

Shared Physical Custody and Children's Experience of Stress

Jani Turunen

Stockholm University Demography Unit (SUDA), Department of Sociology

Work in progress. Please do not quote or cite without author permission.

Abstract

This paper studies shared physical custody in Sweden. We ask whether children in 50/50 shared physical custody settings are more likely to report high levels of stress compared to children living with a single parent or with a parent and a stepparent most of the time. The analysis uses logistic regression analysis and is based on the Swedish Surveys of Living Conditions (ULF). These are nationally representative rich datasets with information from both parents and children containing a wide variety of relevant control variables. The results show a pattern with children living in a shared physical custody setting with alternating residence between the households of the mother and the father reporting a markedly lower likelihood of feeling stressed.

Introduction

The emergent complexity of family forms in the past decades has got 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 reason is likely the fact that it still is relatively rare in most countries. This paper studies children in Sweden, a country that is often considered a fore-runner 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. The phenomenon has however not yet been widely analyzed. 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 well-being

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; 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.

Shared physical custody and shared residence can however theoretically predict both positive as well as negative associations with child well-being. One way in which it 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 (see for example McLanahan, 1999; Thomson et al. 1994; Sweeney, 2007). By sharing custody and care of the child it can benefit from a steady contact with both parents. A steady everyday-like contact can also strengthen the parent-child bond and facilitate the kind of authoritative parenting style that Amato and Gilbreth (1999), in a meta-analysis of nonresident fathers' role in children's well-being, found to be positive for child development (Gilmore, 2006). Shared residence can also reduce the work load for a single parent, increase the parent's cooperation and reduce conflicts and potential custody disputes (see Emery, 1999). 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 (see Nielsen, 2002).

On the other hand joint physical custody can also be argued to decrease children's emotional well-being. 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 changes in parenting regimes creating emotional instability. Opponents of shared physical custody have also warned for stress created by children getting caught up in high conflict parental relationships (see Bauserman, 2002).

Any association between shared physical custody and child well-being could also be spuriously produced by selection of parents with certain pre-existing characteristics that are associated with well-being of the child. The shared physical custody families 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 adopters of new family behaviors (see for example Blossfeld et al., 1995; Härkönen & Dronkers, 2006; Lesthaeghe, 2010). They can also have lower inter-parental conflict levels and be more child-oriented in general.

Review of empirical literature

Shared physical custody research is still a nascent field and the literature is rather limited. Many studies rely on small non-random samples that are not nationally representative and a considerable share 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 well-being (Bauserman, 2002; Buchanan & Jahromi, 2008; Fehlberg et al., 2011; Gilmore, 2006; Harris-Short, 2010; Nielsen, 2011; Smyth & Moloney, 2008; Smyth, 2009; Trinder, 2010) 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 emotional well-being 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. There are also differences in whose reports are used for measuring the well-being of the child with some using parent's reports and others information directly from the child. Another

factor making comparisons between studies harder are different definitions of shared physical custody, with definitions like living at least 25 percent, 33 percent, 35 percent or 50 percent with each parent. However the literature do tend to point in the direction of the absolute amount of time with a parent being less important than the quality of the relationship (see for example Gilmore, 2006). Another issue is the choice of reference category. Some studies compare children with shared physical custody to those living full time with one parent (usually the mother) whereas some compare these two groups to children living with two non-separated biological parents and other studies do not have a comparison group altogether. Although theoretical guidance for choosing comparison group can vary, one could argue that in most cases the relevant comparison for children in shared physical custody would be other children of separated parents living in only one household, the counterfactual for living with shared custody being living with one parent rather than not having separated parents at all.

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 recent review of the research on shared physical custody in non-high conflict families presents a rather positive picture of the findings with the vast majority pointing to a positive association with different measures of child well-being (Nielsen, 2011). A widely cited meta-analysis by Bauserman (2002) showed that children in joint physical custody were better adjusted than those in sole custody settings, on all categories of adjustment except academic, and presented no difference in behavioral adjustment compared to children in original two-parent families. Advising against a legal presumption for shared physical custody Gilmore

(2006) concludes in his review that although parental contact after divorce is beneficial for child development the benefits are rather small and it can in cases of high parental conflict have adverse effects.

