COPARENTING DYNAMICS IN HIGH-CONFLICT DIVORCE: AN INTEGRATIVE REVIEW OF PSYCHOSOCIAL MECHANISMS, PARENTING STYLES, AND CHILD ADJUSTMENT

Maria Manuela Apostol[1,2], Magdalena Iorga[1,2*], V. Ciofu[2], Camelia Soponaru[2]
1. Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy Iasi
2. Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania
[*]Corresponding author. E-mail: magdalena.iorga@umfiasi.ro

COPARENTING DYNAMICS IN HIGH-CONFLICT DIVORCE: AN INTEGRATIVE REVIEW OF PSYCHOSOCIAL MECHANISMS, PARENTING STYLES, AND CHILD ADJUSTMENT (Abstract): High-conflict divorce represents a major ecological transition with profound implications for parents and children. Although coparenting has been widely examined, contemporary literature underscores the need for an integrative understanding of how relational dynamics, parental functioning, and children's psychosocial adjustment interact during and after separation. **Materials and methods:** This integrative review synthesizes empirical and theoretical work published between 2000 and 2024, with emphasis on mechanisms linking coparenting quality to children's emotional, behavioral, and social outcomes. **Results:** Drawing on family systems theory, emotional security theory, and multidimensional co-parenting models, the review identifies four core processes-emotional security, emotion regulation, social-cognitive processing, and parent-child relational functioning-as central pathways explaining how coparenting affects child adjustment. Parenting styles, parental stress, and burnout are examined as mediating and moderating variables that either amplify or buffer risk in high-conflict contexts. **Conclusions:** The study proposes a multi-level conceptual model illustrating how coparenting structures, psychosocial mechanisms, and contextual moderators unfold within the divorce process. Implications for clinical practice, family interventions, and forensic psychological evaluation are discussed, emphasizing the relevance of coparenting processes for determining the best interests of the child. **Keywords:** COPARENTING, HIGH-CONFLICT DIVORCE, EMOTIONAL SECURITY, PARENTING STYLES, PARENTAL STRESS, CHILD ADJUSTMENT, INTEGRATIVE REVIEW.

INTRODUCTION

The coparenting relationship has become a central focus in contemporary family science as parental separation and divorce increasingly reshape the developmental ecologies in which children grow. A long-standing body of research demonstrates that it is not the dissolution of the marital relationship per se, but the quality of the ongoing co-parental alliance that most powerfully predicts children's post-divorce adjustment (1-3). Coparenting-conceptualized as a distinct relational subsystem grounded in shared responsibility, coordinated caregiving, and mutual influence-persists regardless of parents' romantic involvement or household configuration, making it a critical locus of relational functioning during and after separation (4, 5).

Key concepts central to this review require brief clarification. Coparenting refers to the ways in which parents coordinate, support, or undermine each other in their shared responsibility for raising a child, independent of their romantic relationship. High-conflict divorce describes a pattern of persistent interparental hostility, coercive communication, and difficulty disengaging from conflict following separation (6, 7). Parenting styles reflect stable patterns of caregiving behavior-such as authoritative, authoritarian, or permissive approaches-that influence children's emotional and behavioral development (8, 9). Parental stress and burnout refer to the psychological strain associated with parenting demands, with burnout capturing a chronic state of emotional exhaustion, detachment, and reduced parental efficacy (10, 11). Child adjustment encompasses emotional, behavioral, relational, and academic functioning in response to developmental challenges.

Despite substantial scholarly attention, significant conceptual and empirical gaps remain. Research has expanded across systemic, ecological, cognitive, and developmental frameworks, yet these strands often operate in parallel rather than in dialogue, limiting theoretical integration (12). Operational definitions of coparenting vary widely across studies - emphasizing cooperation, conflict, triangulation, gatekeeping, or division of labor - resulting in inconsistent findings and a fragmented understanding of which relational processes matter most for children (1, 2, 13). Moreover, although considerable progress has been made in identifying psychosocial mechanisms such as emotional security, emotion regulation, social-cognitive processing, and parent-child relational quality, these constructs have seldom been synthesized into a unified developmental model that accounts for the unique dynamics of divorce (6, 7, 13).

The context of separation further amplifies the need for conceptual clarification. Divorce represents an ecological transition that reorganizes family boundaries, restructures communication patterns, and intensifies stressors across legal, interpersonal, and emotional domains (12, 14). High-conflict dynamics-including undermining behaviors, coercive exchanges, and triangulation, heighten children's vulnerability and disrupt foundational regulatory systems (6, 13, 15). At the same time, emerging research points to novel factors shaping behavior in contemporary families, such as parental burnout, digital communication formats, and chronic post-separation conflict trajectories (10, 11, 16). These developments have outpaced theoretical integration, leaving the field without an updated framework that reflects current empirical complexity.

This integrative review addresses these gaps by synthesizing multidisciplinary literature with particular attention to high-conflict divorce. The review pursues four aims:

(1) to consolidate theoretical frameworks that define coparenting as a relational and regulatory system (1, 12);

(2) to integrate empirical evidence on psychosocial mechanisms linking coparenting to children's emotional, behavioral, and relational adjustment (2, 3);

(3) to examine parental stress, burnout, and parenting styles as transactional processes that shape and are shaped by coparental dynamics (17);

(4) to propose a multi-level conceptual model that situates coparenting within the broader ecological and developmental context of divorce.

By articulating a coherent, systemically informed framework, this review offers conceptual clarity, synthesizes otherwise fragmented evidence, and identifies pathways through which interventions, clinical practice, and forensic evaluations can more effectively support children and families navigating separation and post-divorce transitions.

This review also incorporates recent developments in the field, including post-2020 research on parental burnout, digital coparenting, and evolving high-conflict divorce trajectories. The study aims to synthesize existing research to generate new conceptual insights, identify gaps in the literature, and update current understanding of coparenting dynamics in high-conflict divorce. Integrative reviews are particularly suited for complex psychosocial phenomena, as they allow for the inclusion of diverse methodological approaches and theoretical perspectives (12). The process followed several key stages, including problem identification, systematic literature search, data evaluation, thematic analysis, and synthesis. The review addresses a broad but clearly defined research question, focusing on how coparenting processes interact with parental functioning and psychosocial mechanisms to influence child adjustment (6, 13).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was designed as an integrative review with structured screening. This approach was selected because the topic of coparenting in high-conflict divorce requires the synthesis of empirical findings, theoretical models, and clinically relevant conceptual contributions. Unlike a systematic review or meta-analysis, the purpose was not to estimate pooled effect sizes, but to integrate diverse bodies of evidence into a coherent conceptual framework (18).

