Original Research Article

Validation of the Romanian version of coparenting relationship scale

Received 5 January, 2022

Revised 28 January, 2022

Accepted 1 February, 2022

Published 7 February, 2022

**Claudia Gabriela
Dumitriu¹,
Alexandra Dudu²
and
Livia Maria Butac^{*3}**

¹PhD. Student, School of
Advanced Studies of the
Romanian Academy, "Constantin
Rădulescu-Motru" Institute of
Philosophy and Psychology,
Department of Psychology,
Romanian Academy, Bucharest,
Romania.

²M.A., Clinical psychologist and
counselor, private practice.

³"Politehnica" University of
Bucharest, Romania.

*Corresponding Author
E-mail: contact@liviabutac.ro,
gabrielacdumitriu@yahoo.com

Studies show that children from divorced families are more likely to experience emotional and behavioral problems, which is why researchers have focused on finding factors that facilitate children's post-divorce adaptation. One of these factors is coparenting. Thus, to measure the quality of coparenting, the Coparenting Relationships Scale (CRS) was developed. The aim of this study was to adapt and validate this scale for the Romanian population. It was used a combination between the procedure of back-translation and the techniques derived from the work of a team, used for adapting the scale for Brazil-Spanish speakers. Data were obtained from a sample of 504 people. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to validate the Romanian translation of the items. Using confirmatory factor analysis, the final factor solution with six subscales and 28 items was considered acceptable, unlike the original version of the scale, consisting of 7 factors and 35 items. The Romanian Version of CRS revealed good internal consistency on all subscales, with coefficients similar to the original scale. The Romanian Version of the CRS can be used by practitioners to assess levels of parental conflict and to design interventions for children.

Keywords: Coparenting, parental divorce, children of divorce, coparenting relationships scale

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary Romania, the divorce, regarded as a social phenomenon, has seen a significant increase in the last decades, along with a tendency towards a diminished rate of marriages (National Institute of Statistics, 2006, p. 50; 2010, p. 80). Although the numbers have shown a trend towards stabilization in the last years, the annual average of divorces is approximately 30.000 per year (National Institute of Statistics, 2020, p. 83), resulting in an average number of children from divorced families of about 18.000.

Numerous studies have shown that children from divorced families are more prone to behavioral and emotional problems such as: depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress, interpersonal difficulties, long-term

relational instability, lower levels of life satisfaction in adulthood etc. (Seijo et al., 2016, Yárnoz-Yaben and Garmendia, 2016, Teubert and Pinquart, 2010). Therefore, attention has been directed towards factors that might be addressed in order to facilitate children's post-divorce adjustment.

Besides other dimensions such as personality and qualities of co-parents, researchers identified coparenting (joint parenting or the collaborative implication of both parents in children's upbringing (Feinberg, 2002) as a particular challenge during the divorce process, with different consequences for children's post-divorce adjustment. On one hand, coparenting is seen as a protective factor against the

negative effects of divorce on children, smoothing the transition by limiting the changes in the family dynamics and structure that often occur after separation (Herrero et al., 2020; Shimkowski and Schrodtt, 2012). Indeed, coparenting seems to be among the factors that provide the child with a sense of consistency and security, as well as a more positive perception of the divorce process and post-divorce dynamics, diminishing the risk of depression, anxiety, and aggressiveness (Herrero et al., 2020).

Furthermore, coparenting may hinder post-divorce adjustment, particularly due to the parental conflict resulting from the dispute for child custody and the conflictual dynamics of the couple, either pre-existent or emerged during the divorce process (Francia and Millea, 2015; Symoens et al., 2014; Anderson, 2020; Hetherington and Stanley-Hagan, 1999; Visser et al., 2017). For example, Herrero et al. (2020) found that even supportive coparenting can be harmful when parents have conflicting relationships, leading to higher aggressiveness in children. Similarly, Lamela et al. (2015) found significant differences in children's internalizing and externalizing symptoms between high-conflict and undermining coparenting on one side and cooperative coparenting on the other. This is due to the fact that during the divorce, parents tend to focus on fights over custody and decisional authority and neglect the real needs of the child, which are vital for a healthy post-divorce adjustment (Bornstein, 2019). Coparenting can also influence children indirectly, through its effects on parents' divorce adjustment and parental practices (Lee et al., 2021).

These mixed results signal the need for a multidimensional approach on coparenting to adequately understand how it impacts family dynamics and what components should be particularly targeted by interventions in the realm of parenting. Such an approach has been developed by Feinberg (2002, 2003), who proposes a conceptual framework of coparenting comprising four domains: childbearing agreement, co-parental support/undermining, division of labor, and joint management of family dynamics. Based on this conceptualization of coparenting, Feinberg et al. (2012) later developed the Coparenting Relationships Scale (CRS), a comprehensive self-report measure of the quality of coparenting, thus allowing researchers to explore more nuanced associations between coparenting and child outcomes. Such results are essential for better targeted interventions addressed to the parents facing the need to coparent in the complex context of separation.

