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Abstract

Research on coparenting has been quite developed in the last four decades. In Indonesia, research related to coparenting still deals with father involvement in child care. While in other countries various coparenting behavior models have been developed in various context. This systematic review examines the empirical literature in the last ten years focusing on the determinants of coparenting behavior in intact family. Although at the beginning of its development coparenting research was carried out on divorced couples, this review examined the determinants of coparenting behavior in married couples. From several databases, the results show that determinants of coparenting behavior are involving of parental characteristics, child characteristics, marital relationships, and intervention program. It is expected that the results of this study can become a reference for conducting researchers on coparenting behavior especially in Indonesian family.

Keywords: parenting, coparenting, intact family

Received 2 June 2020/Accepted 25 August 2020 ©Author all rights reserved

Introduction

Individual development is strongly influenced by the socialization process that occurs in the family (Bronfenbrenner, 2005) through nurturing. In the nuclear family, parenting ideally carried out by father and mother, since there are different roles from the two that can optimalize child's development (Bornstein, 2002). In fact, childrearing in some society only considered as maternal responsibility. Unbalanced division of parenting assignments becomes the source of conflict between mother and father over childcare (Caldera, Fitzpatrick, & Wampler, 2002). Family
theorists (McHale, 1997; Feinberg, 2003) consider that the occurrence of conflict in parenting relationship shows poor quality of coparenting.

Research on coparenting has emerged and increasingly draws researcher’s attention since the last four decades. Coparenting generally defined as the way parents work together in their role as parents (Feinberg, 2003). Feinberg (2003) formulated coparenting into four overlapping component: child rearing agreements, division of labor, support/undermining, and joint family management. Child rearing agreement shows the level at which caregiver figures agree on matters relating to childcare, including moral values, behavioral expectations, discipline, emotional needs, educational standards and priorities, safety, and relationships with peers. Division of labor relates to the division of tasks, obligations and responsibilities related to daily routines involving child and household care tasks, and responsibilities related to financial, legal and child health. Support-undermining relates to the level of support between partners, namely affirmation of other partner’s competencies as caregiver, recognition and appreciation of their contributions, and justifying decisions and parenting authority of other caregiver. The parent undermined their spouse by criticizing, belittling, and blaming. In joint family management caregivers explicitly or implicitly set standards on how family members treat each other, regulate structure and cohesiveness in family relationships, allow or prevent coalitions between caregivers and children, and determine the balance of interactions between caregivers and children.

Several studies have mentioned the importance of coparenting in child and parents behavior. Block, Block, dan Morrison (1981) found that agreement between parents is positively related to ego control and ego resilience in boys. Subsequent research also found positive relationship with other psychological functioning, namely IQ scores and moral development in boys. In girls, children who grow up in families with parents who have a harmony of values are relatively more competent, confident, independent, responsible, helpful, socially skilled, resilient, and able to overcome anxiety (Vaughn, Block, & Block, 1988). Furthermore, the researchers sought to explain how coparenting affects children through parenting behaviors. As a result, it was found that coparenting mediates the relationship between marital conflict and parenting behavior (Margolin et al, 2001), between marital adjustment and maternal warmth (Bonds & Gondoli, 2007), and between marital satisfaction and parenting behavior (Pedro, Ribeiro, & Shelton, 2012 ).

For instance, several studies show the beginning of study about coparenting construct in extended families, families with more than one child, and other family systems that are also associated with different values (McHale, 2011). With COVID-19 turning into a pandemic, the researchers also developed coparenting research in the context of a pandemic situation (Humphreys, 2020; Szabo et al, 2020).