Search Strategy. The initial search identified more than 11,000 records across PsycINFO, Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed, and Google Scholar. After duplicate removal, title and abstract screening, and full-text eligibility assessment, the final integrative synthesis retained 38 core studies considered conceptually and empirically relevant to the review aims.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria. Studies were included if they were peer-reviewed publications, addressed coparenting as a central or clearly relevant construct, focused on separation, divorce, high-conflict family dynamics, or post-divorce adjustment, and examined parenting processes, parental functioning, psychosocial mechanisms, or child outcomes.

Studies were excluded if they focused exclusively on intact families without relevance to separation or divorce, did not address coparenting or interparental coordination, lacked relevance to child adjustment or psychosocial mechanisms, were not peer-reviewed, or consisted only of opinion pieces without empirical or theoretical grounding.

Study Selection Process. The study selection followed a structured multi-stage screening procedure. First, titles and abstracts were reviewed to identify studies relevant to coparenting in the context of separation, divorce, and child adjustment. Duplicate records were removed, and potentially eligible articles underwent full-text evaluation. Studies were retained when they contributed conceptually or empirically to understanding psychosocial mechanisms, parental functioning, or developmental outcomes associated with coparenting in divorce contexts.

Data Analysis and Synthesis. The selected literature was analyzed using a thematic synthesis approach (19). Studies were grouped according to key conceptual domains, including:

- structural dimensions of coparenting,
- psychosocial mechanisms linking coparenting to child adjustment,
- parenting styles and parental stress,
- contextual factors associated with divorce.

This approach allowed for the identification of converging patterns across theoretical frameworks and empirical findings, as well as the development of an integrative conceptual model.

RESULTS

Conceptual and Theoretical Background

Coparenting is widely conceptualized as a distinct relational subsystem that emerges when two adults share responsibility for raising a child, regardless of their romantic involvement or household configuration. Across intact, separated, and reconstituted families, coparenting reflects the ways in which adults coordinate caregiving, regulate boundaries, and sustain (or disrupt) the emotional climate surrounding the child. Although marital dissolution alters relational structures, it does not eliminate the parental alliance; rather, it requires its reorganization under heightened emotional, logistical, and contextual demands. Within this shifting landscape, coparenting becomes a primary determinant of family functioning and a central mechanism shaping child development (1, 2, 3, 4, 5).

Coparenting as a Distinct Relational System. A consistent body of work defines coparenting as multidimensional, encompassing agreement on childrearing, mutual support, division of caregiving tasks, and effective conflict management (1, 5). These dimensions reflect both behavioral coordination and the affective tone of the parenting partnership. Importantly, coparenting is conceptually independent from marital quality: although former partners may disengage from their romantic roles, the parental subsystem persists and often becomes the only arena for ongoing interaction after divorce (3, 5).

This relational autonomy is crucial for understanding why children's adjustment is more strongly predicted by the quality of coparental processes than by marital status itself (2, 3). In families undergoing dissolution, the restructuring of roles, boundaries, and communication patterns amplifies the salience of the coparental subsystem (12, 14).

Ecological and Systemic Foundations. Grounded in ecological and family systems theory, contemporary scholarship situates coparenting within nested contexts that include individual characteristics, dyadic processes, broader family subsystems, and the social-legal environment (1, 12). Systemic models conceptualize coparenting as a regulatory structure that coordinates interactions across the family, maintains generational boundaries, and prevents triangulation (12, 14, 16). When these boundary functions weaken - common in high-conflict divorce - children may be drawn into adult disputes, exposed to inconsistent expectations, or burdened by inappropriate emotional responsibility (6, 15, 16).

From an ecological perspective, coparenting processes are shaped by stressors such as economic instability, custody arrangements, parental mental health, and cultural norms regarding parenting roles (20). These contextual layers do not operate independently but interact dynamically with relational processes, reinforcing the

need for integrative theoretical models (1, 12, 20).

Theoretical Models Informing Contemporary Research. Multiple frameworks contribute to the current conceptualization of coparenting:

- *Feinberg's Ecological Model* emphasizes agreement, support, division of labor, and joint management, later expanded to include shared parental pleasure (21). This model underscores the interplay between structural coordination and relational climate.
- *Family Systems Theory* highlights boundary regulation, subsystem differentiation, and homeostatic patterns. It explains why unresolved marital tension often spills into the parental subsystem after divorce, fueling conflict, coalitions, and loyalty conflicts (12, 14).
- *Parental Alliance Models* emphasize solidarity and shared responsibility, framing coordinated coparenting as a relational construct that persists across developmental transitions (14).
- *Multidimensional Empirical Models* (2) identify cooperation, agreement, conflict, and triangulation as robust, distinct facets of coparenting, validated across diverse family forms.
- *Spillover and Social-Cognitive Models* explain how emotional states and cognitive attributions influence coparental behavior: hostility, mistrust, or negative expectations can readily translate into undermining or coercive interaction patterns (7, 13).

Although each framework emphasizes different mechanisms, they converge on the principle that coparenting is dynamic, interdependent, and deeply embedded within the broader ecology of family functioning (1, 2, 14).

Coparenting in the Context of Divorce. Divorce reshapes the architecture of the family system, altering relational patterns and introducing new demands on the parental partnership. As adults' transition from shared households to parallel or cooperative arrangements, coparenting becomes increasingly salient and often more challenging. Empirical research consistently demonstrates that high-conflict coparenting - marked by hostility, triangulation, inconsistent communication, or boundary ambiguity - predicts diminished emotional security, internalizing symptoms, behavioral dysregulation, and social difficulties in children (3, 22).

Conversely, cooperative coparenting fosters regulatory stability, enhances parental availability, and supports adaptive developmental trajectories (2, 3, 16). The degree to which parents succeed in disentangling their romantic dissolution from their parental alliance is a central predictor of children's long-term well-being (2, 3).

Synthesis. Together, conceptual and theoretical developments portray coparenting as a multifaceted relational system that remains highly influential during and after marital dissolution (1, 4, 12). Divorce heightens the vulnerability of this subsystem, amplifying both its potential risks and its capacity to buffer children against adversity (3, 6, 16). These conceptual foundations lay the groundwork for examining the psychosocial mechanisms, parental processes, and contextual moderators that shape children's adjustment in high-conflict separation - issues addressed in the subsequent sections (3, 22).

Theoretical Models of Coparenting

Coparenting has been conceptualized through multiple theoretical traditions that collectively highlight its relational, regula-

tory, and developmental functions within the family system (1, 12, 13). Although these models differ in emphasis - systemic, ecological, cognitive, and behavioral - they converge on the view that coparenting constitutes a distinct subsystem characterized by coordination, boundary regulation, and shared responsibility for the child. (4, 5). The following synthesis integrates major theoretical frameworks informing contemporary coparenting research, emphasizing their relevance for understanding dynamics in high-conflict divorce (3, 6, 16).

Feinberg's Ecological Model of Coparenting. Feinberg's ecological model remains foundational in defining coparenting as a multidomain construct embedded in broader social and contextual systems (1, 21).