Coparenting in Romania

CRS was used in several studies concerning post-divorce counseling interventions (Barton et al., 2018; Bisson and Andrew, 2007; Lamela et al., 2016; Ferraro et al., 2016; Fletcher et al., 2018; Galovan and

Schramm, 2017; Kan and Feinberg, 2015; Lavner et al., 2019; Morgan et al., 2016) and has been translated and validated in other countries, including Brazil, Portugal, and Sweden (Carvalho et al., 2018; Feinberg et al., 2012; Lamela et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2012; Pinto et al., 2019).

The Coparenting Relationships Scale was, so far, validated mostly in Western and Northern Countries. However, important differences exist between Western and Eastern cultures with respect to coparenting and post-divorce practices, such as shared custody and division of labor. Indeed, Eastern European countries, including Romania, have lower levels of gender equity, higher pay gap, and more conservatory views on childbearing, with women still being the main caregivers, to the detriment of their economic independence (Pascall and Manning, 2000; Roman, 2001). Despite the economic disadvantage of women, a recent study on 19 countries in Europe found that Eastern European countries had the highest proportion of parents reporting sole mother custody after separation or divorce (Zilincikova, 2020). Such a cultural context is likely to favor the emergence of high-conflict divorce and poor coparenting to a higher extent compared to Western cultures, pointing to the need to properly identify and address coparenting difficulties in Romania.

However, no measure for the assessment of the quality of coparenting has been validated for the Romanian population. The current study addresses this gap by translating, adapting and validating the Coparenting Relationships Scale for a Romanian sample. The validated version of the CRS may then be used to assess coparenting patterns and correlates in Romania, to properly inform and evaluate interventions that target post-divorce adjustment in children, through the development of coparental skills in separated parents.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Romanian adaptation of the items

Since there is no generally accepted specific method for adapting a scale to a different language (Iliescu, 2017) we used a combination between the procedure of back-translation (Iliescu, 2017) and the techniques derived from the work of a team, used for adapting the scale for Brazil-Spanish speakers (Carvalho et al., 2018). Two teams that worked independently were involved, each one consisting of two psychologists who were proficient in English and a linguist. Each team performed a reverse back-translation procedure: a psychologist translated from English to Romanian, a linguist back-translated in English, to highlight the language differences, a third step was performed by each team, i.e. a retranslation in Romanian of the

English back-translated items. As a result, the researchers obtained 3 English versions of the items (the original one and the two independent back-translations), 4 Romanian versions (the initial translation and the reverse-back-translation of each team), and a series of linguistic comments provided by one of the linguists that studied the initial items after performing the required back-translation. The items were then grouped in accordance with the scales, in order to facilitate the decrease in the item bias and the concept bias (Iliescu, 2017) and the final form was decided on by a team of 4 psychologists who were proficient in English and familiar with the subject covered by the text.

From the 35 items of the scale, 19 (items 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 34) did not raise any difficulty; all the versions lead to the same phrase (or with very minor differences) both in English and in Romanian.

The items that needed both translation and adaptation were those that used colloquial expressions in English (that do not have a perfect equivalent in Romanian) and those that included modern terms that are part of the current English language but have not yet been adopted in Romanian.

In the first category were:

- "pays a great deal of attention" (item 4) – we translated it by *oferă multă atenție* although "a great deal" encompasses more than the Romanian word *multă*;

- "live dirty work to me" (item 5) – here we adapted the formulation, first by replacing "dirty" with "hard" (*greu*) and we also added an explanatory part (*să strâng după ei*) since the literal translation of the English word "dirty" in Romanian is commonly associated with some professions (such as waste management) or criminal activity, which was not the case for this item;

- "still wants to do his or her own thing" (item 7) – we translated it as "*se concentrează în continuare pe sine*" that is not a literal translation but expresses better the content of the item;

- "fun" (item 8) – we used "*amuzant*", although "*distractiv*" was suggested in some versions of the translation process;

- "carry a fair share" (item 20) – was translated using an explicative syntagm (*a îndeplini în mod echitabil*);

- "being at wit's ends" (item 26) was the most challenging term, with no equivalent term/expression in Romanian, and we used "*a fi copleșit*";

- "to be bothered" (item 29) – in English the verb has a cognitive component (as in "bored") and a behavioral one (to be interrupted); we opted for the translation of the behavioral sense (*a fi deranjat*);

- "argue" (items 32, 33) – the English term has two components, one of contradiction and one of negotiation, and we opted for *a se certa* that keeps

only the contradiction component, which better expresses the item's meaning;

- "yell" (item 35) – we opted for a less strong Romanian term (*a țipa*) considering that any behavior more aggressive than shouting will also be included in a positive answer to the Romanian term.