This literature review aims to find out the determinants of coparenting in heterosexual intact nuclear family, particularly from scientific articles. This restriction on married couples is done by taking into account the value aspects of society in Indonesia which considers divorce as a problem that needs to be overcome, refusing same-sex marriage (Law No.1 of 1974 concerning Marriage), and cohabitation (Martayana, 2018). Unfortunately when the authors tried to study the literature of research articles using coparenting variables in Indonesia, only three articles can be found, and none of the three discussed about coparenting determinants. It is hoped that the results of this literature review can be useful for research on family in Indonesia.
### Method

**Procedure**

Literature search was performed using the PRISMA method (Figure 1). The literature search was conducted from 10 to 17 September 2018 through an electronic database including Springerlink, Science Direct, Scopus, and PsycNet. Search on the database was carried out with consideration of the quality of the article, assuming the articles published in the database have been through peer review. The search is performed using the keyword *coparenting determinant*.

**Figure 1**. Literature searching method

Inclusion criteria include 1) research on coparenting determinants, 2) include a sample of couples in marital relationship and have children, 3) published in the form of research articles, 4) a span of the last 10 years. Exclusion criteria included 1) research conducted on the family structure of same-sex couples, cohabitation, single parents, step parents, incarcerated mothers, and other family structures besides married couples, 2) literature review articles. The search process begins by
reviewing the titles and abstracts of the entire search results and comparing them with established criteria.

From the searching process, 242 articles were retrieved; 4 from Scopus, 61 from Science Direct, 72 from Springerlink, and 104 from PsycNet. After scanning the title, there is one same article in two different databases. After ensuring that the articles meet predetermined criteria, we found 22 literature review articles, 158 articles with subjects not in accordance with criteria (adoptive parents, homosexuals, cohabitation, incarcerated mother, single parent), 33 articles about the impact of coparenting, 2 articles about the effectiveness of coparenting interventions, 5 articles about parenting behavior, 23 articles were published over 10 years, 3 articles about coparenting measurement tools, and 1 article contained symposiums abstract list. Finally, 20 articles used in this literature review.

By adhering to the objective of knowing the determinants of coparenting in intact nuclear family, all articles that have been obtained from the initial selection process are concluded based on the research problem, research objectives, theoretical perspectives, variables and measurements, data analysis techniques, samples, findings, and limitations and suggestions for further research.

Result

Characteristics of sample

Table-1 shows the characteristics of sample in the studies. The majority of the studies involved parents with single child, aged 0 to 5 years old. Five studies involved families with more than 1 child, and one study involved families with adolescent child. All children are born normal, none of them reported child with special needs. In all studies subjects came from middle to upper social classes, and majority of parental education levels are tertiary institutions. Subjects in the studies were predominantly white (caucasian), but some also mentioned subjects with other racial backgrounds, such as Asian, Latino, and few reported black subjects.
Tabel-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of sample</th>
<th>Characteristic(s)</th>
<th>Number of Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of Studies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Age (in years)</td>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 – 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parent education</td>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tertiary education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Race/Ethnic background</td>
<td>Caucasia</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Hispanic White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multirace</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social class</td>
<td>Middle up</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of child</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than one</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coparenting Determinants in Intact Nuclear Family

Table 2 shows summary of studies that have been selected for review. Coparenting determinants are then grouped into four categories, parental characteristics, child characteristics, marital relationships, and participation in intervention programs.

Parental Characteristics

Most of the studies found showed that parental characteristics highly influence coparenting. Preliminary research that also becomes a reference for other studies (which is therefore also important to be included in this discussion even though it has been published for more than 10 years) is Belsky, Crnic, & Gable (1995) who examined the determinants of coparenting based on couple’s characteristic differences with daily hassle as moderator variable. They found that demographic characteristics, such as age, educational level, personality, and attitudes towards childcare were significantly related to coparenting, with daily hassle as moderating variables. Feinberg & Kan (2008) also supported that demography, which is parental education, significantly moderates the effects of coparenting interventions in terms of decreasing maternal depression, increasing reported coparental support for mother, and child sleep habits. Schoppe-Sullivan & Mangelsdorf (2013) report that in addition to education level, socioeconomic status is also negatively related to undermining coparenting.
## Table-2

