



Stockholm  
University

[www.suda.su.se](http://www.suda.su.se)

---

**Demography Unit**

Stockholm University  
Department of Sociology  
Demography Unit

# Shared Physical Custody and Children's Experience of Stress

Jani Turunen

**Stockholm  
Research Reports  
in Demography  
2016: 08**

---

*© Copyright is held by the author(s). SRRDs receive only limited review. Views and opinions expressed in SRRDs are attributable to the authors and do not necessarily reflect those held at the Demography Unit.*

# Shared Physical Custody and Children's Experience of Stress

*Jani Turunen*

Stockholm University

**Abstract:** This paper studies shared physical custody in Sweden, the country where the phenomenon is most prevalent. We ask whether children in shared physical custody settings are more likely to report high levels of stress compared to children living in sole custody. The analysis is based on data with combined information from parents, children and administrative registers. We control for inter-parental as well as parent-child relationship quality and parents' income. The results show that children sharing residence equally have lower likelihood of experiencing high levels of stress. The results can be interpreted as evidence for a positive effect of continuing everyday-like parental relationships after a family dissolution.

The emergent complexity of family forms in the past decades has received a lot of attention within the social sciences and while the evidence for a negative association of divorce and other family structure transitions is considerable the literature on shared physical custody of children is much more limited, especially based on randomly selected nationally representative samples. The likely reason is the fact that it still is relatively rare in most countries. This paper studies children in Sweden, a country that is often considered a forerunner in development of new family life patterns that are soon followed by other industrialized countries. Shared residence for children is still a relatively new phenomenon in Sweden, but has quickly become increasingly common. This study analyses children's likelihood of experiencing stress in shared physical custody settings with shared and alternating residence after parental union dissolution.

One should not confuse shared *physical* custody and shared residence with shared *legal* custody. Whereas shared legal custody only gives both parents the legal right to decisions about the child's upbringing, school choices, religion etc. 50/50 shared residence means that the child actually *lives* equal, or near equal, time with both parents, alternating between separate households. This makes it possible for both parents to engage in active parenting and gives children the possibility to have ongoing contact with both parents after separation. But living in two different households and alternating not just between two geographical locations but also potentially between two different "parental regimes" with different rules and customs may create instability and increase children's ill-being like the feeling of stress.

In this paper I ask whether children in shared physical custody settings are more likely to report high levels of stress compared to children living in another type of residential setting.

### **Shared physical custody and child wellbeing**

The negative association between family structure changes or living in post-divorce family settings and a wide variety of child outcomes is a well-established finding in the family studies literature (among many see for example Amato, 2001; McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994; Sweeney, 2010; Thomson et al., 1994). Shared physical custody as a more recent phenomenon is far less studied and the findings has not yet been as widely theorized as in case of child outcomes of divorce, single parent or stepfamily life.

In the Swedish legislation promoting shared legal and residential custody the policies are motivated by the best interest of the child and its need to maintain a close contact with both parents after a union dissolution and (Proposition 1997/98:7; Proposition 2005/06:99). Shared physical custody and shared residence can however theoretically predict both positive as well as negative associations with child wellbeing.

One way in which shared residential custody can ameliorate harmful effects of family dissolution is by limiting loss of parental resources, both social and financial, something that has been shown to mediate some of the adverse outcomes of divorce (see for example McLanahan, 1999; Thomson et al. 1994; Sweeney, 2007). Economic theory argues that not having access to the child weakens a parent's incentives to invest in it, explaining the financial strain in post-separation sole custody families (Weiss & Willis 1985).

By sharing custody and care of the child it can also benefit from a steady contact with both parents. A steady everyday-like contact strengthen the parent-child bond and facilitate the kind of authoritative parenting style, with high levels of support and control, that has found to be positive for child development (Amato and Gilbreth, 1999). This style of parenting has been shown to be more common among fathers with shared physical custody compared to those whose children reside with the mother (Bastaitis et al. 2012). A stronger parent-child bond could also provide a stronger safety net for the child consisting of not just the parent in question but also his or her social networks. Sharing physical custody may reduce the workload for a single parent, offer greater flexibility for work, increase cooperation between parents and reduce conflicts and potential disputes (see Emerey, 1999). Each parent may also become more competent in their parenting roles by having the full responsibility half of the time. Having continuous contact with both parents may decrease children's experience of stress created by worrying for the absent parent or feeling responsibility to take care of a parent (Maccoby & Mnookin 1992).

On the other hand shared physical custody can also be argued to decrease children's emotional wellbeing. Children may become stressed from a lack of stability due to constant changes of households (see Bauserman 2002). Besides changing physical location a child may also need to constantly adapt to large differences in parenting regimes creating emotional instability (Maccoby & Mnookin 1992).

It goes without saying that parental relationships that have ended in a divorce or separation are likely to be conflicted and that these parents might not always get along very well. One of the main objections to shared physical custody has been the risk of

increased stress created by children getting caught up in high conflict parental relationships (see Bauserman 2002; Maccoby & Mnookin 1992). Others have argued that shared custody is preferable even when the parents have a conflicted relationship because a secure contact with both parents ameliorates the negative effect of a parental conflict (Fabricius & Luecken 2007; Bender 1994). Economic theory predicts, on one hand, that a higher investment in a child, in this case caring for it half of the time, increases the risk of parental conflicts because each parent has a stronger incentive to control this investment. On the other hand not having contact with the child may reduce the investment of the non-custodial parent and increase conflict due to feelings of injustice from the point of view of the custodial one (Hanson et al. 1994).

Any association between shared physical custody and child wellbeing could also be spuriously produced by selection of parents with certain pre-existing characteristics that are associated with wellbeing of the child. The shared physical custody parents could for example have higher socioeconomic status and more resources as it has been shown that these socioeconomic groups are more likely to be early adaptors of new family behaviors (see for example Blossfeld et al., 1995; Härkönen & Dronkers, 2006; Lesthaeghe, 2010). They may also have more cooperative personalities, lower inter-parental conflict levels and be more child-oriented in general. Children of these parents are more likely to do well in general and the parents are more likely to opt for a shared custody arrangement after splitting up.