The second category included items like:

- "goals" (item 6) that can have multiple translations in Romanian (we opted for *țeluri* that was considered to encompass more than *objective* or *scopuri*);

- "parenthood" (item 28) that was translated with "*a fi părinte*" that is easier to understand as compared to *rolurile de părinți*;

- "parenting" (items 3, 20, 30) that was translated differently depending on the context (*creșterea și educarea copiilor* for item 3, *responsabilități de părinte* for item 20 and *a fi părinte* for item 30);

- "focus" (item 30) – was translated as *obiectiv comun* that is easier to understand as compared to *focalizare* which is a neologism;

- "interchange" (item 31) – here we preferred the neologism *interacțiune* to more classical translations that implied using a longer series of words (*a vă afla în situații*);

- "marital" (item 33) – we used the neologism *marital* instead of the older *matrimonial*.

The final scale in Romanian is presented in Annex I.

Data collection

A questionnaire including the CRS items in Romanian, together with sections concerning demographic data has been prepared. It also included some questions regarding the respondents' evaluation of the couple's harmony, the child's suffering due to interparental conflict and the parents' opinion on the tendency of the child to side with one parent, excluding the other in conflictual situations. The answers were measured on a 7 point Likert scale.

Due to the restrictions caused by the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, the questionnaire has been distributed on-line to a convenience sample; the respondents have been recruited via personal contacts (including the psychotherapeutic practice) and using groups of parents managed by either teachers or psychologists. The answers have been collected between January and April 2021.

Sample structure

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. The above data allow us to consider the sample as representative for the urban population in Romania.

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) analysis has been performed to validate the Romanian translation of the

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

Characteristic	Values
Number of valid answers	504
Gender	Females - 287 (56.9%) Males 217 - (43.1%) M=40.6, SE=5.99 years, (skewness=0.08, kurtosis=0.037)
Education level	Primary school – 9 (1.8%) Gymnasium level – 14 (2.8%) High school graduates – 160 (31.7%) Bachelor Degree – 159 (31.5%) Master Degree – 140 (27.8%) PhD – 22 (4.4%)
Number of children per respondent	Single child – 246 (48.8%) 2 children – 228 (45.2%) 3 children – 26 (5.2%) 4 children – 4 (0.8%)
Age of the youngest child	0 – 18 years old (considering 0 for children bellow one year) M=8.25, SE=4.49
Age of the oldest child	0 - 36 years old M=13.56, SE=6.27
Marital status	Married – 352 (64.5%) Cohabitation with the other parent – 23 (4.6%) Divorced (single parents) – 66 (13.1%) Divorced from the child's other parent and in a relationship with another parent – 37 (7.3%) In the process of divorcing – 17 (3.4%) Different status – 36 (7.1%)
Child's residence	Living with both parents – 358 (76.4%) Living with the respondent parent but spending time with the other parent as well – 43 (8.5%) In the care of the other parent but spending time with the respondent – 47 (9.3%) In the respondent's care and with no time spent with the other parent – 23 (4.6%) In a different situation – 6 (1.2%)

items using the R (Lavaan) statistics package. The adequacy of the models was tested using several parameters: Chi-square test (CMIN), the ratio CMIN/DF (DF – degrees of freedom), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) for model comparison. A good fit of the model is indicated by a lower value of CMIN/DF, CFI > 0.9, TLI > 0.95, RMSEA ≤ 0.05 (for good fit) and RMSEA between 0.08 and 0.05 for an acceptable fit. If several models are compared, the best is characterized by the lowest AIC values (Cangur and Ercan, 2015; Civelek, 2018). The reliability of the scale was tested using Cronbach-alpha consistency indexes (Gliem and Gliem, 2003).

RESULTS

The original model with 7 scales (Feinberg et al., 2012) could not be tested with CFA since the subscale "Division of Labor" consisted of only two items. The structure with 6 factors was tested – the results are presented in Table 2. This structure did not show a

good fit. Examining both the factor saturation of the scales and the Cronbach alpha values for the original 6 factors structure, we decided to eliminate items 6, 7, 8, 28 and 29 (besides items 5 and 20 from the Labor Division factor that was eliminated as well) from the model, preserving the same factor structure as in the original model. We also performed CFA using a third factor structure, the one resulting from the Portuguese adaptation of the CRS (Lamela et al., 2018). Comparatively, the results are presented in Table 2. We found that the structure proposed for the Romanian scale (Model 3) was the best fit between the model and the data. Accordingly, the factor structure with 6 factors and 28 items presented in Table 3 was adopted. The factor structure is presented in Figure 1 – the factor loadings of each item are all above 0.7, which also indicates a good fit of the model.