**Summary of Collected Articles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Belsky, Crnic, &amp; Gable (1995)</td>
<td>Character difference (Char)</td>
<td>69 Caucasian parents who have their first child, 15 months old</td>
<td>Char &amp;UnSup R^2=0,07 (p &lt;0,05)</td>
<td>Parental Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsupportive Coparenting (UnSup)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Char X Has &amp;vs Sup R^2=0,05 (p&lt;0,10)</td>
<td>Parental Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsupportive Emotional Coparenting (UnSupE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Char X Has &amp;UnSup R^2=0,13 (p&lt;0,01)</td>
<td>Parental Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive Coparenting (Sup)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Char X Has &amp;UnSup E R^2=0,13 (p&lt;0,01)</td>
<td>Parental Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Hassle (Has)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kolak &amp; Volling (2007)</td>
<td>Marital relationship quality (Mar)</td>
<td>Mother, father, 2 children (aged 2 years and 3-7 years) from 57</td>
<td>Mar &amp; Coop (r = .51, p = .001)</td>
<td>Marital Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coparental Cooperation (Coop)</td>
<td>European-American families</td>
<td>Mar &amp; Tri (r = 2.44, p = .001)</td>
<td>Marital Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coparental Triangulation (Tri)</td>
<td>Middle to upper socioeconomic class</td>
<td>Mar &amp;Conf (r = 2.56, p = .001).</td>
<td>Marital Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coparental Conflict (Conf)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Schoppe-Sullivan &amp; Mangelsdorf (2013)</td>
<td>1. Personality</td>
<td>57 new European-American families with their first child</td>
<td>Cohen’s f^2 = 0.82</td>
<td>Parental Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Beliefs about father role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Family of origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Observed marital behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Laxman, Jessee, Mangelsdorf</td>
<td>Supportive coparenting (Sup)</td>
<td>79 married couples and their children</td>
<td>Stabilitas Sup R^2=0,13 p&lt;0,05</td>
<td>Parental Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undermining coparenting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stabilitas Und R^2=0,21(p&lt;0,01)</td>
<td>Parental Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Com &amp; Sup R^2=0,21 (p&lt;0,01)</td>
<td>Parental Characteristics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: All effect sizes are significant at the 0.05 level unless otherwise noted.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rossmiller-Giesing, Brown, Schoppe-Sullivan (2013)</td>
<td>(Und) Parent’s communion (Com) Parent’s negative emotionality (Emo)</td>
<td>-middle</td>
<td>Com &amp; Und $R^2$=0.18 ($p&lt;0.05$) Emo &amp; Sup $R^2$=0.14 ($p&lt;0.1$) Emo &amp; Und $R^2$=0.33 ($p&lt;0.001$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Schoppe-Sullivan et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Infant fussiness (Fuss) Infant unadaptability (Una) Marital Quality (Mar)</td>
<td>97 Caucasian parents, upper middle socioeconomic class, tertiary education level</td>
<td>Fuss X Mar &amp; Und $R^2$ = 0.12 ($p&lt;0.05$) Una X Mar &amp; Und $R^2$ = 0.14 ($p&lt;0.05$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. Feinberg & Kan (2008)                                             | Coparental support (Sup) Parenting-based closeness (PClose) Depressive symptom (Dep) Anxiety (Anx) Parent-child dysfunctional interaction (PCDI) Infant soothability (IS) | 169 new couples with their first child (82% married) Diverse socioeconomic, diverse levels of education | Mother report after intervention Sup $R^2$ = 0.35 ($p<0.05$) Dep $R^2$ = 0.56 ($p<0.01$) Anx $R^2$ = 0.38 ($p<0.05$) PCDI $R^2$ = 0.34 ($p<0.10$) 
Father report after intervention Sup $R^2$ = 0.54 ($p<0.05$) PClose $R^2$ = 0.44 ($p<0.05$) PCDI $R^2$ = 0.7 ($p<0.05$) IS $R^2$ = 0.35 ($p<0.05$) |
<p>| 7. Schoppe-Sullivan, Brown, Cannon, Mangelsdorf                      | Father’s Beliefs about the Roles of Father (BFather) Mother’s Beliefs about the Roles of Father (BMother) Maternal Encouragement | 97 couples with 3.5 months old child Upper middle socioeconomic class | BFather&amp; Cop $r$=0.27 ($p&lt;0.01$) BMother&amp; Cop $r$=0.18 ($p&lt;0.1$) MEnco&amp; Cop $r$=0.43 ($p&lt;0.01$) MCrit&amp; Cop $r$=-0.50 ($p&lt;0.01$) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Maternal Criticism (MCrit)</th>
<th>Coparenting Quality (Cop)</th>
<th>Child Negative Affect (CAff)</th>
<th>Marital Adjustment (MAdj)</th>
<th>Supportive Coparenting (Sup)</th>
<th>Undermining Coparenting (Und)</th>
<th>Goodness of Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>111 families with children aged 4 years on average</td>
<td>MAdj&amp; Sup r = 0.92 (p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>MAdj&amp; Und r = -0.85 (p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>CAff&amp; Sup r = -0.06</td>
<td>CAff&amp; Und r = 0.27 (p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>CAff X MAdj&amp; Sup r = -0.28 (p&lt;0.01)</td>
<td>CAff X MAdj&amp; Sup r = 0.02</td>
<td>χ² (26) = 37.469, N = 111, p = .068, RMSEA = 0.063, CFI = 0.944, p=0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jia &amp; Schoppe-Sullivan</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>112 couples with 4-years-old children</td>
<td>FPlay&amp; Sup r=0.32</td>
<td>FPlay&amp; Und r=-0.35</td>
<td>FCare&amp; Sup r = -0.40</td>
<td>FCare&amp; Und r=0.29</td>
<td>Goodness of Fit : χ² (506)=682.24, p=.001, RMSEA = .06 (CI90%=.044, .066)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Szabo, Dubas, &amp; Aken</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>88 Caucasian families, upper middle social classes, parent education majority of college, more than one child</td>
<td>Temp1 &amp;MCop R² = 0.28 – 0.40</td>
<td>Temp2 &amp;MCop R² = 0.29 – 0.40</td>
<td>Temp1 &amp;FCop R² = 0.19 – 0.26</td>
<td>Temp2 &amp;FCop R² = 0.19 – 0.25</td>
<td>Temp1 &amp;OCop R² = 0.05 – 0.09</td>
<td>Temp2 &amp;OCop R² = 0.01 – 0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11. | McDaniel & Teti (2012) | Quality of Coparenting (Cop)  
Infant Night Waking (InfW)  
Parent Night Waking (ParW)  
Parent Sleep Quality (ParS)  
Depressive Symptom (Dep)  
Infant Temperament (InfT) | 150 white families of upper middle social class, postsecondary education | Month 1  
InfW&ParW $r=0.46$  
ParW&ParS $r=-0.28$  
ParS&Dep $r=-0.28$  
Dep&Cop $r=-0.27$  
(all $p<0.001$)  
Month 3  
InfW&ParW $r=0.39$  
ParW&ParS $r=-0.37$  
ParS&Dep $r=-0.15$  
Dep&Cop $r=-0.24$  
(all $p<0.001$ except ParS&Dep $p<0.01$)  
Goodness of Fit:  
$\chi^2 (56) = 59.56$, $p = 0.35$; RMSEA = 0.02, low = 0.00, high = 0.04; CFI = 0.99 | Temperament of Second Child (Temp2) |