### **Review of empirical literature**

Shared physical custody research is still a nascent field and the literature is relatively limited compared to the general literature on post-divorce wellbeing. Many studies rely

on small non-random samples that are not nationally representative and many of the child outcome studies are based on children of high conflict parents and court cases. For a research field with such a limited amount of publications there are surprisingly many research reviews on shared physical custody and children's wellbeing (Bauserman, 2002; Buchanan & Jahromi, 2008; Fehlberg et al., 2011; Gilmore, 2006; Harris-Short, 2010; Nielsen, 2011; Nielsen 2013a; Nielsen 2013b; Nielsen 2014a; Nielsen 2014c; Smyth & Moloney, 2008; Smyth, 2009; Strous, 2011; Trinder, 2010; Warshak, 2014) which likely reflects a growing interest from policy makers and legal professionals due to changes, or planned changes, in custody legislation.

The previous research has in general presented positive associations between shared physical custody and child wellbeing but the literature varies greatly in quality and methodology. Some rely on clinical or court based non-random samples whereas others use nationally representative samples of parents or children. The findings pointing to mixed or adverse outcomes of shared physical custody tend to be from non-random samples (Neoh & Mellor, 2010; Smart et al. , 2001) and from studies of children from high conflict parents (McIntosh, Burns et al., 2010; McIntosh, Smyth et al. 2010). A study based on the Fragile Families project with an over-representation of impoverished and never-married parents in large American cities showed some negative associations between children's attachment and over-night visits to the father, although the overall pattern was inconclusive (Tornello et al 2013). A Belgian study with representative data from the region of Flanders did however show shared physical custody to be negatively associated with children's wellbeing not only when parents' relationship was conflicted

but also when the child had a bad relationship with one of the parents (Vanassche et al. 2013).

The longitudinal Stanford Custody Project showed that children who lived in shared custody were emotionally better off after four years than those who lived in a sole custody setting (Maccoby & Mnookin 1992). Higher wellbeing for those in shared physical custody compared to sole custody has been found for both small children (Lee 2002) as well as college students (Fabricius & Luecken 2007).

Recent reviews of the research on shared physical custody by Nielsen (2011: 2013a; 2013b) presents a rather positive picture of the findings with the vast majority pointing to a positive association with different measures of child wellbeing. A widely cited meta-analysis by Bauserman (2002) showed that children in shared legal or physical custody were better adjusted than those in sole custody settings, when it came to general adjustment, family relationships, self-esteem, emotional and behavioral adjustment but not academic adjustment. Furthermore they presented no difference in behavioral adjustment compared to children in original two-parent families.

Most of the research in the field has hitherto been conducted in Anglophone countries. But in a large sample multilevel analysis of children's life satisfaction in 36 countries Bjarnason and colleagues (2012) showed that children in shared physical custody settings reported higher levels of life satisfaction than those in other divorced or separated families but that this was an effect of higher family affluence. They also showed that the relative difference between children of different family structures were similar in all countries, supporting previous comparative findings (Breivik & Olweus, 2006b), but that children in the Nordic countries had higher levels of wellbeing compared to children in



the same family type in countries with a less generous welfare state model. In a similar multi-level analysis of school aged children in 36 countries Bjarnason and Arnarsson (2011) showed that children in shared physical custody had equal or better communication with their parents compared to those in two-parent families, which have been supported in a later study (Carlslund et al., 2012). They also showed that even though the child spends less time in a certain household the quality as well as quantity of time together with parents is higher in shared physical custody (Bjarnason & Arnarsson 2011).

Some studies comparing children of shared physical custody with those in original two-parent families in the Nordic countries, have shown that these children are in most parts equally well off when it comes to subjective health or subjective wellbeing (Breivik & Olweus, 2006; Fransson et al. 2016; Hagquist 2015; Jablonska & Lindberg, 2007) whereas others find that children in post-divorce family types are more at risk for negative outcomes but with children in shared custody being better off than those in sole custody (Carlslund, Eriksson, Löfstedt & Sellström 2012; Bergström et al. 2013; Bergström et al. 2014; Bergström et al. 2015). Others do not find a difference between shared and sole physical custody when it came to subjective health or subjective wellbeing (Carlslund, Eriksson & Sellström 2012). Continental European studies have shown slightly positive effects of shared physical custody for children compared to living in a sole custody arrangement (Haugen 2010; Spruijt & Duindam, 2010; Vanassche et al. 2013).

Few studies have dealt explicitly with children's experience of stress but Melli and Brown (2008) showed that children of divorce in Wisconsin had fewer stress related

illnesses as well as less depression and other health problems in shared physical custody compared to sole mother custody. In a longitudinal study of post-divorce custody arrangements children in shared physical custody were better off academically, emotionally and psychologically and less stressed by feeling they needed to care for their mother. Children in both residential settings were more likely to feel stressed and depressed when there were large differences in parenting styles (Buchanan & Maccoby, 1996). A Swedish study of 157 adolescents, aged 14 to 16, measuring salivary cortisol, a hormone linked to stress, and comparing adolescents in original two-parent homes with those in shared physical custody showed no statistically significant difference between these two groups (Fransson et al. 2014). This study did however not include children in sole physical custody.

Most of the studies hitherto are cross-sectional and rarely have measures on pre-divorce characteristics so it is difficult to say whether there is a positive selection of parents with certain traits into shared custody arrangements. The cross-sectional evidence does however show somewhat higher education and income among those with shared custody (Juby et al., 2005; Kitteröd & Lyngstad, 2012; Melli & Brown, 2008) as well as lower levels of conflict and more inter-parental cooperation (Bauserman, 2002; Öberg & Öberg, 2004). Sodermans and colleagues (2013) have shown that an earlier over-representation of parents with low conflict levels has disappeared over time as shared physical custody has become more prevalent. Although presenting some differences in parental characteristics between the two types of custody arrangements both Nielsen (2011; 2013a; 2013b) and Melli and Brown (2008) conclude that the parents with shared physical custody of children do not differ greatly from those with sole custody.