The model articulates four interrelated dimensions: Childrearing Agreement, Support versus Undermining, Division of Labor and Joint Family Management.

These dimensions describe how parents coordinate practices, regulate emotional exchanges, and maintain stability for the child. A later addition, shared parenting pleasure, captures positive effects and collaborative enjoyment in childrearing - an important protective factor even in separated families (21).

Within divorce, this ecological framework is particularly salient: external stressors (legal constraints, economic strain, custodial arrangements) intersect with interpersonal processes to shape the coparental system (1, 17, 20). The model thus positions coparenting as both a product of and a buffer against contextual challenges (1, 12).

Family Systems Theory and Boundary Regulation. Structural family systems theory conceptualizes coparenting as a subsystem with its own roles, boundaries, and regulatory functions (12, 13). Core assumptions include:

- Subsystem differentiation between marital relationships and the parental alliance.
- Boundary clarity, which protects children from adult conflict;
- Coalitions and triangulation, which signal structural imbalance;
- Homeostatic tendencies, whereby dysfunctional patterns may persist even after divorce (12, 13).

Following separation, unresolved emotional ties, shifting roles, and legal negotiations often destabilize boundaries, making systems theory particularly useful for explaining triangulation, loyalty conflicts, and boundary ambiguity in high-conflict families (3, 13, 16, 22).

The Parental Alliance Framework (Egere, Hawkins). The parental alliance framework proposes a relational alliance centered on solidarity, support, shared responsibility, and absence of undermining (4). Unlike structural approaches, this model emphasizes shared identity as a parental team, which must be renegotiated after divorce (3, 4). The model highlights the fluidity of the alliance across developmental transitions and suggests that post-divorce cooperation is not simply continuity of pre-divorce functioning, but a qualitatively new relational task (3, 4, 16).

Teubert and Pinquart's Empirically Derived Model. Meta-analytic research identified four robust dimensions consistently replicated across studies (2): Cooperation, Agreement, Conflict, Triangulation.

This model is widely influential because it delineates the facets of coparenting most predictive of child adjustment (2, 3). The explicit positioning of triangulation as a core dimension is particularly relevant for divorce, where children are at heightened

risk of being drawn into parental disputes or emotional alliances (6, 13, 16).

Spillover Models of Marital and Coparental Affect. Spillover theories posit that emotions and behavioral patterns within one subsystem transfer into the coparental subsystem (23, 24). Key assumptions include: negative spillover (marital hostility - undermining, conflictual coparenting) and positive spillover (marital warmth - cooperative, supportive coparenting).

In divorce, emotional residues from the romantic relationship continue to influence coparental dynamics long after separation. This theoretical lens explains why some high-conflict patterns persist despite physical separation (3, 23, 24).

Social Learning and Attributional Perspectives. Social learning models emphasize the role of reciprocal reinforcement and habitual interaction patterns. Parents model cooperation or conflict for each other, and negative cycles become self-perpetuating (24). Attributional processes - such as perceiving the other parent as incompetent or hostile - shape expectations and behaviors, reinforcing undermining or defensive responses (7, 16, 24).

These cognitive-behavioral perspectives are especially relevant in contentious divorces, where misinterpretations, mistrust, and rigid schemas maintain conflict even in the absence of overt hostility (6, 7, 16).

Contemporary Integrative Models. Recent scholarship integrates systemic, ecological, and psychological frameworks into more comprehensive conceptualizations that reflect the complexity of modern family life. Contemporary models incorporate:

- Transactional processes, where children's temperament and behavior shape coparenting and vice versa (25);
- Divorce-specific stressors, such as court involvement, residential transitions, and parallel parenting (20);
- Digital communication patterns, including co-parenting apps and asynchronous negotiation (15);
- Reciprocal emotional influence, capturing mutual escalation or de-escalation patterns across interactions (26).

These models better capture the multifactorial nature of coparenting in real-world divorce contexts and align well with Family Process's systemic orientation (1, 12, 25, 26).

Synthesis. Across theoretical traditions, several points of convergence emerge:

- Coparenting is a distinct relational subsystem with unique functions and boundaries (1, 12, 13).
- It is dynamic, bidirectional, and contextually embedded, rather than a static set of behaviors (1, 17, 25).
- Conflict, triangulation, and boundary ambiguity are particularly damaging in divorce because they undermine children's regulatory and relational systems (6, 13, 16, 22).
- Children's adjustment reflects the interplay between multiple subsystems - not only the parent-child relationship but also the interparental and contextual environment (12, 20, 25).

These theoretical foundations provide conceptual scaffolding for understanding the psychosocial mechanisms discussed in subsequent sections (1, 16).

Core Dimensions of Coparenting

Coparenting is best understood as a multidimensional relational system through which adults coordinate, support, or undermine one another in their shared respon-

sibility for raising a child. Although theorists use varying terminology, empirical consensus identifies a set of core dimensions that structure the coparental subsystem across family forms, including intact families, separated households, and high-conflict post-divorce contexts. These dimensions - agreement, support versus undermining, division of responsibilities, and conflict management/boundary regulation - represent the proximal organizational features through which coparenting exerts downstream influence on parental functioning and child development (1, 2, 4, 21).

Coparental Agreement. Coparental agreement encompasses parents shared perspectives, expectations, and decisions regarding childrearing practices. High agreement supports predictable routines, consistent discipline, and coherence across households, fostering stability during the reorganization that follows divorce (2, 3). Low agreement, by contrast, increases ambiguity and erodes the child's sense of continuity, which can heighten anxiety and behavioral distress (3, 6, 16). Empirical work shows that disagreement is particularly problematic when compounded by negative attributes or mistrust, which contribute to escalating cycles of conflict and withdrawal (27).

Support and Undermining. Support refers to behaviors through which parents validate one another's competence, reinforce parenting decisions, and convey emotional or practical assistance. Supportive coparenting is associated with higher parental efficacy, warmer parent-child interactions, and lower stress (1, 17, 20). Undermining - such as criticism, contradiction, or sabotage - represents the opposite pole. Undermining conveys relational hostility, weakens parental authority, and places children in situations where loyalty and security are threatened. In high-conflict divorce, undermining often occurs both directly (e.g, denigrating remarks) and indirectly (e.g, encouraging rule-breaking in the other household), making it one of the most potent predictors of emotional insecurity and child maladjustment (3, 22, 27).

Division of Parental Responsibilities. The distribution of caregiving tasks and decision-making responsibilities forms another structural dimension of coparenting. In post-divorce families, this division becomes intertwined with custody arrangements, residential schedules, and logistical constraints (3, 17). When parents perceive the distribution of responsibilities as inequitable or imposed, stress, resentment, and defensive communication patterns intensify (17, 20). Conversely, flexible, transparent, and collaborative divisions of labor promote family stability and reduce the emotional burden on both parents and children (1, 21). Research indicates that perceived fairness in responsibility-sharing is more predictive of parental satisfaction than the actual proportion of tasks performed (25).