Relationship Adjustment (RA)  
Postnatal Parenting Alliance (PPA) | 151 Caucasian couples expecting their first child, middle and upper socioeconomic | Male  
IA & PPA $r=-0.19$ ($p<0.05$)  
RA T1 & PPA $r=0.29$ ($p<0.001$)  
RA T2 & PPA $r=0.45$ ($p<0.001$)  
Female  
IA & PPA $r=-0.20$ ($p<0.05$)  
RA T1 & PPA $r=0.37$ ($p<0.001$)  
RA T2 & PPA $r=0.59$ ($p<0.001$) | Child Characteristics | Marital Relationship |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13.</th>
<th>Pedro, Ribeiro, &amp; Shelton (2012)</th>
<th>Marital Satisfaction (MS) Coparenting Cooperation (CC) Coparenting Conflict (CF)</th>
<th>519 families Age of child 9-13 years Majority white Education high school to college</th>
<th>Maternal MS &amp; CC $r=0.60$ $p&lt;0.001$ MS &amp; CF $r=-0.45$ ($p&lt;0.001$) Paternal MS &amp; CC $r=0.60$ ($p&lt;0.001$) MS &amp; CF $r=-0.50$ ($p&lt;0.001$)</th>
<th>Marital Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Altenburger, Schoppe-Sullivan, Lang, Bower &amp; Dush (2014)</td>
<td>Prenatal Coparenting Behavior (PCB) Observed Couple Behavior (OCB) Supportive Coparenting (Sup) Undermining Coparenting (Und)</td>
<td>182 dual earner family Upper middle socioeconomic class</td>
<td>PCB &amp; Sup $r=0.25$ ($p&lt;0.01$) PCB &amp; Und $r=-0.20$ ($p&lt;0.05$) OCB &amp; Sup $r=0.23$ ($p&lt;0.05$) OCB &amp; Und $r=-0.20$ ($p&lt;0.05$) Goodness of Fit: $\chi^2 (154) = 192.30; p = 0.02; TLI = 97; CFI=0.98; RMSEA =0.04$</td>
<td>Marital Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Doss et al (2014)</td>
<td>Coparenting Alliance before &amp; after Coparenting Intervention</td>
<td>90 couples Higher education Upper middle socioeconomic class</td>
<td>Women 1 mo Cohen’s $d=1.24$ 1 year Cohen’s $d=1.06$ 2 years Cohen’s $d=0.47$ Men</td>
<td>Marital Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Antawati, Hendriani, Nurdibyanandaru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16. | Kuo, Volling, & Gonzalez (2017) | 241 families (father, mother, 2 children) | Father MS & Father CC $\beta = 0.13$ ($p < 0.05$)  
Father MS & Mother CC $\beta = 0.18$ ($p < 0.05$)  
Temp1 & Father CC $\beta = -0.12$ ($p < 0.001$)  
Temp1 & Mother CC $\beta = -0.16$ ($p < 0.001$)  
Father GB & Mother CF $\beta = -0.09$ ($p < 0.05$)  
Mother GB & Father CF $\beta = -0.10$ ($p < 0.05$)  
Temp1 & Mother CF $\beta = 0.13$ ($p < 0.05$)  
Temp2 & Mother CF $\beta = 0.11$ ($p < 0.05$) |
| | Coparenting Cooperation (CC) | | Parental Characteristics |
| | Coparenting Conflict (CF) | | Child Characteristics |
| | Gender-role Beliefs (GB) | | Marital Relationship |
| | Firstborn’s difficult temperament (Temp1) | | |
| | Infant sibling’s difficult temperament (Temp2) | | |
| | Marital Satisfaction (MS) | | |
| 17. | Burney & Leerkes (2010) | 134 mothers and 90 partners | Mother  
IDN X IS (low) & Cop $\beta = -0.21$ ($p < 0.05$)  
IDN X IS (high) & Cop $\beta = 0.04$, ns.  
IDL X DP poor & Cop $\beta = -0.25$ ($p < 0.05$)  
IDL X DP equal & Cop $\beta = 0.06$, ns |
| | Marital Functioning (MF) | | Marital Relationship |
| | Infant distress to novelty (IDN) | | Child Characteristics |
| | Infant distress to limitations (IDL) | | |
| | Division of Parenting (DP) | | |
| | Coparenting (Cop) | | |
| | Infant soothability (IS) | | |