## **The Swedish context**

This paper focuses on children in Sweden, a country that is often considered a forerunner in family demographic behaviors like cohabitation, divorce, childbearing across partnerships and family reconstitution (van de Kaa, 2001). Sweden has a wide acceptance for different family forms (Trost, 1996) as well as a relatively high share of children living with their father after separation. Among the first countries in the world Sweden introduced no-fault divorce legislation in 1915 and unilateral no-fault divorce in 1974 (Sandström, 2012). It is among the countries with the highest degree of change when it comes to family structure dynamics and one of the countries with the highest proportion of parental union dissolutions closely following the United States (Andersson 2002).

Sweden is also the country with the highest share of children living in shared physical custody arrangements (Bjarnason & Arnarsson, 2011). Children have frequent contact with the other parent even when they do not share residence equally with about 85% of all children who do not have shared residence visiting the non-resident parent at least once per month (Statistics Sweden, 2011).

The Swedish child custody laws are a result of policy makers' ambition to make family life more gender equal and have developed in this direction since the 1970's along with other family policies like individual taxation of married couples or gender neutral parental leave for example (Schiratzki, 2008). The laws and policies have aimed at enforcing fathers' caring obligations both within unions, regardless of marital status, as well as after a union dissolution (Bergman & Hobson, 2002).

In 1977 joint legal custody after union dissolution, for both previously cohabiting and married parents, could be granted by court if it was in the best interest of the child and both parents agreed on it. In 1982 joint legal custody could be agreed upon by the parents without court decision. In 1992 a presumption for joint legal custody was introduced making it the default option after a parental separation and in 1998 the courts could grant joint legal-, as well as physical, custody even in cases where one of the parents was against it. In 2006 this was modified somewhat, putting more emphasis on the parents' ability to co-operate, as well as the child's own will, before the custody ruling. The vast majority of Swedish post-separation custody arrangements are agreed upon by parents without any involvement of the courts. Custody is disputed in around 10% of the cases but most of the parents come to an agreement after mediation by social services, a lawyer, a court appointed mediator or a judge, and in less than 2 percent of the divorces or separations involving children the final custody arrangement is decided by a judge (Schiratzki, 2008).

In a qualitative study of separated and divorced families in Sweden (Öberg & Öberg, 2004) most parents motivated the decision to have joint physical custody with it being the most natural, reasonable and equal alternative. These parents regarded each other as good parents and saw no reason to deprive one of them from everyday life with the children.

The present study focuses on the Swedish case during the early 2000's, a period when the policy reforms promoting shared responsibility for children described above had been enacted and when shared physical custody had become a relatively common custody arrangement. Although the results are only representative for Sweden at the time, the

setting of study at a period in time when the phenomenon was neither a novelty nor a norm, makes it more comparable to other countries where the prevalence of shared custody arrangements today are similar to, or developing towards, the situation in Sweden at the time. Using data with information on self-reported stress and parent-child relationship quality gathered from the children and inter-parental relationship quality gathered from parents contributes to the previous literature that generally has not taken these important, possibly confounding, factors into account.

### **Data**

The data for this study are from the Surveys of Living Conditions (ULF) from 2001, 2002 and 2003, the first years when the survey was accompanied by a child supplement. The cross-sectional surveys consist of a nationally representative sample of the Swedish population aged 18 to 84 and child supplements with data collected from children aged 10-18 living in the household of the main respondent. The total response rate was 75% (Statistics Sweden, 2005). The data collection was done through in-home interviews and carried out by trained professional interviewers from Statistics Sweden. The children were interviewed on a wide range of topics on living conditions and wellbeing simultaneously with the parent's interview after informed consent had been obtained from both legal guardians. 82% of the children residing with the adult respondent agreed to participate in the interview with the response rate being somewhat higher among younger adolescents and among those whose parent, and not stepparent, was the respondent in the adult interview. In this paper children's reports are used on issues that can be assumed are better known by children themselves than their parents, such as questions regarding their experience of stress and relationships with parents. Parents'

reports are used for questions that children might not have accurate information about such as parents' conflict level. Information on the child's living arrangements is also from the parents' reports. Furthermore information from administrative registers were added and linked to the respondents. For this study information from registers are used for respondent's income.

Although child-based surveys have become more common, surveys using a combination of child and adult reports are still quite rare (Jonsson & Östberg, 2010). Comparisons of child and parent reports have shown that parents overestimate the emotional wellbeing of their children (Jonsson & Östberg, 2010; Waters et al., 2003) and that children misreport parental characteristics like educational attainment (Engzell & Jonsson, 2015) as well as a difference in the reporting of household socioeconomic characteristics, like the number of books in the home (Jerrim & Mickelwright, 2012) thus making the use of parent-child data important.

The original sample consisted of 4084 children of whom 73% lived with two biological, or adoptive, parents, 9% with a single mother, 4% with a single father, 10% with a mother and a stepparent and 3% with a father and a stepparent. Less than 1% lived in another type of family setting, like foster parents or with a sibling or grandparent. As this study focuses on the subsample of children who have experienced a parental union dissolution and lived with a single parent or in a stepfamily the ones living with two biological parents, in foster care or with other relatives were dropped. Further only those children whose both parents were alive were kept dropping another 28 cases. To be able to measure inter-parental relationship quality level based on a survey question on how well the two divorced or separated parents agree on matters regarding the child,

respondents who are not the parent of the child, i.e. stepparents were dropped, leaving us with 825 children. Finally 11 children are dropped due to lack of information on residential arrangements and 3 children are dropped because of missing data on the dependent variable leaving us with a final sample of 807 children.

### **Modeling and method**

The dependent variable; children's experience of stress, is based on the child's own report on the question how often he/she has felt stressed during the last six months with five response options ranging from daily to rarely or never. After an initial multinomial regression of this five-category variable and the independent variable showing that only the two categories with the highest frequency of stress were correlated with residential setting (see Findings) the variable was dichotomized to a dummy for the child's experience of stress with children reporting stress more than once per week categorized as a high stress group with the value one and all others with the value zero.

The independent measure is a three-category variable for residential setting with a category for children who are reported (by the parent) to live full time in one household, not full but most of the time in one household and those with shared residence living equal, or near equal, time in both parental households.