Conflict Management and Boundary Regulation. While conflict is expected in separated families, its management determines whether it becomes constructive or harmful. Constructive conflict includes respectful negotiation, emotional regulation, and problem-solving; it does not predict negative child outcomes (6, 16).

Maladaptive conflict - characterized by hostility, contempt, coercion, or chronic escalation - is consistently linked to emotional insecurity, dysregulated behavior, and disturbances in parent-child relationships. Boundary regulation is a central

component of this dimension. Effective coparenting protects children from adult disputes and maintains generational boundaries. In high-conflict divorce, boundary erosion frequently manifests as triangulation, parentification, or the child being used as a messenger or confidant - patterns that research identifies as uniquely detrimental to psychological adjustment (13, 16, 22).

Emerging Contemporary Dimensions. Contemporary research expands the traditional dimensions in response to social and technological change. New constructs include:

- Shared parental joy, reflecting positive affect and bonding opportunities that buffer stress (21);
- Coparenting solidarity, capturing long-term cohesion in the parenting unit even across households (4, 17);
- Digital coparenting, wherein communication occurs via co-parenting apps or parallel communication systems (15);
- Child-driven effects, recognizing that child temperament and vulnerabilities actively shape coparental interactions (25, 26).

These emerging elements underscore that coparenting is a fluid relational system responsive to developmental, cultural, and technological contexts (15, 25, 26).

Synthesis. Together, these dimensions form the structural architecture of the coparenting system, shaping the emotional and relational context in which children develop. Variations across these dimensions influence how children interpret parental interactions, regulate emotions, and form relational expectations. In high-conflict divorce, these variations become more pronounced, increasing both developmental risk and the potential for resilience depending on the quality of coparental functioning (1, 2, 3, 6, 16).

Psychosocial Mechanisms Linking Coparenting to Child Adjustment

A substantial body of research indicates that the influence of coparenting on children's post-divorce adjustment operates through identifiable psychosocial mechanisms embedded in children's emotional, cognitive, and relational development. Rather than functioning as a unidirectional predictor, coparenting shapes children's well-being by activating a set of processes that regulate how children interpret, respond to, and internalize interparental dynamics (6, 7, 16). This section synthesizes the primary mechanisms supported by recent empirical and theoretical work, highlighting pathways particularly salient in high-conflict separations (3, 22).

Emotional Security Processes. Emotional security has long been identified as a central mediator linking interparental functioning to child outcomes. Within the context of divorce, children rely on the coparental subsystem as a barometer of stability across households. Cooperative coparenting - marked by predictable rules, respectful communication, and minimized exposure to conflict - supports children's sense of safety and reduces vigilance and fear. Conversely, competitive coparenting, characterized by hostility, inconsistent messages, or public disparagement, undermines emotional security and triggers hyperarousal, avoidance, or role-reversal tendencies. Longitudinal studies consistently demonstrate that insecurity mediates associations between coparental conflict and internalizing symptoms, relational anxiety, and behavioral dysregulation across development (6, 14, 22).

Emotion Regulation Development. Emotion regulation capacities emerge within daily relational interactions, particularly those involving parents. Supportive coparenting offers children exposure to regulated emotional exchanges and consistent behavioral routines across contexts, fostering skills such as self-soothing, effortful control, and adaptive coping (25). In contrast, high-conflict or erratic coparenting environments, especially those characterized by unpredictable transitions between households, increase emotional arousal and limit children's opportunities to internalize regulatory strategies. Dysregulated behavior, impulsivity, irritability, and somatization frequently reflect difficulties rooted in inconsistent or hostile coparental climates (6, 16). Recent studies (2020-2024) identify emotion regulation difficulties as a robust mediator explaining why even moderate coparenting conflict can yield significant developmental risk (28).

Social-Cognitive Processing and Internal Representations. Children's social-cognitive interpretations of interparental dynamics shape expectations about relationships and influence peer and family interactions. Supportive coparenting facilitates the development of coherent internal working models characterized by trust, cooperation, and constructive conflict management (6, 7). In contrast, triangulation, negative attributions, and undermining behaviors distort children's interpretations of interpersonal intent and reliability. These distortions often manifest as hostile attribution biases, pessimistic relational schemas, or polarized loyalty toward one parent (13, 16, 22). Such cognitive patterns predict peer conflict, social withdrawal, and difficulties forming secure attachments (7, 16), highlighting the significance of cognitive mechanisms in the broader coparenting-child adjustment pathway.

Parent-Child Relationship Quality as a Mediating Link. Coparenting quality indirectly shapes developmental outcomes through its influence on parent-child relational patterns. Supportive coparenting enhances parental efficacy, warmth, and sensitivity, strengthening secure attachment and adaptive communication (29). Alternatively, hostile coparenting spills into the parent-child dyad, leading to harsher discipline, decreased emotional availability, or inconsistent behavior (23, 24). These patterns, in turn, contribute to children's externalizing behaviors, internalizing distress, and relational instability. Evidence suggests that parent-child relationship quality often serves as a sequential mediator following emotional security or emotion regulation, underscoring its central role in the developmental cascade initiated by coparenting processes (16, 29).

Parental Stress and Burnout as Transactional Mechanisms. Parental stress and burnout function not only as background risk factors but as dynamic mechanisms embedded within the coparental system. High-conflict coparenting elevates parental stress, reducing emotional regulation and increasing reactivity, which subsequently deteriorates cooperative interactions (17, 20). Burnout - characterized by exhaustion, detachment, and diminished parental efficacy - further disrupts parenting and coparenting behaviors (10, 11, 26). These processes form recursive feedback loops: conflict intensifies stress; stress reduces cooperative capacity; reduced cooperation heightens conflict exposure for children (17, 20, 26). Recent research highlights burnout as a particularly strong predictor of hostile, withdrawn, or inconsistent behav-

iors in post-divorce families (10, 11, 26).

Triangulation and Loyalty Conflicts. Triangulation represents one of the most detrimental psychosocial mechanisms in post-separation family systems. When children are drawn into parental disputes - explicitly or implicitly - they experience loyalty conflicts, emotional burden, and role confusion (13, 16, 22). These processes undermine autonomy development, impair secure attachment, and foster chronic anxiety or depressive symptoms (6, 14). Even infrequent but intense episodes of triangulation have been shown to exert long-term developmental effects, especially when occurring during early childhood or adolescence. Triangulation also interacts with emotion regulation and cognitive processing, amplifying the negative developmental cascade initiated by coparental conflict (16, 22).