Reliability analysis

Cronbach-alpha consistency analysis was performed. All item-scale correlation indexes were acceptable, while the consistency indexes for the removed items were lower than the overall scale coefficients obtained

Table 2. Fit indexes of the models tested by CFA

Index	Model 1 (Feinberg et al., 2012, 6 scales)	Model 2 (Lamela et al., 2018)	Model 3 (proposed factor structure, Romanian scale)
CMIN ^(*)	2224.569	1569.282	1301.709
CMIN/DF	4.635	4.024	3.904
CFI	0.893	0.921	0.932
TLI	0.883	0.912	0.923
RMSEA	0.085	0.077	0.076
AIC	55141	49612	45840

(*) In all cases, $p=0.000$

Table 3. Factor structure of the proposed model (Model 3 - Romanian language)

	English name of the factor	Romanian name of the factor	Items included (R-reversed scoring)
F1	Coparenting Agreement	Acord Parental	9R, 11R, 15R
F2	Coparenting Closeness	Apropiere parentală	2, 17, 24, 30
F3	Coparenting Support	Suport parental	3, 10, 19, 25, 26, 27
F4	Endorse Partner Parenting	Aprobarea partenerului	1, 4, 14, 18, 23
F5	Coparenting Undermining	Subminare parentală	12, 13, 16, 21, 22
F6	Exposure to Conflict	Expunere la conflict	31-35

Items eliminated from the original scale: 5R, 6, 7R, 8, 20R, 28R, 29R

Figure 1: Factor structure of the Romanian language model

for Model 3. The consistency indexes for the scales, together with the confidence range are presented in Table 4. The values indicate good or very good reliability (Gliem and Gliem, 2003); the fact that none of the α values significantly exceed 0.95 means that there are no redundant items.

The subscales of Model 3 were also analyzed in correlation with a series of 4 questions – the results are presented in Table 5 together with the qualitative effect sizes (McLeod, 2019).

The first question regarded the couple's harmony, as perceived by the respondents. They show a very good

Table 4. Reliability of the Model 3 Scales

Scale	Cronbach alpha	Confidence range for Cronbach alpha
F1 - Acord Parental	0.867 (good)	0.848-0.886
F2 -Apropiere parentală	0.868 (good)	0.848-0.886
F3 - Suport parental	0.952 (excellent)	0.945-0.958
F4 - Aprobarea partenerului	0.923 (excellent)	0.912-0.933
F5 - Subminare parentală	0.892 (good)	0.877-0.907
F6 - Expunere la conflict	0.945 (excellent)	0.935-0.951

Table 5. Pearson correlation coefficients (r) between the Model 3 subscales and respondents' opinion about the couple's harmony and child's siding with only one parent

		Agreement	Closeness	Support	Endorsing	Undermining	Conflict exposure
Couple	r	0.665	0.790	0.839	0.764	-0.683	-0.690
harmony	Effect size	large	very large	very large	very large	large	large
Siding with one	r	-0.298	-0.199	-0.255	-0.233	0.322	0.349
parent	Effect size	small	small	small	small	small	average
Child's	r	-0.444	-0.422	-0.481	-0.468	0.456	0.453
distancing	Effect size	average	average	average	average	average	average
Affecting the	r	-0.507	-0.480	-0.527	-0.501	0.521	0.520
child	Effect size	large	average	Large	large	large	large

(*) In all cases, $p=0.000$

correlation with the subscales of Parental Closeness, Parental Support and Parental Undermining (negative) while the effect size is somehow lower, but still important, for the subscales of Parental Accord and Conflict Exposure (negative). This can be explained by the fact that respondents accepted that even in a solid couple there are subjects for disagreement but also that problems in the relationship may not always be discussed in the presence of the child (although it is a quite common occurrence). The second question was about the respondents' perception of the child's tendency to side with only one parent in case of disagreement. The only correlation with an average effect size is the one regarding the Exposure to Conflict subscale – here, the specific way in which each partner addresses a disagreement in the couple (linked to his/her personality, education, stress level, etc.) may influence a decision of the child (for instance, siding with the less aggressive parent).

The third question was about the respondents' perception that parental conflict resulted in a complete distancing of the child from one of the parents. The correlation was of average size for all scales (negative for factors F1-F4 and positive for the F5 and F6 factors) – probably in a prolonged conflict, the child feels more stable if they put some distance between them and the parent perceived as "bad". The fourth question was more general, about the respondents' evaluation of how much the child is affected by tensions in the parental couple – the correlation coefficients indicate a large effect for all

factors (negative for the first factors and positive for the factors F5 and F6) excepting the subscale Coparenting Closeness that is perceived as having only an average effect (meaning that there is a level of parental disagreement that is acceptable even in the most successful couples).

DISCUSSION

Based on the literature, emphasizing the need for multidimensional measures of coparenting (Feinberg et al., 2012), the current study aimed to provide support for the psychometric properties of the adapted version of the Coparenting Relationships Scale in a sample of Romanian parents. Using confirmatory factor analysis, the final factor solution with six subscales and 28 items was found to be acceptable, unlike the original version of the scale, consisting of 7 factors and 35 items (Feinberg et al., 2012). One subscale, i.e., division of labor, was eliminated from the analysis since it consisted of only two items. Similarly, other studies found no support for a factor structure including the division of labor dimension (Lamela et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2020; Pinto et al., 2018), potentially due to the small number of items in the subscale or due to cultural reasons, such as highly gender-equal policies (Lee et al., 2018).