Most of the research in the field has hitherto been conducted in the Anglophone countries. But in a large sample multilevel analysis of children's life satisfaction in 36 countries Bjarnason and colleagues (2010) showed that children in shared physical custody settings reported higher levels of life satisfaction than those in other non-intact 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 well-being 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, which have been supported in a later study (Carlslund et al., 2012), and 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.

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 (Breivik & Olweus, 2006; Jablonska & Lindberg, 2007) whereas others find that children in post divorce family types are more at risk for negative outcomes but no difference between shared and sole physical custody (Carlslund et al., 2012). Other continental European studies have shown slightly

positive effects of joint physical custody for children as well as parents, especially fathers (Spruijt & Duindam, 2010; Sodermans 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 experienced less stress 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 style (Buchanan & Maccoby, 1996).

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). Although presenting some differences in parental characteristics between the two types of custody arrangements both Nielsen (2011) and Melli and Brown (2008) conclude that the parents with shared physical custody of children do not differ greatly from those with sole custody. It is however important to control for both socioeconomic factors as well as parental cooperation and conflict when studying the well-being of children in different custody arrangements and to keep this in mind when reading studies based on child data without parental reports on these issues.

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. It is also among the countries with the highest degree of change when it comes to family structure dynamics, closely following the United States. Andersson (2002) shows that in 16 Western- and Central European countries as well as the USA, the proportion of children having experienced a parental separation by age 15 range between 50 percent in the US and 9 percent in Italy. In Sweden 34 percent of the children had experienced a separation making it one of the countries with the highest proportion of parental union dissolutions.

Sweden is also the country with the highest share of children living in joint physical custody arrangements (Bjarnason & Arnarsson, 2011). The development has been quite rapid with about 1 % of children of divorce, separation or non-union birth sharing residence equally between two parental households in the mid 1980's to over one fourth twenty years later (Lundström, 2009). 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 50/50 shared residence visiting the non-resident parent at least once per month (Statistics Sweden, 2011). Studies based on Swedish administrative registers have shown that the average geographical distance between children and non-coresident parents has decreased during the past 20 years which has been interpreted as an effect of the increased commonality of shared physical custody (Raneke, 2011; Stjernström & Strömgren, 2012).

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 shared 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 shared legal custody could be agreed upon by the parents without court decision. In 1992 a presumption for shared legal custody was introduced making it the default option after a parental separation and in 1998 the courts could grant shared 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 ruling for shared physical custody and shared residence for children. This year it also became possible for separated parents to divide the non-means tested monthly child allowance if the child shares residence roughly equally between both households (Schiratzki, 2008). The vast majority of Swedish post-separation custody arrangements are agreed upon by parents without any involvement of the courts. Of the parents who cannot agree on an arrangement most come to an agreement after lawyer- or court mediation and in less than 2 percent of the divorces or separations involving children the final custody arrangement is decided by the court (Schiratzki, 2008).

In a qualitative study of separated and divorced families in Sweden (Öberg & Öberg, 2004) most parents motivated the decision to have shared 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. They thought that parents need their children as well as children need both their parents and that none of the two parents is more important to the child than the other. Furthermore they thought that shared physical custody was a way for both parents to continue the parental ambitions they originally had when they had children.