Integrated Mechanistic Pathways. Taken together, these psychosocial mechanisms illustrate how structural dimensions of coparenting (e.g, agreement, support, conflict) translate into developmental outcomes (1, 2). They operate in reciprocal, overlapping ways rather than as isolated pathways. High-conflict coparenting simultaneously undermines emotional security, disrupts regulation, distorts cognitive schemas, and compromises parent-child interactions - all of which accumulate into significant stress for children (6, 16, 22). Conversely, supportive coparenting promotes resilience by enhancing regulatory capacities, positive relational expectations, and secure dyadic bonds (2, 29).

Parental Stress and Burnout as Transactional Processes in Coparenting System

Parental stress represents one of the most powerful and consistent forces shaping coparenting quality, particularly during the acute and post-divorce phases. Divorce introduces a constellation of stressors - emotional upheaval, legal negotiations, financial strain, changes in residential arrangements, and continuous role renegotiation - that increase parents' cognitive and emotional load. Within this context, parents often experience diminished regulatory capacity, heightened reactivity, and reduced tolerance for ambiguity, all of which erode the cooperative processes central to effective coparenting (17, 20).

Extensive empirical work demonstrates that parental stress is directly associated with greater interparental hostility, defensiveness, rigid communication, and lower perceived coparental efficacy (17, 20, 27). Stress amplifies negative attributions about the other parent, making cooperative exchanges less likely and increasing susceptibility to patterns of undermining, coercion, or gatekeeping (23, 24). These stress-induced dynamics frequently initiate negative feedback loops: conflict increases stress, stress undermines regulation, and dysregulation perpetuates further conflict. In high-conflict divorces, such loops often become entrenched, contributing to chronic instability in the coparental system (17, 20, 27).

Recent scholarship has refined this picture by identifying parental burnout as a related but distinct construct with unique implications for coparenting (10, 11). Burnout is characterized by emotional exhaustion, emotional distancing from the parental role, and a sense of inefficacy or depletion. Unlike normative stress, burnout reflects a prolonged mismatch between parental demands and available resources (10, 11), resulting in diminished warmth,

inconsistent monitoring, and reduced engagement with the child. Burnout therefore contributes to coercive exchanges, emotional unavailability, and lower responsiveness - patterns that disrupt both parent-child relationships and the broader coparental alliance (10, 11, 26).

Importantly, research suggests that stress and burnout may function asymmetrically within the coparenting system. When one parent experiences disproportionate emotional overload - such as bearing primary caregiving responsibilities, facing financial insecurity, or navigating court-mandated obligations - the imbalance can destabilize cooperation even if the other parent maintains a supportive stance (17, 20). This asymmetry is particularly salient in high-conflict divorces, where legal pressures and interpersonal grievances amplify physiological and emotional activation, increasing the likelihood of misinterpretation, impulsive communication, or avoidance (16, 17, 20).

At the same time, supportive coparenting appears to buffer stress and protect against burnout (17, 20, 26). Behaviors such as validating the partner's parenting role, sharing responsibilities equitably, and maintaining predictable communication routines strengthen parental self-efficacy and reduce cognitive load (17). These cooperative processes enhance emotional availability and reduce the likelihood of harsh or inconsistent parenting (10, 11). Conversely, persistent undermining or triangulation elevates stress and accelerates burnout trajectories, thereby intensifying risk for both parents and children (16, 26).

When viewed within a transactional framework, parental stress and burnout are not merely background variables but active mechanisms that shape and are shaped by coparenting dynamics. They moderate the extent to which structural coparenting dimensions influence child outcomes and mediate pathways from interparental conflict to children's emotional and behavioral functioning. High stress magnifies the negative implications of conflictual coparenting, whereas supportive coparenting mitigates stress and fosters resilience across the family system (1, 12, 17).

Taken together, these findings underscore the need for conceptual models and interventions that explicitly incorporate parental stress and burnout as dynamic components of coparenting (10, 11, 26). For practitioners, assessing stress-related vulnerabilities is essential in distinguishing capacity-limits from motivational conflict, calibrating expectations for cooperation, and designing interventions that restore regulatory stability (17, 20). For researchers, transactional models integrating stress, burnout, and coparenting offer a more ecologically valid understanding of post-divorce family functioning (12, 17, 26).

An Integrative Conceptual Model of Coparenting in the Context of Divorce

The empirical and theoretical evidence reviewed in the previous sections converges toward a unifying conclusion: coparenting functions as a dynamic regulatory system that organizes children's emotional, cognitive, and relational development during and after parental separation (1, 3, 6, 12). Building on systemic, ecological, and developmental frameworks, this section advances an integrative conceptual model that situates coparenting within a multilevel transactional process (12, 17, 25).

The model captures (a) core structural dimensions of coparenting, (b) psychological mechanisms linking coparental behav-

ior to child functioning, (c) parental stress, mental health, and parenting style as reciprocal influences, and (d) contextual moderators unique to the divorce ecology (3, 17, 20).

Core Structural Dimensions as Proximal Processes. At the foundation of the model are four well-established structural dimensions - agreement, support versus undermining, division of labor, and conflict/boundary management. These processes constitute the "proximal relational environment" in which children experience interparental interaction (1, 2, 21). During divorce, these dimensions become increasingly salient as parents renegotiate responsibilities, reconstruct boundaries, and coordinate parenting across separate households (3, 17). High-quality coparenting in this domain is characterized by predictable routines, mutual validation, coordinated communication, and maintenance of generational boundaries. Conversely, undermining, hostility, inconsistent roles, and boundary dissolution serve as potent destabilizing forces (6, 13, 16, 22).

Psychological Mechanisms Linking Coparenting to Child Outcomes. The model incorporates four primary psychosocial mechanisms that mediate the impact of coparenting on children's well-being:

- Emotional security: children monitor interparental dynamics as indicators of safety and relational stability. Cooperative coparenting reinforces predictability, while competitive or hostile exchanges threaten emotional security.
- Emotion regulation: Children's regulatory capacities develop within the emotional climate created by parents. Coordinated parenting fosters adaptive regulation; conflictual coparenting promotes dysregulation and heightened physiological arousal.
- Social-cognitive processing: children internalize parental conflict, triangulation, and undermining into schemas that influence expectations about relationships, trust, and problem-solving.
- Parent-child relational quality: coparenting indirectly shapes the warmth, sensitivity, and responsiveness individual parents bring to their interactions with the child (6, 7, 16, 29).

These mechanisms operate concurrently and interactively, forming a multidimensional pathway linking coparenting processes to child adjustment (6, 16).

Parental Stress, Mental Health, and Parenting Styles as Transactional Influences. A distinctive contribution of the model is the treatment of parental functioning as part of a reciprocal feedback system rather than a background factor (17, 20). Divorce-related stress - legal pressures, time constraints, reduced support, and financial strain - heightens emotional reactivity and reduces parents' ability to engage in supportive coparenting (17, 20, 26). At the same time, conflictual coparenting intensifies parental stress and erodes mental health, leading to burnout, emotional withdrawal, and harsher or inconsistent parenting styles (10, 11, 26). These processes are inherently transactional: stress both shapes and is shaped by coparenting behaviors (17, 26).