The child's socioeconomic background is controlled for by a variable for the parent's income after taxes based on information linked to the surveys from administrative registers. This is a three-category variable with one category for those in the bottom quartile of the income distribution, one for the top quartile and one for the two middle quartiles for each survey year. Models with different definitions of income like pre-tax income, household income and different categorizations like quartiles, quintiles,

continuous and logged were estimated without changing the overall results or the correlation between income and the dependent variable. Models with measures for parent's occupational class as well as highest educational attainment were also estimated as well as all combinations of these variables and parental income. Goodness of fit testing showed however that the model with income provided a better fit than models with either of the other two dimensions of socioeconomic status and combining income with either education or occupation did not significantly improve the model fit nor did it change the overall results.

The model also controls for the age and sex of the child and the parent, parents' immigrant status, the number of children in the household, whether the child lives in a stepfamily setting and whether the child lives in the Stockholm metropolitan area, the other metropolitan areas in Sweden or outside of them. The model also include a categorical variable for inter-parental relationship quality, based on a question on how well the parental respondent gets along with the other parent the on matters regarding the focal child. The variable ranges in five steps from very well to very badly. Measures for parent-child relationship quality were skewed towards the positive end with 88 percent and of the children reporting getting along very well or well with their mother and 78 percent with their father. Therefore a dummy variable was constructed with children reporting getting along "quite badly" or "very badly" with either their mother or their father coded as one. Alternative models with parent-child relationship variables with different cut-offs and the full range from very positive to very negative were also estimated without changing the overall results or improving model goodness of fit.



I use logistic regression to estimate the child's likelihood of being in the high stress group, meaning experiencing stress daily or several times per week and estimate average marginal effects to determine the effect size of the correlations. Because the sampling for the surveys was done on parental level the probability to be in the sample for a child in a two-parent family is twice as high as for a child living with a single parent. Weights are therefore used to adjust for this. In order to control for clustering, i.e. more than one child from the same family in the sample, I have used robust standard errors by using Stata's cluster-command.

### **Findings**

Of the children in the sample 60% live full time with one parent, 11% live most of the time with one parent and 29% share residence equally between two parental households. Of the children with equally shared residence 74% commute weekly between two households, 13% commute fortnightly, 4% every other day, and the rest have some other unspecified arrangement. The dependent variable was based on a survey question about how often the child felt stressed with the response options: 1. Daily, 2. Several times per week, 3. Once per week, 4. A few times per month and 5. Rarely or never. The mean was 3.55 and the standard deviation 1.16. An initial multinomial regression analysis on this variable with showed a statistically significant negative correlation ( $p < 0.05$ ) between living in a shared physical custody setting and experiencing stress daily (coeff. -1.43) and feeling stressed several times per week (coeff. -0.54) compared to those living full time with one parent, with the base outcome being feeling stressed rarely or never. The other outcome categories were not significantly different from the base category. Children

living some of the time with both parents but not sharing equally did not show any statistically significant difference to those living full time with one parent.

Table 1 shows the frequencies and percentages for each variable category. Of the 807 children 23% report stress more than once per week. Those reporting stress daily make up 3,5% of the sample (not presented in table). Models with a narrower definition of high levels of stress, i.e. child reporting daily experience of stress, was estimated and the results pointed in the same direction. In this sample of children not living with both their parents in the same household 29% have equal, or roughly equal, residence in both households, 11% live some of the time, but not equally, in both households and 60% live full time with one parent.

[Table 1 here]

Table 2 presents cross tabulations of the dependent variable with all other covariates. We can see that belonging to the high stress category is more common in among children living full-time with one parent. The children living equally in two households have a slightly higher share reporting stress several times per week than their peers sharing residence between both parental households but without having an equal residential setting. Surprisingly we can see a positive income gradient with more children of high earners belonging to the high stress category than children of both low and medium earners. We can also see a clear age gradient for the child's age and a somewhat less pronounced one for parent's age with more of the children in the higher age categories belonging to the high stress group. More girls than boys report experiencing stress several times per week. Children with parents reporting disagreement on matters regarding the

child as well as children reporting conflict with the parent are both more common in the high stress group than are those without conflicted relations.

[Table 2 here]

Table 3 presents all variables by type of residential arrangement. We can see that more of the children with shared residence belong to the high income category and fewer to those with the lowest income compared to those who do not share residence equally. The children living some of the time with the other parent are in between. Table 3 also shows that more boys than girls have equally shared residence. Disagreement on matters regarding the child is more common among those not sharing residence equally as is disagreement between parent and child suggesting that those who choose shared physical custody may be a select group of parents who have parted on more amicable terms. For this reason it is important to control for inter-parental relationship quality when analyzing outcomes of shared physical custody.

[Table 3 here]

The results of the multivariate logistic regressions are presented in table 4. Model 1 shows the bivariate association between stress and residential setting or custody type. In model 2 controls for covariates that can be assumed to most likely be exogenous to the outcome and the third model controls for inter-parental and parent-child conflict. The latter may be selective into living arrangements but could also be influenced by these. Overall we do not see any change in the association between residential setting and stress between models, children living full time with one parent have significantly higher likelihood of experiencing stress several times per week. The association does however become statistically non-significant for the middle category of children, who live most of

the time with one parent but have some shared residence, when we control for inter-parental and parent-child conflict.

In the full model (model 3) children sharing housing equally have significantly lower risk of belonging to the high stress group with an odds ratio of 0.58 compared to the children who live full time with one parent. As mentioned above, I also estimated a model with a more narrow definition of stress with those reporting stress daily as the outcome (3% of the sample). The results (not presented in table) pointed however in the same direction although the odds ratio was as low as 0.29 ( $p < 0.1$ ). Average marginal effects were also estimated showing a 8,5 percentage points lower predicted probability of belonging to the high stress category for children in shared physical custody compared to those living full time with one parent ( $p < .05$ ). We can thus conclude that having equally shared residence is associated with markedly lower likelihood of stress for the children. The main finding is robust across different model specifications (see different specifications under Modeling and method) and remains after controlling for parental characteristics like income and the level of conflict between parents, as well as child characteristics like age, sex and parental relationship quality. Having some shared residence, but not living equally in both households, is not significantly different from living full time with one parent, or sharing equally. This is however a small (87 cases or 11%) and heterogeneous group.