1 mo Cohen’s $d = -0.13$  
2 years Cohen’s $d = 0.66$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Antawati, Hendriani, Nurdibyanandaru                                   |                                                                           | 94 couples with first child                                                        | Father:  
PRC & Cop $R^2 = 0.13$ (p<0.001)
MS & Cop $R^2 = 0.03$ (p=0.056)
IU & Cop $R^2 = 0.04$ (p<0.05)  
Mother:  
PRC & Cop $R^2 = 0.25$ (p<0.001)
MS & Cop $R^2 = 0.003$ (ns)
IU & Cop $R^2 = 0.000$ (ns) |
| Gordon & Feldman (2008)                                               | Partners relational composite (PRC) Marital Satisfaction (MS) Infant Unpredictability (IU) Coparenting (Cop) | 94 couples with first child                                                        | Marital Relationship:  
Child Characteristics: |
| Talbot, Baker, & McHale (2009)                                        | Marital Quality Coarenting                                                | Eighty-five couples transitioning to new parenthood                                | Mothers: $R^2 = .13$, $p < .01$, for Step 1; $R^2 = .04$, $p < .10$, for Step 2.  
Fathers: $R^2 = .18$, $p < .001$, for Step 1; $R^2 = .01$, ns, for Step 2.  
Regressions predicting conflict:  
Mothers: $R^2 = .06$, $p < .05$, for Step 1; $R^2 = .00$, ns, for Step 2.  
Fathers: $R^2 = .06$, $p < .05$, for Step 1; $R^2 = .00$, ns, for Step 2. |
Schoppe-Sullivan & Mangelsdorf (2013) reported that maternal belief about father role is significant predictor of supportive coparenting behavior with prebirth marital behavior as moderator variable. Another aspect of belief is also found in study by Khazan, McHale, & DeCourcey (2008), which is maternal belief about ideal family, predicts coparenting coordination and conflict. When mother discover gap between the ideal family image and what they truly have, not only will she experience low marital satisfaction but also an indication of worse coordination and greater coparenting conflict.