Parenting styles function within this cycle as amplifiers or attenuators of risk. Authoritarian and permissive styles are more likely under high stress and conflict, whereas authoritative parenting is more likely to emerge when coparental cooperation reduces parental overload (8, 9).

Divorce-Specific Contextual Moderators. The model incorporates contextual

moderators unique to the ecology of divorce, including:

- Stage of the divorce process (acute separation vs. post-divorce stabilization);
- Level of legal conflict (adversarial, mediated, collaborative);
- Custodial and residential arrangements;
- Communication modalities (direct negotiation, parallel parenting, court-mandated communication apps):
- Socioeconomic conditions and support networks (3, 12, 17).

These factors influence the strength and direction of associations between coparenting and child outcomes and help explain variability between families in similarly structured divorces (3, 20).

Child Adjustment as a Multifaceted Outcome. Child outcomes in the model encompass emotional (e.g, anxiety, insecurity), behavioral (e.g, externalizing symptoms, dysregulation), relational (e.g, peer conflict, attachment challenges), and academic functioning (2, 3, 30). Consistent with developmental research, the model integrates child age as a moderator: boundary disturbances disproportionately affect younger children, while inconsistency and communication breakdowns weigh more heavily on adolescents (6, 16).

Integrative Summary. The proposed conceptual model positions coparenting as a central organizing force within post-divorce family systems (11, 12, 31). Structural coparenting behaviors shape children's development through psychological mechanisms, while parental stress and contextual moderators intensify or buffer risk (17, 20, 26). This multi-level, transactional framework advances the field by integrating disparate theoretical perspectives and providing a coherent basis for intervention, assessment, and future research.

DISCUSSION

Across diverse theoretical and empirical traditions, a consistent conclusion emerges it is not the dissolution of the marital relationship per se, but rather the quality of ongoing coparental processes, that most strongly shapes children's emotional, behavioral, and relational trajectories (2, 3, 6). By synthesizing structural dimensions of coparenting with established psychosocial mechanisms and transactional parental factors, this review advances a comprehensive, multilevel account of how families reorganize - and sometimes destabilize - during divorce (12, 17, 26, 31).

A key contribution of this review is the integration of structural coparenting dimensions (agreement, support vs. undermining, division of responsibilities, conflict/boundary regulation) with within-child processes, including emotional security, emotion regulation, social-cognitive interpretations, and the quality of parent-child interactions (6, 7, 16, 29). These mechanisms have been discussed independently in past scholarships, yet few models have articulated how they interact dynamically, especially under high-conflict conditions (3, 16, 22). The synthesized evidence presented here underscores that these mechanisms operate as interconnected pathways, rather than discrete processes, through which coparenting exerts developmental influence (6, 16, 29).

Another significant contribution lies in highlighting parental stress, burnout, and parenting styles as active transactional forces within the coparenting system (10, 11, 17, 26). Divorce-related stress elevates

emotional reactivity, increases negative attributions between parents, and undermines behavioral consistency (17, 20). At the same time, conflictual coparenting reciprocally reinforces parental exhaustion and psychological overload. This bidirectional interplay creates feedback loops in which parental functioning and coparental dynamics mutually amplify dysfunction, placing children at heightened developmental risk (10, 11, 26, 32, 33). Addressing these cyclical patterns is therefore critical for both clinical and forensic practice.

The findings also emphasize the unique relevance of triangulation and loyalty conflicts in divorced families (34, 35). Even when overt conflict is limited, children may experience role confusion and psychological burden when exposed to competitive or boundary-dissolving relational patterns (13, 16, 22). This review reinforces longstanding systemic insights that triangulation is one of the most potent predictors of child distress, with detrimental effects across emotional, behavioral, and relational domains (6, 14). As a result, targeted interventions that protect generational boundaries and reduce role reversal are essential components of post-divorce support (13, 16).

Furthermore, this review advances the literature by attending to emerging contemporary developments, including digital forms of coparenting communication, coparenting apps, hybrid physical-virtual interactions, and culturally diverse family structures (15, 26.36). These evolving contexts reshape coparental dynamics in ways that have received limited empirical attention to date. The proposed integrative model accommodates such contextual variation and invites future research to consider how technological, legal, and cultural adaptations influence relational processes during divorce (15, 25).

Clinically, the review underscores the importance of shifting from individual-focused approaches to relationally informed interventions. Programs that strengthen communication boundaries, reduce undermining behaviors, enhance emotional regulation skills, and support task sharing appear particularly effective (17, 20). These findings align with systemic family therapy principles and reinforce Family Process's longstanding emphasis on interactional rather than individualistic conceptualizations (12, 13). For practitioners involved in forensic evaluation, the model clarifies which domains - coparenting structure, psychosocial mechanisms, parental stress, boundary regulation - carry the strongest developmental implications and therefore warrant careful assessment when determining the best interests of the child (3, 13, 22).

The present integrative review demonstrates that coparenting is a central relational mechanism through which divorce shapes children's developmental trajectories. Across theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and psychosocial pathways, a consistent conclusion emerges: it is not the dissolution of the marital relationship itself that predicts child adjustment, but rather the quality, stability, and emotional climate of the coparental subsystem that continues to operate after separation (1, 2, 3, 6). The relational patterns that parents enact - cooperation, support, conflict, undermining, and triangulation - serve as regulatory forces that organize children's emotional security, stress reactivity, cognitive schemas, and relational expectations (6, 13, 16, 22).

By synthesizing structural coparenting

dimensions with key psychosocial mechanisms and transactional parental processes, this review advances a multilevel systemic model capable of explaining why some children demonstrate resilience following divorce while others experience significant emotional and behavioral distress (1, 12, 17). The integration of parental stress, burnout, and parenting style into the model highlights the recursive nature of post-divorce family dynamics: conflictual coparenting erodes parental functioning, compromised parental functioning exacerbates conflict, and both processes converge to shape children's internal worlds (10, 11, 17, 26). Conversely, even moderate improvements in coparental cooperation have disproportionate protective effects, strengthening regulatory capacities and restoring stability across family subsystems (2, 17, 29).

The model supports a shift toward relationally oriented assessment and intervention. For clinicians, this means conceptualizing child symptoms within the broader coparental ecology rather than as isolated individual problems. For mediators, legal professionals, and custody evaluators, the findings underscore the importance of evaluating not only each parent's individual capacities but also the quality of their interparental coordination, boundary regulation, and communication patterns (3, 13, 16, 22). For researchers, the review highlights the need for longitudinal, multi-informant methodologies capable of capturing the dynamic interplay between coparental structures, psychosocial mechanisms, and contextual moderators (17, 26).