[Table 4 here]

The independent variables present both expected and unexpected patterns. Girls are more likely to report high levels of stress compared to boys and children of parents who report high levels of disagreement on matters regarding the child have a higher risk of being

stressed. Interaction between both relationship quality variables and the shared physical custody variable was tested without finding any significant interaction effect on the association with experience of stress. The parental income show a surprising positive gradient with the children of high income parents reporting higher levels of stress compared to the children of the parents in the bottom quartile. The difference between the highest- and the middle income category is however not statistically significant. Models with different categorizations and definitions of income, including pre- and post-tax income, household income, log income and income quartiles as well as quintiles were estimated without changing the pattern. This finding may be due to lower demands on children from low income families when it comes to school results or extracurricular activities (see for example Lareau, 2003). An interaction between parental income and the independent variable was tested without finding any statistically significant interaction effect.

## **Conclusion**

This paper explores the relationship between post-separation custody form and children's perceived stress and shows that children in Sweden sharing residence equally after a parental union dissolution are less likely to report high levels of stress compared to those living full time in one parental household. The finding is in line with recent research on shared physical custody and other aspects of children's wellbeing from Sweden (Bergström et al. 2013; Bergström et al. 2014; Bergström et al. 2015; Fransson et al. 2016; Hagquist 2015; Jablonska & Lindberg, 2007) as well as other countries (for summary see for example Nielsen, 2013b). Unlike these studies the present study controls for important potentially confounding factors like parent-child relationship quality, inter-

parental relationship quality and parental income. These factors did however not change the association between living in shared custody and children's self-reported stress.

There are various mechanisms that may explain the lower stress levels for children who live alternately in two households. The first explanation is that sharing and alternating residence limits a loss of parental resources, both economic and social, that affect the wellbeing of children. Economic theory predicts that a parental investment in a child is greater when the parent has higher control of the investment, something that shared physical custody provides. A second interpretation lies in the notion that having a steady everyday-like contact between the child and both parents after a divorce, rather than living with one and seeing the other occasionally or on weekends, creates a stronger relationship and facilitates a parenting style that is beneficial for children's wellbeing (Bastaits et al. 2012). It is also plausible that sharing the burden of childrearing is beneficial for the parent who otherwise would have been a single carer, reducing the workload and offering greater possibilities for work and other non-child centered activities. Similarly it may help both parents develop in their roles and competence as parents.

Previous research has been inconclusive when it comes to the question on whether children's wellbeing is benefitted by having any degree of shared residence (Vanassche et al. 2013) or whether a certain threshold level is necessary as has been shown by Fabricius and colleagues (2012). The present study show no statistically significant difference between having some shared physical custody compared to sharing equally or living full time with one parent. This is however a small and very heterogeneous group in the Swedish context and regrettably the present data does not identify the share of time lived

with each parent when it is less than half time but more than full time. It is important for future research to further investigate how varying types of custody arrangements differ when it comes to children's wellbeing.

The current study does have some limitations. First, we do not have longitudinal data allowing for causal modelling. So although we for example control for relationship quality we cannot know whether high-conflict couples are less likely to choose shared custody or whether the custody form fosters positive relationships. We can however draw the conclusion that the association between custody type and stress is not explained by parental conflict or differences in income for example. The data was collected in 2001-2003 which means that it does not reflect the current situation in Sweden where shared physical custody has continued growing in popularity among separated families. It is however important to also use data from this period when the phenomenon started to become widespread, especially when comparing to the situation in other countries where it is growing but has not reached the same levels as current day Sweden.

The research field is still under rapid development. It was for along time dominated by small sample studies, sometimes based on high conflict cases such as custody cases in courts. More Recent studies have however used larger, randomly selected samples but more studies on large population based samples, using information from parents as well as children, are needed. It is also important to dig deeper into the causal mechanisms behind any association between child outcomes and shared physical custody and investigate whether different groups of children are affected differently by this. In order to do this it is necessary that questions on residential arrangements are included in data collection in cross-sectional surveys, prospective survey designs and in the form of

retrospective residential and custody histories. By doing this we can start to explain how custody arrangements affect children. Based on the results of the present analysis, as well as other recent studies, we can however at least say that shared physical custody does not seem to be harming children and adolescents who have experienced a parental separation. On the contrary it seems to be a protective factor against the well documented negative effects of a parental union dissolution.

**Acknowledgements:** I am grateful to Lawrence Berger, Linda Nielsen and Elizabeth Thomson for reading earlier drafts of this paper and for providing useful comments. The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement no. 320116 for the research project FamiliesAndSocieties.



## References

- Amato, P. (2001) Children of divorce in the 1990s: An update of the Amato and Keith (1991) meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15(3): 355-370.
- Amato, P. and Gilbreth, J. (1999) Nonresident Fathers and Children's Wellbeing: A Meta-Analysis, *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61: 557-573
- Andersson, G. (2002). Children's experiences of Family Disruption and Family Formation: Evidence From 16 FFS Countries. *Demographic Research* 7:343-64.
- Bastaitis, K., Ponnet, K. & Mortelmans, D. (2012) Parenting of Divorced Fathers and the Association with Children's Self-Esteem. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 41:1643–1656
- Bauserman, R. (2002) Child Adjustment in Joint-Custody Versus Sole-Custody Arrangements: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 16: 91–102
- Bender, W.N. (1994). Joint Custody: The option of choice. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 21: 115-131
- Bergman, H. and Hobson, B.(2002). Compulsory fatherhood: the coding of fatherhood in the Swedish welfare state, in Hobson, B. *Making Men into Fathers. Men, Masculinities and the Social Politics of Fatherhood*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Bergström, M., Fransson, Hjern, A., Köhler, L. and Wallby, T. (2014). Mental health in Swedish children living in joint physical custody and their parents' life satisfaction: A cross-sectional study. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology* 55: 433-439

