologist*, 49, 536–548.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Mills, M. C. (2007). Individualization and the life course: Towards a theoretical model and empirical evidence. In C. Howard (Ed.), *Contested individualization* (pp. 61–79). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Moorman, S. M., Booth, A., & Fingerman, K. L. (2006). Women's romantic relationships after widowhood. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 1281–1304.
- Morgan, L., & Kunkel, S. (1998). *Ageing: The social context*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Régnier-Loilier, A., Beaujouan, É., & Villeneuve-Gokalp, C. (2009). Neither single, nor in a couple: A study of living apart together in France. *Demographic Research*, 21, 75–108. doi:10.4054/DemRes.2009.21.4
- Riggio, H. R. (2004). Parental marital conflict and divorce, parent–child relationships, social support, and relationship anxiety in young adulthood. *Personal Relationships*, 11, 99–114.
- Rijken, A. J., & Knijn, T. (2009). Couples' decisions to have a first child: Comparing pathways to early and late parenthood. *Demographic Research*, 21, 765–802. doi:10.4054/DemRes.2009.21.26
- Sassler, S. (2010). Partnering across the life course: Sex, relationships, and mate selection. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 557–575. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00718.x
- Schenk, N., & Dykstra, P. A. (2012). Continuity and change in intergenerational family relationships: An examination of shifts in relationship type over a three-year period. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 17, 121–132. doi:10.1016/j.alcr.2012.01.004
- Silverstein, M., & Bengtson, V. L. (1997). Intergenerational solidarity and the structure of adult child–parent relationships in American families. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103, 429–460.

- Silverstein, M., Burholt, V., Wenger, G. C., & Bengtson, V. L. (1998). Parent-child relations among very old parents in Wales and the United States: A test of modernization theory. *Journal of Aging Studies, 12*, 387–409. doi:10.1016/S0890-4065(98)90026-3
- Sobotka, T. (2004). Is lowest-low fertility in Europe explained by the postponement of childbearing? *Population and Development Review, 30*, 195–220.
- Sprijt, E., de Goede, M., & van der Valk, I. (2001). The well-being of youngsters coming from six different family types. *Patient Education and Counseling, 45*, 285–294.
- Stevens, N. (2002). Re-engaging: New partnerships in late-life widowhood. *Ageing International, 27*, 27–42.
- Stewart, S. D. (2005). Boundary ambiguity in stepfamilies. *Journal of Family Issues, 26*, 1002–1029. doi:10.1177/0192513X04273591
- Strohm, C. Q., Seltzer, J., Cochran, S. D., & Mays, V. M. (2009). “Living apart together” relationships in the United States. *Demographic Research, 21*, 177–214. doi:10.4054/DemRes.2009.21.7
- Sweeney, M. M. (1997). Remarriage of women and men after divorce: The role of socioeconomic prospects. *Journal of Family Issues, 18*, 479–502. doi:10.1177/019251397018005002
- van de Kaa, D. J. (1987). Europe’s second demographic transition. *Population Bulletin, 42*, 1–47.
- van der Pas, S., van Tilburg, T., & Knipscheer, C. (2007). Changes in contact and support within intergenerational relationships in the Netherlands: A cohort and time-sequential perspective. *Advances in Life Course Research, 12*, 243–274. doi:10.1016/S1040-2608(07)12009-8
- van Tilburg, T. G. (1998). Losing and gaining in old age: Changes in personal network size and social support in a four-year longitudinal study. *Journals of Gerontology: Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 53*, S313–S323. doi:10.1093/geronb/53B.6.S313