In terms of personality, Bouchard (2014) examined 151 couples in transition as parents and found that attachment style developed by parents in marital relations could predict readiness for coparenting, both for mothers and fathers. Talbot, Baker, & McHale (2009) also get the same results. In addition, negative emotions from fathers are also predictors of undermining coparenting. This is supported by Laxman et al (2013) that father’s negative emotions were associated with higher levels of undermining coparenting when the child was 3 years old. But they added, not only did father’s negative emotions play a role, mother’s negative emotions were also related to undermining coparenting when the child was 3 years old. This negative emotional effect only found in parents who report their children as having difficult temperament.

Several studies have found important role of maternal gatekeeping behavior in coparenting. Maternal gatekeeping is a set of beliefs and behaviors of mothers that can inhibit collaborative efforts between fathers and mothers in the family (Allen & Hawkins, 1999). Schoppe-Sullivan et al (2008) found that maternal gatekeeping behavior moderates the relationship between father’s beliefs and father’s behavior, and also between coparenting quality and father’s behavior. Maternal gatekeeping also moderates the relationship between quality of coparenting relationships and father behavior. Cannon et al (2008) further explained through their study of 97 couples regarding prebirth parent characteristics as predictors of maternal gatekeeping and paternal behavior. The results show a reciprocal relationship between maternal gatekeeping and fathering behavior. While Jia & Schoppe-Sullivan (2011) state that father involvement is a significant predictor of coparenting.
Child Characteristics

Characteristics or temperament of children also commonly found as coparenting determinants. Initially Schoppe-Sullivan et al (2007) said that the temperamental characteristics of children are not directly related to the quality of coparenting. The child’s temperament is relevant for understanding early coparenting behavior when considering the quality of marriage at the birth of a child. In a subsequent study, Cook (1999) found that children’s negative affects were significant predictor of undermining coparenting. The relationship between negative affect of children with supportive coparenting is significant for families with high marital adjustment, and not for families with moderate or low marital adjustment.