- Bergström, M., Modin, B., Fransson, E. Rajmil, L. Berlin, M., Gustafsson, P. and Hjern, A. (2013). Living in two homes-a Swedish national survey of wellbeing in 12 and 15 year olds with joint physical custody. *BMC Public Health* 13:864
- Bergström, M., Fransson, E., Modin, B., Berlin, M., Gustafsson, P.A., Hjern, A. (2015). Fifty moves a year: is there an association between joint physical custody and psychosomatic problems in children? *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 69:769-774.
- Bjarnason, T. and Arnarsson, Á. (2011). Joint Physical Custody and Communication with Parents in 37 Western Societies. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 42: 871–890.
- Bjarnason T, Bendtsen P, Arnarsson AM, Borup I, Iannotti RJ, Löfstedt P, Haapasalo I and Niclasen, B. (2012). Life Satisfaction Among Children in Different Family Structures: A Comparative Study of 36 Western Societies. *Children & Society*.
- Blossfeld, H., de Rose, A., Hoem, J. and Rohwer, G. (1995). Education, Modernization, and the Risk of Marriage Disruption in Sweden, West Germany, and Italy. In Oppenheim Mason, K. and Jensen, A. (Eds), *Gender and Family Change in Industrialized Societies*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Breivik, K. and Olweus, D. (2006). Adolescents' Adjustment in Four Post-Divorce Family Structures: Single Mother, Stepfather, Joint Physical Custody and Single Father Families. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 44: 99-124.
- Breivik, K. and Olweus, D. (2006b). Children of divorce in a Scandinavian welfare state: Are they less affected than US children? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 47: 61–74.

- Buchanan C., and Jahromi, P. (2008). A psychological Perspective on Shared Custody Arrangements. *Wake Forest Law Review* 2:419-439.
- Buchanan, C., & Maccoby, E. (1996). *Adolescents after divorce*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Carlslund, Å, Eriksson, U., Sellström, E. (2012). Shared physical custody after family split-up: implications for health and wellbeing in Swedish schoolchildren. *Acta Paediatrica* 102(3): 318–323.
- Carlslund, Å, Eriksson, U., Löfstedt, P. & Sellström, E. (2012). Risk behaviour in Swedish adolescents: is shared physical custody after divorce a risk or a protective factor? *European Journal of Public Health*, 23(1): 3–8
- Emery, R. (1999). *Marriage, divorce, and children's adjustment* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Engzell, P., & Jonsson, J. O. (2015). Estimating Social and Ethnic Inequality in School Surveys: Biases from Child Misreporting and Parent Nonresponse. *European Sociological Review*, 31(3): 312-325
- Fabricius, W., and Luecken, L. (2007) Postdivorce living arrangements, parent conflict and physical health for children of divorce. *Journal of Family Psychology* 21: 195–205.
- Fabricius, W., Diaz, P. and Braver, S. (2011). Parenting time, parent conflict, parent-child relationships, and children's physical health. In *Parenting plan evaluations: Applied research for the Family Court.*, Edited by: Kuehnle, K. and Drozd, L. New York, , NY: Oxford University Press.

- Fehlberg, B., Smyth, B., Maclean, M. and Roberts, C. (2011). Legislating for shared time parenting after separation: A research review. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family*. 25: 318-337
- Fransson, E., Turunen, J., Östberg, V., Hjern, A. & Bergström, M. (2016). Psychological complaints among children in joint physical custody and other family types: Considering parental factors. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health* 44: 177–183
- Fransson, E., Folkesson, L., Bergström, M., Östberg, V. & Lindfors, P. (2014). Exploring salivary cortisol and recurrent pain in mid-adolescents living in two homes. *BMC Psychology* 2(46)
- Gilmore, S. (2006) Contact/Shared residence and Child Wellbeing: Research Evidence and its Implications for Legal Decision-Making. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family* 20:344-365
- Harris-Short, S. (2010). Resisting the march towards 50/50 shared residence: rights, welfare and equality in post-separation families. *The Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*. 32: 257-274.
- Haugen, G. (2010) Children's perspectives on shared residence. *Children and Society* 24, 112–122.
- Härkönen, J. and Dronkers, J. (2006). Stability and change in the educational gradient of divorce: A comparison of seventeen countries. *European Sociological Review*, 22: 501-517.
- Jerrim, J. & Micklewright, J. (2012) *Socioeconomic gradients in children's cognitive skills: Are cross-country comparisons robust to who reports family background?* DoQSS Working Paper No. 12-06. Institute of Education, University of London.

- Jonsson, J.O. and Östberg, V. (2010) Studying Young People's Level of Living: The Swedish Child-LNU. *Child Indicators Research*, 3:47–64.
- Juby, H., Le Bourdais, C., and Marcil-Gratton, N. (2005). Sharing roles, sharing custody? Couples' characteristics and children's living arrangements at separation. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67: 157-172.
- Kitteröd, R. and Lyngstad, J. (2012). Untraditional caring arrangements among parents living apart: The case of Norway. *Demographic Research* 27:121-152
- Lareau, A. (2003) *Unequal Childhoods. Class, Race and Family Life*. Berkeley: University of California press.
- Lee, M. (2002) Children's adjustment in maternal and dual residence arrangements. *Journal of Family Issues* 23: 671–687.
- Lesthaeghe , R. (2010) The Unfolding Story of the Second Demographic Transition. *Population and Development Review* 36:211-251
- Maccoby, E., and Mnookin, R. (1992) *Dividing the child*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- McIntosh, J., Burns, A., Dowd, N., & Gridley, H. (2010). *Parenting after separation*. Melbourne: Australian Psychological Society.
- McIntosh, J., Smyth, B., Kelaher, M., Wells, Y., Long, C. (2010). *Post-separation parenting arrangements: Patterns and developmental outcomes for infants and children*. Collected reports. Three reports prepared for the Australian Government Attorney-General's Department, Canberra.