Overall, this review enriches theoretical coherence, integrates disparate literature, and offers a relationally grounded framework suitable for guiding empirical research, clinical intervention, and legal decision-making. By conceptualizing coparenting as a multilevel, reciprocal, and ecologically embedded system, the review moves beyond linear explanations and contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how children navigate the challenges of high-conflict divorce (1, 12, 17).

Future research should prioritize longitudinal and multi-informant designs to better capture the dynamic interplay between coparenting processes, parental functioning, and child development across time (17, 26). Importantly, these processes rarely operate in isolation but instead unfold within evolving relational patterns shaped by developmental, contextual, and post-divorce transitions.

Implications for Practice and Policy. The integrative evidence reviewed here underscores the centrality of coparenting processes in shaping children's developmental trajectories following separation and divorce. These findings carry significant implications for clinical intervention, preventive programming, and family law policy. Because coparenting represents a dynamic relational system - rather than an individual parental characteristic - effective responses must target relational patterns, communication processes, and systemic influences that extend beyond traditional parent-training approaches (1, 12, 17).

From a clinical standpoint, practitioners working with separating or divorced families should conceptualize coparenting as a primary mechanism of change. Interventions that promote supportive communication, reduce undermining, clarify boundaries, and strengthen parental coordination have demonstrated robust effects in improving both parental functioning

and child adjustment (2, 3, 17). Emotion-focused, systemic, and psychoeducational models may be particularly effective when they explicitly address interparental dynamics, emotional regulation, and children's interpretations of conflict (6, 7, 16). Given the high incidence of parental stress and burnout in adversarial divorces, therapeutic work must also integrate strategies for stress reduction, self-regulation, and coping - both to restore individual parental resources and to interrupt negative transactional cycles (10, 11, 17, 26). Therapists should remain attentive to triangulation and loyalty conflicts, ensuring that children are not placed in mediating roles or burdened with parental emotional needs (13, 16, 22).

Preventive and Community-Based Programming - Preventive interventions targeting newly separated families may mitigate escalating conflict and foster healthier long-term coparenting patterns (17, 20, 32). Programs that offer structured communication training, conflict-de-escalation strategies, and guidance for establishing consistent routines across households show promise in reducing relational turbulence during the acute phase of separation (3, 17). Community organizations, schools, and pediatric healthcare providers represent key access points for early identification of high-risk families and referral to specialized services (20).

Implications for Forensic Psychological Evaluations - In legal context, the findings of this review reinforce the importance of evaluating coparenting quality as a central determinant of children's best interests (3, 13, 22). Custody and parenting-time decisions benefit from assessments that move beyond individual parental characteristics and instead examine relational processes, boundary management, patterns of support or undermining, and the presence of triangulation (13, 16, 22). Psychological evaluations should incorporate multi-informant, multi-method approaches - including observations of parent-child interactions, analysis of communication patterns, and consideration of contextual stressors (17, 20). Importantly, evaluators must differentiate between conflicts that are situational and likely to improve, versus entrenched patterns of hostility or coercive control that pose ongoing risks to children (6, 22). Such distinctions are critical for recommending parenting plans, therapeutic interventions, and judicial safeguards.

Policy Development and Family Law Reform - At the policy level, the review suggests that family law systems should integrate relationally informed principles into decision-making structures (3, 12). Mandated coparenting education programs, early mediation services, and specialized high-conflict interventions can reduce adversarial dynamics and promote child-centered solutions (17, 20). Policies that encourage cooperative communication - while monitoring and responding to patterns of coercion, intimidation, or manipulation - support both parental mental health and children's well-being (3, 10, 11).

Furthermore, the increasing use of digital coparenting communication platforms invites new policy considerations regarding privacy, documentation, and appropriate use in high-conflict settings. Clear guidelines can help ensure that technological tools enhance coordination rather than reinforce antagonistic monitoring or control (15).

Limitations and Future Directions. Despite its integrative contribution, several

limitations should be acknowledged. First, the review synthesized studies characterized by considerable methodological and conceptual heterogeneity, including differences in sample characteristics, operational definitions of coparenting, and assessment procedures. Such variability limits direct comparability across studies and complicates the identification of universally applicable mechanisms. Second, although the review followed a structured screening procedure, it was not designed as a systematic review or meta-analysis. Consequently, the synthesis prioritized conceptual integration and theoretical relevance rather than quantitative effect estimation. Some degree of interpretative subjectivity is therefore inherent in the selection and organization of the literature (18). Third, the included studies were predominantly conducted in Western cultural contexts, which may limit the generalizability of the proposed model to culturally diverse family systems and legal environments. Coparenting practices, conflict expression, and post-divorce family organization may vary substantially across sociocultural contexts (3, 12, 37). In addition, variability in the conceptualization of high-conflict divorce across studies represents an important challenge. Some investigations focused primarily on overt interparental hostility, whereas others emphasized chronic litigation, triangulation, or communication dysfunction, potentially contributing to inconsistencies in findings (6, 16, 22, 33). Finally, the review highlights the need for future longitudinal and multi-informant research capable of capturing the dynamic and transactional nature of coparenting across the divorce trajectory. Greater attention should also be directed toward digital coparenting practices, culturally diverse family structures, and intervention studies examining mechanisms of resilience in post-divorce adaptation (15, 17, 26).

CONCLUSIONS

This integrative review emphasizes that supporting children in the context of divorce requires interventions and policies that address the relational fabric of the coparenting system. By prioritizing emotional security, boundary clarity, parental well-being, and cooperative communication, practitioners and policymakers can promote resilience and reduce the risks associated with high-conflict separation (6, 13, 17).

The findings support a systemic perspective in which families do not simply reorganize after divorce, but continuously recalibrate relational processes that continue to shape children's emotional, behavioral, and relational development (1, 12). Strengthening coparenting - even incrementally - represents a powerful lever for promoting resilience and reducing vulnerability among children navigating separation and divorce (2, 3, 17).

The refinement of conceptual models, integration of emerging psychosocial constructs, and expansion of culturally diverse research will further enhance the capacity of clinicians, researchers, and legal professionals to support families experiencing this major developmental and ecological transition (15, 17, 26).

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND FUNDING

The authors declare no conflicts of interest. This research received no external funding.