Davis (2009) conducted a longitudinal study involving 56 couples in the last trimester of pregnancy, when the children were 3.5 months and 13 months old. The result show that difficult child temperament is associated with a decrease in supportive coparenting behavior over time. More specifically Burney & Leerkes (2010), in a study with 120 mothers and 79 fathers of married couples and having 1 child aged 6 months, showed that the reactivity dimension of child temperament is associated with the decrease of coparenting quality if there is a stressor present, and the effect is different between mom and dad. Mothers who feel their children are reactive only report negative coparenting if their children are also not easily pacified or if mothers are not satisfied with the division of care tasks compared to their expectations. On the other hand fathers report coparenting negatively when dealing with more reactive children and low quality marital relationship. Laxman et al (2013) support these results, in which infant difficult temperament is associated with less supportive coparenting when children are 3 years old but not related to undermining coparenting. Likewise, Kuo, Volling & Gonzales (2017) found that difficult temperaments in children are associated with less cooperative fathers and mothers.

In addition, it was also found that frequency of child night waking and the birth of the next child also affect parent coparenting behavior. McDaniel & Teti (2012) show the frequency of child night waking predicts the parents quality of sleep, whereas poor sleep quality predict depressive symptoms and negatively related with coparenting quality. While Szabo, Dubas, & Aken (2012) found that quality of coparenting appears to increased when the next child was born, and subsequent child temperament also affecting coparenting.
Marital Relationship
In some of studies mentioned, marital relationships also determine coparenting behavior. Kolak & Volling (2007) showed that there is relationship between the quality of marriage and coparental cooperation/conflict with paternal expressiveness as moderator variable. Schoppe-Sullivan & Mangelsdorf (2013) also showed that marital behavior is a predictor of supportive coparenting behavior. Furthermore Pedro, Ribeiro & Shelton (2012) found that coparenting mediates the relationship between marital satisfaction and spouse behavior. Fathers who have high marital satisfaction will tend to contribute more to coparenting with the mother, and this will influence the parenting behavior become more positive. This result was also found by Gordon & Feldman (2008). In another study (Kuo, Volling, Gonzales, 2017) it was found that father’s marital satisfaction can predict father and mother coparenting cooperation, but does not apply to mother’s marital satisfaction.

Intervention Program
Intervention program for parents also has influence on coparenting quality. Feinberg & Kan (2008) examined the effectiveness of Family Foundation training aimed at improving the quality of coparental relationships, parental mental health, parent-child relationships, and emotional and physiological regulation of children. As a result, the intervention conditions were reported to produce more positive coparenting in parents compared to those who did not attend the program. This result is supported by Doss et al. (2014) who tested the effectiveness of a short intervention program (6 hours) aimed at improving the quality of coparenting and marital relationships towards 90 heterosexual couples. They found that participants in the intervention group reported improved coparenting quality and women experienced a decrease in stress during the first year of child birth.

Coparenting Dynamics
Several studies also discuss the coparenting dynamics, such as when coparenting arises and how coparenting changes in couples. Altenburger et al. (2014) observed 182 double-income families in the transition of parenthood, prebirth and at 9 months child ages. They get different results from previous studies (Van Egeren & Hawkins, 2004) and support other studies (Feinberg, 2002) that coparenting is observed to have emerged during pregnancy. Then Kuo, Volling & Gonzales (2017)
found that the quality of coparenting decreases at the birth of a second child and there is a tendency for an increase in coparenting conflicts.

Discussion
A total of 20 articles were used in this literature review to determine the determinants of coparenting in heterosexual married couples. Most of the researches use family system theory as a theoretical framework. This can be seen from the selection of variables and methods used in data collection. The variables chosen include internal aspects of the spouse, the quality of the child, the quality of dyadic relationships such as marital relationships, and do not involve variables outside the family, such as social support and so on (See Table 2). There are two data collection techniques that are generally used in measuring coparenting, first by observing dyadic and triadic interactions in family activities, and the second is using a self assessment questionnaire by couples by reporting on the behavior of self and partners in interacting. The average study found (Schoppe-Sullivan & Mangelsdorf, 2013; Laxman et al. 2013; Schoppe Sullivan et al., 2008) used a longitudinal study design, in which coparenting was compared between the prenatal period (mostly the last trimester of pregnancy) with several months postnatal period. Other studies have also compared coparenting in two child age periods (Belsky, Crnic, Gable, 1995; Kuo, Volling, Gonzales, 2017).