After the examination of the factor saturation of the scales and the Cronbach alpha values for the original 6 factors structure, five other items were eliminated

from the analysis. The same items showed relatively small factor loadings in a Portuguese sample (e.g., Lamela et al., 2018). However, the factor structure model resulted in the Portuguese sample is different from the original factor structure (Feinberg et al., 2012) and revealed a smaller fit when compared to the original one in the current sample. Therefore, our results support the original factor structure proposed by Feinberg et al. (2012). Such differences between samples from other countries might reflect cultural differences that are oftentimes mirrored in coparental behaviors (Feldman et al., 2010).

The Romanian version of the CRS revealed good internal consistency across all subscales, with coefficients similar to those obtained by Feinberg et al. All subscales of the Romanian version of the CRS were significantly related to dimensions of couple functioning (i.e., couple harmony) and child outcomes (e.g., siding with one parent, children's distancing). The smallest effect size was found for the association between subscales of the CRS and siding with one parent. Given the fact that siding with one parent was assessed by the parents themselves, non-significant results might be due to biases in parents' perceptions regarding their children's attitudes or to other factors determining the child to take the side of one parent, such as parental influence of one of the partners.

Implications for Practice and Research

The current study provides an adapted version of the CRS, that can be used by practitioners to assess levels of parental conflict and, consequently, to design interventions for children that may be affected by the poor quality of coparenting. The CRS is also a useful research instrument, helping to better understand coparenting practices in the Romanian cultural context and raise awareness on the need for coparenting interventions in couple therapy counseling, aimed at improving the adjustment to divorce of children affected by parental conflict. This is even more important considering that CRS has not been adapted in any Eastern culture so far, despite well-known cultural differences between Western and Eastern parental practices and coparenting dimensions (Dwairy and Achoui, 2010; Roman, 2001).

Limitations and Future Directions

The current study also has some limitations. Firstly, the Coparenting Relationships Scale is a self-report measure, providing a potentially biased perspective on coparenting quality. In future research, coparenting could be assessed both through observational (McHale et al., 2001) and self-report measures to provide a more accurate perspective on the quality of coparenting (Feinberg et al., 2012).

Secondly, participation in the study was voluntary,

which might make the current sample biased. For example, people who decided to take part in the study might be more motivated to share their parenting experiences due to relational difficulties with their partners, which might increase awareness of such issues. Future studies should consider aspects of parents' relational functioning, as well as personal characteristics that may have an impact on their perceptions of coparenting quality.

Thirdly, we did not investigate some psychometric characteristics for this scale, such as convergent and discriminant validity or test-retest reliability. As such, future studies should investigate whether the Romanian version of the CRS is significantly different from other measures of couples' functioning and parenting, such as the Dyadic Coping Inventory, which was also validated in a Romanian sample (Rusu et al., 2016) and whether coparenting scores are stable over time.

Conclusions

The current study contributes to the literature on coparenting by providing support for the psychometric validity of the Coparenting Relationships Scale (Feinberg et al., 2012) and by proposing an adapted version of the scale that can be used in Romanian samples.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors want to thank the members of the teams that participated in the process of translation and adaptation: Dr. Yolanda Catelly, Head of the Department of Communication in Modern Languages at the "Politehnica" University of Bucharest and Dr. Adriana Bulz, from the Foreign Language Department of the Technical Military Academy, Bucharest, as linguists; psih. Simona Ligia Tutunaru (integrative psychotherapist and linguist, English/German translator; psih. Laura Alexandra Măț (clinical psychologist), psih. Carmen Dolores Goșa (integrative psychotherapist, Romanian Institute for Integrative Psychotherapy); psih. Carmen Comșa (clinical psychologist, psychotherapist and psychological counsellor); psih. Ana Toma (PhD student, clinical psychologist, private practice) psih. Elena Chiriac (clinical psychologist, private practice) as psychologists.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