- McLanahan, S. S. (1999). Father absence and the welfare of children. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Coping with divorce, single parenting, and remarriage: A risk and resiliency perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McLanahan, S. S., and Sandefur, G. (1994). *Growing up with a single parent: What hurts, what helps*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- McLanahan, S., Seltzer, J., Hanson, T. and Thomson. E. (1994). Child Support Enforcement and Child Wellbeing: Greater Security or Greater Conflict. In Garfinkel, I. McLanahan, S. and Robins, P. (eds.), *Child Support and Child Wellbeing*. New York: Ford Foundation and Foundation for Child Development.
- Melli, M., & Brown, P. (2008). Exploring a new family form: The shared time family. *International Journal of Law, Policy and Family*, 22, 231–269.
- Nielsen, L. (2011). Shared Parenting After Divorce: A Review of Shared Residential Parenting Research, *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 52: 586-609
- Nielsen, L. (2013a). Shared Residential Custody: Review of the Research (Part I of II). *American Journal of Family Law* 27:61-72
- Nielsen, L. (2013b). Shared Residential Custody: Review of the Research (Part II of II). *American Journal of Family Law* 27:123-137
- Nielsen, L. (2014a). Parenting Plans for Infants, Toddlers, and Preschoolers: Research and Issues, *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 55: 315-333.
- Nielsen, L. (2014b). Wozzles: Their role in custody law reform, parenting plans, and family court. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 20: 164-180
- Nielsen, L. (2014c). Shared Physical Custody: Summary of 40 Studies on Outcomes for Children. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 55: 613-635

- Proposition 1997/98:7 Vårdnad, boende och umgänge [Government Bill 1997/98:7 Custody, residence and relations]
- Proposition 2005/06:99 Nya vårdnadsregler [Government Bill 2005/06:99 New custody rules]
- Sandström, G. (2012). *Ready, Willing and Able. The Divorce Transition in Sweden 1915-1974*. Umeå University.
- Schiratzki, J. (2008) *Mamma och pappa inför rätta*. Iustus, Stockholm
- Smart, C. Neale, B. and Wade, A. (2001). *The changing experience of childhood: Families and divorce*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Smyth, B. and Moloney, L. (2008) Changes in patterns of post-separation parenting over time: A brief review. *Journal of Family Studies* 14:7-22.
- Smyth, B. (2009). A 5 year retrospective of shared care research in Australia. *Journal of Family Studies* 15: 36–59.
- Sodermans, AK, Matthijs, K. and Swicegood, G. (2013). Characteristics of joint physical custody families in Flanders. *Demographic Research*, 28: 821-848
- Spruijt, E. and Duindam, V. (2010). Joint Physical Custody in The Netherlands and the Wellbeing of Children. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 51:65-82.
- Statistics Sweden. (2005). *Barns villkor*. Levnadsförhållanden rapport 110, Statistiska Centralbyrån, Stockholm
- Statistics Sweden (2011): *Barns sociala relationer*. Levnadsförhållanden rapport 119, Statistiska Centralbyrån, Örebro.

- Strous, M. (2011) *Overnights and overkill: post-divorce contact for infants and Toddlers, South African Journal of Psychology, 41: 196-206*
- Sweeney, M. (2007). Stepfather families and the emotional wellbeing of adolescents. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 48: 33 – 49*
- Sweeney, M. (2010). Remarriage and stepfamilies: Strategic sites for family scholarship in the 21st century. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72, 667–684.*
- Thomson, E., Hanson, T. L., and McLanahan, S. S. (1994). Family Structure and Child Wellbeing: Economic Resources vs. Parental Behaviors. *Social Forces, 73: 221-242.*
- Tornello, S., Emery, R., Rowen, J., Potter, D., Ocker, B., & Xu, Y. (2013). Overnight custody arrangements, attachment and adjustment among very young children. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 75: 871–885*
- Trinder, L. (2010). Shared residence: Review of recent research evidence. *Family Law, 40, 1192–1195.*
- Trost, J. (1996). Family structure and relationships: The dyadic approach. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 27: 395-408.*
- Van de Kaa, D. J. (2001). Demographic Transition, *Second. International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences, 5: 3486-3488.*
- Vanassche, S, Sodermans, AK, Matthijs, K and Swicegood, G. (2013). Commuting between two parental households: The association between joint physical custody and adolescent wellbeing following divorce. *Journal of family Studies 19: 139-158*
- Warshak, R. (2014). Social science and parenting plans for young children. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law, 20, 46–67.*



Waters, E., Stewart-Brown, S. and Fitzpatrick, R. (2003) Agreement between adolescent selfreport and parent reports of health and wellbeing: results of an epidemiological study. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 29:501-509.

Weiss, Y. and Willis, R. (1985). Children as Collective Goods and Divorce Settlements. *Journal of Labor Economics* 3:268-292

Öberg, B. and Öberg, G. (2004). *Skiljas - men inte från barnen* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Stockholm: Mardeld.

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics.**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Number of respondents</b>	807	100%
<b>Child is stressed several times per week</b>		
Yes	625	77%
No	182	23%
<b>Residential setting</b>		
Full time with one parent	485	60%
Mostly with one parent	87	11%
Joint physical custody	235	29%
<b>Income category</b>		
Lowest 25%	210	26%
Mid 50%	462	57%
Highest 25%	135	17%
<b>Age of child</b>		
10-12	296	37%
13-15	290	36%
16-18	221	27%
<b>Age of adult respondent</b>		
≤35	116	14%
36-40	205	25%
41-45	271	34%
≥46	215	27%
<b>Sex of child</b>		
Boy	415	51%
Girls	392	49%
<b>Sex of parent</b>		
Man	222	28%
Woman	585	72%
<b>Immigrant status</b>		
At least one parent born in Sweden	736	91%
Both parent born outside of Sweden	71	9%
<b>Number of children in household</b>		
1	191	24%
2	315	39%
3	219	27%
≥4	82	10%
<b>Place of residence</b>		
Metropolitan Stockholm	125	16%
Other metropolitan areas	98	12%
Rest of Sweden	584	72%
<b>Parental relationship quality</b>		
Parents get along very well	250	31%
... well	228	28%
... neither well nor badly	129	16%
...quite badly	70	9%
... very badly	92	11%
Missing	38	5%
<b>Parent-child conflict</b>		
No	748	93%
Yes	59	7%
<b>Stepfamily</b>		
No	506	63%
Yes	301	37%