REFERENCES

1. Feinberg ME. The internal structure and ecological context of coparenting: A framework for research and intervention. *Parenting: Science and Practice* 2003; 3(2): 95-131 / doi: 10.1207/S15327922 PAR030201.
2. Teubert D, Pinquart M. The association between coparenting and child adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Parenting: Science and Practice* 2010; 10(4): 286-307 / doi: 10.1080/15295192. 2010.492040.
3. Lamela D, Figueiredo B. Coparenting after marital dissolution and children's mental health: A systematic review. *Jornal de Pediatria* 2016; 92(4): 331-342 / doi: 10.1016/ j.jped. 2015.09.011.
4. Van Egeren LA, Hawkins DP. Coming to terms with coparenting: Implications of definition and measurement. *Journal of Adult Development* 2004; 11*:* 165-178 / doi: 10.1023/B: JADE.0000035625. 74672.0b.
5. McHale JP, Rasmussen JL. Coparental and family group-level dynamics during infancy: Early family precursors of child and family functioning during preschool. *Development and Psychopathology* 1998; 10(1): 39-59 / doi:10.1017/S0954579498001527.
6. Davies PT, Cummings EM. Marital conflict and child adjustment: An emotional security hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin* 1994; 116(3): 387-411 / doi: 10.1037/0033-2909. 116. 3.387.
7. Grych JH, Fincham FD. Marital conflict and children's adjustment: A cognitive-contextual framework. *Psychological Bulletin 1990; 108*(2), 267-290 / doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.267.
8. Baumrind, D. The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence 1991; 11*(1): 56-95/ doi: 10.1177/0272431691111004.
9. Darling N, Steinberg L. Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin* 1993; 113(3): 487-496 / doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487.
10. Roskam I, Raes ME, Mikolajczak M. Exhausted parents: Development and preliminary validation of the Parental Burnout Inventory. *Frontiers in Psychology* 2017; 8: Article 163 / doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00163.
11. Mikolajczak M, Gross JJ, Roskam I. Parental burnout: What is it, and why does it matter? *Clinical Psychological Science* 2019; 7(6): 1319-1329 / doi: 10.1177/2167702619858430.
12. Cox MJ, Paley B. (1997). Families as systems. *Annual Review of Psychology* 1997; 48: 243-267 / doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.48.1.243.
13. Fosco GM, Grych JH. Emotional, cognitive, and family systems mediators of children's adjustment to interparental conflict. *Journal of Family Psychology 2008; 22*(6): 843-854 / doi: 10.1037/a0013809.
14. Minuchin, S. *Families and family therapy*. Harvard University Press, 1974 / doi: 10.4159/9780 674041127.
15. Cummings EM, Davies PT. Emotional security as a regulatory process in normal development and the development of psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology* 1996*;* 8(1): 123-139 / doi: 10.1017/S0954579400007008.
16. Ganong L, Coleman M, Jamison T. Patterns of stepfamily relationship development. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 2011; 73(2): 396-413 / doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010. 00814.x
17. Durtschi JA, Soloski KL, Kimmes J. The dyadic effects of supportive coparenting and parental stress on relationship quality across the transition to parenthood. *Family Process* 2017; 56(4): 986-1004 / doi: 10.1111/famp.12252.
18. Torraco RJ. Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Hum Resour Dev Rev* 2005; 4(3): 356-367.
19. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol* 2006; 3(2): 77-101.

20. Bronte-Tinkew J, Horowitz A, Carrano J. Aggravation and stress in parenting: Associations with coparenting quality. *Journal of Family Issues* 2010; 31(4): 525-555 / doi: 10.1177/0192513 X09340152.
21. Feinberg ME, Brown LD, Kan ML. A multi-domain self-report measure of coparenting. *Parenting: Science and Practice* 2012; 12(1): 1-21 / doi: 10.1080/15295192.2012.638870.
22. Murphy SE, Jacobvitz DB, Hazen NL. Coparenting conflict, children's emotional security, and child adjustment in divorced families. *Family Court Review* 2016; 54(2): 210-223 / doi: 10.1111/fcre.12215.
23. Erel O, Burman B. Interrelatedness of marital relations and parent-child relations: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin* 1995; 118(1): 108-132 / doi: 10.1037/0033-2909. 118.1.108.
24. Cook WL, Schoppe-Sullivan SJ, Buckley CK, Davis EF. Are some children harder to coparent than others? Children's negative emotionality and coparenting relationship quality. *Journal of Family Psychology* 2009; 23(4): 606-614 / doi: 10.1037/ a0015992.
25. Karreman A, van Tuijl C, van Aken MAG, Deković M. Parenting, coparenting, and effortful control in preschoolers. *Journal of Family Psychology* 2008; 22(1): 30-40 / doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.22.1.30
26. Zhang Q, Wang Y, Liu H. Influence of coparenting on parental burnout and child adjustment: A moderated mediation model. *Frontiers in Psychology* 2024; 15: 1345982 / doi: 10.3389/fpsyg. 2024.1345982.
27. Altenburger LE, Schoppe-Sullivan SJ, Lang SN, Bower DJ, Kamp Dush CM. Associations between coparenting conflict and children's adjustment: The role of parental depressive symptoms. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 2016; 25*:* 328-339 / doi: 10.1007/ s10826-015-0216-5.
28. Ward KP, Lee SJ. Parental stress, parenting practices, and child adjustment during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Developmental Behavioral Pediatrics* 2020; 41(9): 715-723 / doi: 10.1097/ DBP. 0000000000000853.
29. O'Mara C, Schrodt P. Coparenting and parent-child relational quality: A meta-analytic review. *Communication Monographs* 2017; 84(1): 42-66 / doi: 10.1080/03637751.2016.1 222553.
30. Hawkins AJ, Amato PR, Kinghorn A. Nonresident father involvement and children's well-being: Father effects or child effects? *American Sociological Review* 2007; 72(6): 990-1010 / doi: 10.1177/ 000312240707200607.
31. Hetherington EM, Kelly J. *For better or for worse: Divorce reconsidered*. WW Norton, 2002.
32. Cookston JT, Braver SL, Griffin WA, DeLusé SR, Miles JC. Effects of the Dads for Life intervention on interparental conflict and coparenting in the two years after divorce. *Family Process* 2007; 46(1): 123-137 / doi: 10.1111/j.1545-5300.2006. 00196.x.
33. Davies PT, Sturge-Apple ML, Cicchetti D, Cummings EM. The role of child adversity and caregiving in children's emotional security theory. *Developmental Psychology* 2007; 43(1): 201-212 / doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.43.1.201.
34. Choi Y, Becher EH. Supportive coparenting, parenting stress, harsh parenting, and child behavior problems in nonmarital families. *Family Process* 2019; 58(2): 404-417 / doi: 10.1111/famp.12373.
35. Pires A, Martins C, Canavarro MC, Moreira H. Coparenting, triangulation, and child emotional functioning in divorced families. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 2021; 30(9): 2284-2297 / doi: 10.1007/s10826-021-02032-7.
36. Lam CB, Solmeyer R, McHale SM. Sibling relationships and coparenting processes in families. *Family Process* 2012; 51(1): 106-120 / doi: 10.1111/j.1545-5300. 2012.01385.x.
37. Lau AS, Power TG. Coparenting, parenting stress, and authoritative parenting among Chinese American families. *Developmental Psychology* 2019; 55(3): 578-590 / doi: 10.10 37/dev0000659.
38. Cowan CP, Cowan PA. *When partners become parents: The big life change for couples* Basic Books, 2000.