Anderson R (2020). Apart Yet Still Together: An

- Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis of How Coparents Navigate Conflict Post-divorce (Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University). Retrieved May 20, 2021 from <https://www.proquest.com/openview/7a3ded186a746753641d264e3c1646de/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=44156>
- Barton A W, Beach S R, Wells A C, Ingels J B, Corso PS, Sperr MC, ... , Brody G H (2018). The protecting strong African American families program: A randomized controlled trial with rural African American couples. *Prevention Science*. 19(7): 904-913.
- Bisson J, Andrew M (2007). Psychological treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). *Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 3.
- Bornstein MH (2019). *Handbook of Parenting: Volume 1: Children and Parenting* (3rd ed.). Routledge
- Cabrera NJ, Scott M, Fagan J, Steward-Streng N, Chien N (2012). Coparenting and children's school readiness: A mediational model. *Family process*. 51(3): 307-324.
- Cangur S, Ercan I (2015). Comparison of model fit indices used in structural equation modeling under multivariate normality. *J. Modern Applied Statistical Methods*. 14(1):14. Retrieved June 7, 2021 from
- Carvalho T R D, Barham E J, Souza C D D, Böing E, Crepaldi A, Vieira M L (2018). Cross-cultural adaptation of an instrument to assess coparenting: Coparenting Relationship Scale. *Psico-USF*. 23: 215-227.
- Civelek M E (2018). *Essentials of structural equation modeling. Essentials of Structural Equation Modeling*.
- Dwairy M, Achoui M (2010). Parental control: A second cross-cultural research on parenting and psychological adjustment of children. *J. Child and Family Studies*. 19(1): 16-22.
- Farr R H, Patterson C J (2013). Coparenting among lesbian, gay, and heterosexual couples: Associations with adopted children's outcomes. *Child development*. 84(4): 1226-1240.
- Favez N, Widmer E D, Frascarolo F, Doan MT (2019). Mother-stepfather coparenting in stepfamilies as predictor of child adjustment. *Family process*, 58(2): 446-462.
- Feinberg M E (2002). Coparenting and the transition to parenthood: A framework for prevention. *Clinical child and family psychology review*. 5(3): 173-195.
- Feinberg M E (2003). The internal structure and ecological context of coparenting: A framework for research and intervention. *Parenting: Science and Practice*. 3(2): 95-131.
- Feinberg M E, Brown L D, Kan M L (2012). A multi-domain self-report measure of coparenting. *Parenting*. 12(1): 1-21.
- Feldman R, Masalha S, Derdikman-Eiron R (2010). Conflict resolution in the parent-child, marital, and peer contexts and children's aggression in the peer group: A process-oriented cultural perspective. *Developmental Psychology*. 46(2): 310-325.
- Ferraro AJ, Malespin T, Oehme K, Bruker M, Opel A (2016). Advancing co-parenting education: Toward a foundation for supporting positive post-divorce adjustment. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*. 33(5): 407-415.
- Fletcher R, May C, Attia J, Garfield C F, Skinner G (2018). Text-based program addressing the mental health of soon-to-be and new fathers (SMS4dads): Protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *JMIR research protocols*. 7(2): e37.
- Francia L, Millier P (2015). Mastery or misery: Conflict between separated parents a psychological burden for children. *J. Divorce & Remarriage*. 56(7): 551-568.
- Galovan A M, Schramm D G (2017). Initial coparenting patterns and postdivorce parent education programming: A latent class analysis. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*. 58(3): 212-226.
- Gliem JA, Gliem RR (2003). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales. *Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education*. Retrieved September 23, 2021 from <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/344>
- Herrero M, Martínez-Pampliega A, Alvarez I (2020). Family communication, adaptation to divorce and children's maladjustment: The moderating role of coparenting. *Journal of Family Communication*. 20(2): 114-128.
- Hetherington E M, Stanley-Hagan M (1999). The adjustment of children with divorced parents: A risk and resiliency perspective. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*. 40(1): 129-140.
- Iliescu D (2017). *Adapting tests in linguistic and cultural situations*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved July 8, 2021 from [https://books.google.ro/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Jxs3DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=Iliescu,+D.+\(2017\).+Adapting+tests+in+linguistic+and+cultural+situations.+Cambridge+University+Press.&ots=kOoosSkMFM&sig=Blgv7vS_QQx8-emxPqDJA1VLEb0&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Iliescu%2C%20D.%20\(2017\).%20Adapting%20tests%20in%20linguistic%20and%20cultural%20situations.%20Cambridge%20University%20Press.&f=false](https://books.google.ro/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Jxs3DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=Iliescu,+D.+(2017).+Adapting+tests+in+linguistic+and+cultural+situations.+Cambridge+University+Press.&ots=kOoosSkMFM&sig=Blgv7vS_QQx8-emxPqDJA1VLEb0&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Iliescu%2C%20D.%20(2017).%20Adapting%20tests%20in%20linguistic%20and%20cultural%20situations.%20Cambridge%20University%20Press.&f=false)
- Kan ML, Feinberg ME (2015). Impacts of a coparenting-focused intervention on links between pre-birth intimate partner violence and observed parenting. *Journal of family violence*. 30(3): 363-372.
- Lamela D, Figueiredo B (2016). Coparenting after marital dissolution and children's mental health: a systematic review. *Jornal de Pediatria*. 92(4): 331-342.