Data source: Child-ULF 2001, 2002 &amp; 2003

**Table 2: Descriptive statistics. All variables by dependent variable.**

Variable	Stressed		Not stressed	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Residential setting</b>				
Full time with one parent	126	26%	359	74%
Mostly with one parent	14	16%	73	84%
Joint physical custody	42	18%	193	82%
<b>Income category</b>				
Lowest 25%	35	17%	175	83%
Mid 50%	110	24%	352	76%
Highest 25%	37	27%	98	73%
<b>Age of child</b>				
10-12	54	18%	242	82%
13-15	68	23%	222	77%
16-18	60	27%	161	73%
<b>Age of adult respondent</b>				
≤35	24	21%	92	79%
36-40	46	22%	159	78%
41-45	61	23%	210	77%
≥46	51	24%	164	76%
<b>Sex of child</b>				
Boy	71	17%	344	83%
Girl	111	28%	281	72%
<b>Sex of parent</b>				
Man	47	21%	175	79%
Woman	135	23%	450	77%
<b>Immigrant status</b>				
At least one parent born in Sweden	159	22%	577	78%
Both parent born outside of Sweden	23	32%	48	68%
<b>Number of children in household</b>				
1	49	26%	142	74%
2	64	20%	251	80%
3	49	22%	170	78%
≥4	20	24%	62	76%
<b>Place of residence</b>				
Metropolitan Stockholm	35	28%	90	72%
Other Metropolitan areas	19	19%	79	81%
Rest of Sweden	128	22%	458	78%
<b>Parental relationship quality</b>				
Parents get along very well	54	30%	196	31%
... well	41	23%	187	30%
... neither well nor badly	36	20%	93	15%
... quite badly	17	9%	53	9%
... very badly	30	16%	62	10%
Missing	4	2%	34	5%
<b>Parent-child conflict</b>				
No	163	22%	585	78%
Yes	19	32%	40	68%
<b>Stepfamily</b>				
No	113	22%	393	78%
Yes	69	23%	232	77%

Data source: Child-ULF 2001, 2002 &amp; 2003

**Table 3: Descriptive statistics. Independent variables by child's residential setting.**

Variable	Full time with one parent		Mostly with one parent		Joint physical custody	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
<b>Income category</b>						
Lowest 25%	156	74%	25	12%	29	14%
Mid 50%	281	61%	45	10%	136	29%
Highest 25%	48	35%	17	13%	70	52%
<b>Age of child</b>						
10-12	153	52%	38	13%	105	35%
13-15	170	59%	32	11%	88	30%
16-18	162	73%	17	8%	42	19%
<b>Age of adult respondent</b>						
≤35	83	72%	11	9%	22	19%
36-40	121	59%	19	9%	65	32%
41-45	141	52%	33	12%	97	36%
≥46	140	65%	24	11%	51	24%
<b>Sex of child</b>						
Boy	239	58%	45	11%	131	32%
Girl	246	63%	42	11%	104	26%
<b>Sex of parent</b>						
Man	73	33%	25	11%	124	56%
Woman	412	70%	62	11%	111	19%
<b>Immigrant status</b>						
At least one parent born in Sweden	430	59%	83	11%	223	30%
Both parent born outside of Sweden	55	77%	4	6%	12	17%
<b>Number of children in household</b>						
1	132	69%	20	11%	39	20%
2	179	57%	28	9%	108	34%
3	131	60%	17	8%	71	32%
≥4	43	52%	22	27%	17	21%
<b>Place of residence</b>						
Metropolitan Stockholm	54	43%	18	15%	53	42%
Other Metropolitan areas	81	83%	3	3%	14	14%
Rest of Sweden	350	60%	66	11%	168	29%
<b>Parental relationship quality</b>						
Parents get along very well	120	48%	25	10%	105	42%
... well (ref.)	132	58%	36	16%	60	26%
... neither well nor badly	88	68%	10	8%	31	24%
... quite badly	36	51%	11	16%	23	33%
... very badly	81	88%	2	2%	9	10%
Missing	28	74%	3	8%	7	18%
<b>Parent-child conflict</b>						
No	437	58%	83	11%	228	31%
Yes	48	81%	4	7%	7	12%
<b>Stepfamily</b>						
No	301	59%	44	9%	161	32%
Yes	184	61%	43	14%	74	25%

Data source: Child-ULF 2001, 2002 &amp; 2003

**Table 4. Logistic regression: Likelihood of frequent feeling of stress**

Variable	Odds ratio		Odds ratio		Odds ratio	
	Model 1	S.E.	Model 2	S.E.	Model 3	S.E.
<b>Residential setting</b>						
Full time with one parent (ref.)	1		1		1	
Mostly with one parent	0.55 *	0.18	0.54 *	0.20	0.63	0.23
Shared residence	0.56 ***	0.12	0.55 **	0.14	0.56 **	0.16
<b>Income category</b>						
Lowest 25%			0.52 **	0.15	0.51 **	0.14
MId 50% (ref.)			1		1	
Highest 25%			1.36	0.38	1.35	0.38
<b>Age of child</b>						
10-12			0.75	0.18	0.74	0.18
13-15 (ref.)			1		1	
16-18			1.30	0.32	1.26	0.31
<b>Age of parent</b>						
≤35 (ref.)			1		1	
36-40			0.86	0.31	0.92	0.34
41-45			0.76	0.30	0.84	0.34
≥46			0.67	0.26	0.69	0.27
<b>Sex of child</b>						
Boy (ref.)			1		1	
Girls			1.88 ***	0.35	1.88 ***	0.35
<b>Sex of parent</b>						
Man (ref.)			1		1	
Woman			1.22	0.29	1.16	0.28
<b>Immigrant status</b>						
At least one parent born in Sweden (ref.)			1		1	
Both parent born outside Sweden			1.91 *	0.64	1.80 *	0.60
<b>Number of children in household</b>						
1 (ref.)			1		1	
2			0.93	0.22	0.96	0.23
3			1.02	0.30	1.07	0.32
≥4			1.13	0.23	1.22	0.63
<b>Place of residence</b>						
Metropolitan Stockholm (ref.)			1		1	
Other Metropolitan areas			0.63	0.27	0.65	0.28
Rest of Sweden			0.74	0.23	0.73	0.23

<b>Stepfamily</b>				
No (ref.)	1		1	
Yes	1.08	0.24	1.19	0.27
<b>Parental relationship quality</b>				
Parents get along very well			1.49	0.39
... well (ref.)			1	
... neither well nor badly			1.72	0.50
...quite badly			1.80	* 0.63
... very badly			2.01	** 0.65
<b>Parent-child conflict</b>				
No (ref.)			1	
Yes			1.49	0.51
<b>Constant</b>			0.31	** 0.16

\*\*\*  $p \leq 0.01$  \*\*  $p \leq 0.05$  \*  $p \leq 0.10$

Data source: Child-ULF 2001, 2002 & 2003