Based on the findings, coparenting is mostly determined by parental characteristics, child characteristics, marital relationships, and participation in interventions program. These parental characteristics include demographic characteristics (gender, age, level of education, and socioeconomic state), personality (attachment style, negative emotions), attitudes (maternal gatekeeping), and beliefs (beliefs of gender roles in the family, beliefs about the ideal family). Child characteristics that highly influence coparenting is the child's temperament. Difficult child temperaments (reactive, difficult to calm, negative emotions) seem to greatly influence how fathers and mothers work together with one another in childcare. Other child factors that also affect coparenting through childcare is child's behavior or habits (eg frequency of night waking) and the number of children in the family.
In the terms of marital relationships, coparenting acts as mediating variable between the marital quality and parenting behavior. Marital quality can affect how spouses cooperate with each other, and in turn will affect the interaction between the spouses and their children. There are two different processes of the relationship between these three variables. Some researches (for example Schoppe Sullivan & Mangelsdorf, 2013) showed that there is a spillover effect between marital satisfaction, coparenting, and parenting behavior. The quality of marriage perceived by spouses will affect their coparenting quality, and their coparenting quality will affect their parenting behavior. Meanwhile, other research (for example Pedro & Ribeiro, 2012) showed that what happened was a crossover effect, in which the satisfaction of marriage experienced by one partner will affect their involvement in a coparenting relationship, and will affect the parenting behavior of the other partner. This crossover effect was also found to be more prevalent in fathers and not in mothers, the perceived satisfaction of marriage affected father involvement in coparenting, and would influence mother's parenting behavior.

Coparenting interventions also seem to have a significant influence on improving parents coparenting quality. Several designs that have been tested, both with a long duration of time (Feinberg & Kan, 2008) and brief (Doss et al, 2014) show the same results, where coparenting training can improve the quality of coparental relationships, mental health of parents, parent child relationships, even up to affect the emotional and physiological regulation of the child, as well as the stress experienced by the mother for one year after childbirth.

Based on this review, there are several things that are of concern for further coparenting research, especially in Indonesia. Like most research on families that is closely related to culture, researchers need to be careful when applying existing coparenting theories in their research, especially coparenting component. From the articles analyzed, the most widely used coparenting component is from Feinberg (2003), one of which is the division of labor. This component in Indonesian culture may not be seen as defined by the original theory. This concerns Indonesian culture, especially in rural areas, which is still closely related with traditional gender roles, where men play a role in the external area while women play a role in the domestic area. Thus, the division of roles that exist in Indonesia assumed to be different from that in Feinberg's theory (2003). In terms of research subjects, the majority of the research was conducted on families with middle to upper
socioeconomic class and tertiary education level. Thus, research on subjects with socioeconomic class and lower secondary education still needs to be done. In addition, the existing coparenting theory does not include the role of other family members (generally grandmothers) who sometimes also play the role of caregiver. Another caregiver figure is important to look at given the phenomenon in Indonesia, especially in families with middle to lower socioeconomic classes, most of whom live in one household and care for children together. When researchers want to expand their research to this multigenerational family, the components of the division of labor also need to be adjusted.

Conclusion
This review provides information about determinants of coparenting in intact nuclear family. It is hoped that the results can provide a basis for other researchers, especially in Indonesia, who wish to conduct research on coparenting. Unfortunately, this review only discussed research in the last ten years, this limits other variables that may be related to coparenting that have not been discussed in this article. For this reason, it is necessary to look for research published over the last ten years to obtain a more complete picture. It also have to be considered that other researchers use different terms to label coparenting behavior, so it is also necessary to do a more extensive search involving diverse keywords. Another weakness of this literature review is that it does not include a search in the research database in Indonesia, due to the limitations of research on coparenting determinants in Indonesia. Since the characteristics of the sample in all studies in this review entirely come from middle to upper socioeconomic communities with the majority of higher education levels, it is recommended for further researchers to conduct research in the context of lower middle socioeconomic community and lower level of education. Further research can also be done to see the suitability of the coparenting components in widely used theory with family systems in Indonesia.
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