- Lamela D, Figueiredo B, Bastos A, Feinberg M (2015). Typologies of post-divorce coparenting and parental well-being, parenting quality and children's psychological adjustment. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*. 47(5): 716-728.
- Lamela D, Morais A, Jongenelen I (2018). Validação psicométrica da Escala da Relação Coparental em mães portuguesas. *Avances en Psicología Latinoamericana*. 36(3): 585-600.
- Lavner JA, Barton AW, Beach SR (2019). Improving couples' relationship functioning leads to improved coparenting: A randomized controlled trial with rural African American couples. *Behavior therapy*. 50(6): 1016-1029.
- Lee JK, Feinberg ME, Wells MB (2021). The Swedish Brief Coparenting Relationship Scale: Psychometrics and Concurrent Validity Among Primiparous and Multiparous Fathers. *Family Relations*. 70(3): 823-839.
- Linares L O, Rhodes J, Montalto D (2010). Perceptions of coparenting in foster care. *Family Process*. 49(4): 530-542.
- McHale JP, Kuersten-Hogan R, Lauretti A (2001). Evaluating coparenting and family-level dynamics during infancy and early childhood: The Coparenting and Family Rating System. In P. K. Kerig & K. M. Lindahl (Eds.), *Family observational coding systems: Resources for systemic research* (pp. 151-170). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McLeod S A (2019). What does effect size tell you. *Simply psychology*.
- Morgan PJ, Jones RA, Collins CE, Hesketh KD, Young MD, Burrows TL, ... Campbell K J (2016). Practicalities and research considerations for conducting childhood obesity prevention interventions with families. *Children*. 3(4): 24.
- National Institute of Statistics (2006). *Romanian Statistical Yearbook 2006*. Bucharest. Retrieved April 2021 from https://insse.ro/cms/files/Anuar%20arhive/serii%20de%20date/2006/ASR_2006.pdf
- National Institute of Statistics (2010). *Romanian Statistical Yearbook 2010*. Bucharest. Retrieved April 2021 from https://insse.ro/cms/files/Anuar%20arhive/serii%20de%20date/2010/pfd/ASR%202010_romana.pdf
- National Institute of Statistics (2020). *Romanian Statistical Yearbook 2020*. Bucharest. Retrieved April 14, 2021 from https://insse.ro/cms/sites/default/files/field/publicatii/anuarul_statistic_al_romaniei_carte_1.pdf
- Pascall G, Manning N (2000). Gender and social policy: comparing welfare states in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. *J. European Social Policy*. 10(3): 240-266.
- Pinto TM, Figueiredo B, Feinberg M E (2019). The coparenting relationship scale—father's prenatal version. *J. of Adult Development*. 26(3): 201-208.
- Roman D (2001). Gendering Eastern Europe: Pre-feminism, prejudice, and east-west dialogues in post-communist Romania. *Women's studies international forum*. 24(1).
- Rusu P P, Hilpert P, Turliuc M N, Bodenmann G (2016). Dyadic coping in an eastern European context: Validity and measurement invariance of the Romanian version of dyadic coping inventory. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*. 49(4): 274-285.
- Seijo D, Fariña F, Corras T, Novo M, Arce, R. (2016). Estimating the epidemiology and quantifying the damages of parental separation in children and adolescents. *Frontiers in psychology*. 7:1611.
- Shimkowski J R, Schrod P (2012). Coparental communication as a mediator of interparental conflict and young adult children's mental well-being. *Communication Monographs*. 79(1): 48-71.
- Solmeyer A R, Feinberg M E (2011). Mother and father adjustment during early parenthood: The roles of infant temperament and coparenting relationship quality. *Infant Behavior and Development*. 34(4): 504-514.
- Symoens S, Colman E, Bracke P (2014). Divorce, conflict, and mental health: How the quality of intimate relationships is linked to post-divorce well-being. *J. Appl. Social Psychology*, 44(3): 220-233.
- Teubert D, Pinquart M (2010). The association between coparenting and child adjustment: a meta-analysis. *Parent Sci Pract*. 10:286-307.
- Visser M, Finkenauer C, Schoemaker K, Kluwer E, van der Rijcken R, van Lawick J, ... Lamers-Winkelmann F (2017). I'll never forgive you: High conflict divorce, social network, and co-parenting conflicts. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*. 26(11):
- Yárnoz-Yaben S, Garmendia A (2016). Parental divorce and emerging adults' subjective well-being: The role of "carrying messages". *J. Child and Family Studies*. 25(2): 638-646.
- Zilincikova Z. (2020) Children's living arrangements after marital and cohabitation dissolution in Europe. *J. Family Issues*. 42(2): 345-373.

Annex I

CRS – Romanian Form

Vă rugăm să răspundeți la întrebările de mai jos gândindu-vă la felul în care procedați/gândiți dumneavoastră de obicei în relația cu celălalt părinte al copilului, indiferent de statusul marital pe care îl aveți (căsătorit, comuniune consensuală, divorțat).

1. Consider că partenerul/a meu/a este un părinte bun.
 2. Relația cu partenerul/a meu/a este mai puternică acum decât înainte de a avea un copil.
 3. Partenera/partenerul meu îmi cere părerea cu privire la probleme legate de creșterea și educarea copiilor.
 4. Partenerul/a meu/a îmi oferă multă atenție copilului nostru.
 5. Partenerului/partenerii meu/mele îi place să se joace cu copilul și apoi ei îmi lasă mie munca grea (să strâng în urma lor). (R)
 6. Eu și partenerul meu împărtășim aceleași țeluri pentru copilul nostru.
 7. Partenerul/a meu/a se concentrează în continuare pe sine în loc să fie un părinte responsabil. (R)
 8. Este mai ușor și mai amuzant să mă joc cu copilul singur/ă decât atunci când este și partenerul/a meu/a prezent/ă.
 9. Partenerul/a meu/a și eu avem idei diferite despre cum să ne creștem copilul. (R)
 10. Partenerul/a meu/a îmi spune că fac o treabă bună sau îmi arată în alte feluri că sunt un părinte bun.
 11. Partenerul/a meu/a și cu mine avem idei diferite în ceea ce privește mâncatul, dormitul și alte rutine ale copilului nostru. (R)
 12. Partenerul/a meu/a câteodată face glume sau comentarii sarcastice despre felul în care sunt eu ca părinte.
 13. Partenerul/a meu/a nu are încredere în abilitățile mele de părinte.
 14. Partenerul/a meu/a este sensibil/ă la nevoile și sentimentele/emoțiile copilului nostru.
 15. Partenerul/a meu/a și eu avem standarde diferite pentru comportamentul copilului nostru. (R)
 16. Partenerul/a meu/a încearcă să arate că este mai bun/ă decât mine în îngrijirea copilului nostru.
 17. Mă simt apropiat/ă de partenerul/a meu/a atunci când îl/o văd jucându-se cu copilul nostru.
 18. Partenerul/a meu/a are multă răbdare cu copilul nostru.
 19. Deseori discutăm despre cel mai bun mod de a împlini nevoile copilului nostru.
 20. Partenerul/a meu/a nu își îndeplinește în mod corect/echitabil partea lui/ei de responsabilități de părinte. (R)
 21. Când suntem toți trei împreună, câteodată partenerul/a meu/a concurează cu mine pentru atenția copilului nostru.
 22. Partenerul/a meu/a discreditează capacitatea mea de a fi părinte.
 23. Partenerul/a meu/a este dispus/ă să facă sacrificii personale pentru a ajuta la îngrijirea copilului nostru.
 24. Creștem și ne maturizăm împreună prin experiențele noastre ca părinți.
 25. Partenerul/a meu/a apreciază cât de mult mă străduiesc să fiu un părinte bun.
 26. Când mă simt copleșit(ă) ca părinte, partenera/partenerul meu îmi oferă sprijinul suplimentar de care am nevoie.
 27. Partenerul/a meu/a mă face să mă simt că sunt cel mai bun părinte posibil pentru copilul nostru.
 28. Stresul de a fi părinți ne-a făcut pe mine și pe partenerul/a meu/a să ne îndepărtăm unul de celălalt. (R)
 30. Rolurile de părinți ne-au furnizat un obiectiv comun pentru viitor.
- Într-o săptămână tipică, atunci când toți trei (dvs, celălalt părinte și copilul) sunteți împreună, cât de des se întâmplă unul din fenomenele de mai jos?
31. Se întâmplă să te afli într-o interacțiune ușor tensionată sau sarcastică cu partenera/partenerul tău?
 32. Să vă certați cu partenerul/a despre copilul vostru în prezența copilului?
 33. Să vă certați despre relația voastră sau problemele maritale ce nu au legătură cu copilul, în prezența copilului?
 34. Unul sau amândoi să vă spună lucruri crude/nemiloase sau dureroase în fața copilului?
 35. Țipați unul la celălalt când copilul este în preajmă și vă poate auzi?

Items grouping according to the original Feinberg al. (2012) scales:

Coparenting Agreement = Items 6, 9, 11, 15

Coparenting Closeness = Items 2, 17, 24, 28, 30

Exposure to Conflict = Items 31-35

Coparenting Support = Items 3, 10, 19, 25, 26, 27

Coparenting Undermining = Items 8, 12, 13, 16, 21, 22

Endorse Partner Parenting = Items 1, 4, 7, 14, 18, 23

Division of Labor = Items 5, 20

Items grouping according to the Lamela et al. (2018) scale:

Coparenting Agreement = Items 9, 11, 15

Coparenting Closeness = Items 2, 17, 24, 30

Exposure to Conflict = Items 31-35

Coparenting Support = Items 3, 10, 19, 25, 26, 27

Coparenting Undermining = Items 8, 12, 13, 16, 21, 22

Endorse Partner Parenting = Items 1, 4, 14, 18, 23, 29

Items grouping according to the Romanian adaptation scales:

Coparenting Agreement = Items 9, 11, 15

Coparenting Closeness = Items 2, 17, 24, 30

Exposure to Conflict = Items 31-35

Coparenting Support = Items 3, 10, 19, 25, 26, 27

Coparenting Undermining = Items 12, 13, 16, 21, 22

Endorse Partner Parenting = Items 1, 4, 14, 18, 23, 29