Data

The data for this study is from the Surveys of Living Conditions (ULF) from 2001, 2002 and 2003 and the child supplements of these. The cross-sectional surveys consist of a nationally representative sample of the Swedish population aged 18. The total response rate was 75% (Statistics Sweden, 2005). The data collection was done through in-home interviews and carried out by trained interviewers from Statistics Sweden. For the child supplements children age 10-18 residing with the respondent were interviewed, providing unusually rich data from two different perspectives. 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, 2013) 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 children were interviewed simultaneously with the parent's interview after informed consent had been obtained from both legal guardians. While the parent was interviewed the children completed a self administered questionnaire while listening to the interview questions on headphones. The questionnaire had only the response options but not the questions and the child was asked to put it in an envelope, seal it and hand it to the interviewer immediately after having finished it, thus providing confidentiality to the child. 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 was the respondent in the adult interview.

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. This study focuses on the subsample of children who lived with a single parent or in a stepfamily. After dropping all children in the other family types the sample consists of 1081 children. To be able to measure inter-parental conflict level based on a survey question on how well the parents agree on matters regarding the child, only children whose biological parent was the survey respondent are kept in the

analytical sample, leaving us with 853 children. Finally 3 children are dropped because of missing data on the dependent variable leaving us with a sample of 850 children. Of these 28% share residence equally between two parental households. Of the children with shared residence 74% commute weekly between two households, 13% commute fortnightly, 4% every other day, and the rest have some other arrangement.

Modeling and method

The dependent variable is a dichotomous measure 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 1 and all others with the value 0.

The independent variable is a dummy for 50/50 shared residence with children who are reported (by the parent) to live equally, or roughly equally, in both parental households coded 1 and all other children 0.

The child's socioeconomic background is controlled for by a variable for the parent's income 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 was estimated without changing the overall results. Models with measures for parent's occupational class as well as highest educational attainment was also estimated as well as all combinations of these variables and parental income. All these models produced the same overall results. 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.

The model also controls for the age and sex of the child and the parent, whether the parent is a non-European immigrant, the number of children in the household, whether the child lives in a stepfamily setting and whether the child lives in one of the three metropolitan areas of Sweden or outside of them. A dummy variable for parental conflict, based on a question on how well the parent's agree on matters regarding the focal child, is constructed with those who reported agreeing "badly" or "quite badly" coded as 1. Similarly a measure for parent-child conflict was constructed with children reporting getting along "badly" or "very badly" with either their mother or their father coded as 1. All three of the original relationship measures are skewed towards the positive end with 56 percent of parents reporting getting along well or quite well with each other and 88 percent and of the children saying they get along well or quite well with their mother and 76 percent with their father. Alternative models with parental and parent-child relationship measured as categorical variables with values ranging 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 risk of being in the high stress group, meaning experiencing stress daily or several times per week. Since 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 applying Stata's cluster-command.

Findings

Table 1 shows the frequencies and percentages for each variable category. Of the 853 children 23% report stress more than once per week. Most of these report stress less than daily but 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 was estimated and the results pointed in the same direction and remained statistically significant ($p < .1$). Of the sample of children not living with both their parents in the same household 23% have equal, or roughly equal, residence in both households.

[Table 1 here]

Table 2 presents all variables by type of residential arrangement. We can see that belonging to the high stress category is more common among children who do not have equally shared residence. 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. Table 2 also shows that more boys than girls have shared residence and that a vast majority of the children of female respondents do not share residence equally. 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 conflict levels when analyzing outcomes of shared physical custody.

[Table 2 here]

The results of the multivariate logistic regression are presented in table 3. Children sharing housing equally have significantly lower risk of belonging to the high stress

group with an odds ratio of 0.56 compared to the children who do not have equal residence. As mentioned above, I also estimated a model with a more narrow definition of stress with those reporting stress daily as the outcome. The results (not presented in table 3) pointed however in the same direction although the odds ratio was as low as 0.3 but only significant on 10%-level. We can thus conclude that having equally shared residence is associated with markedly lower likelihood of stress for the children. This finding seems robust across different model specifications (see different specifications under Modeling and method) and remain 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.

[Table 3 here]

The control 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 significantly higher risk of being stressed. The parent-child conflict level is however not significantly associated with high stress level. Interaction between both variables and the shared physical custody variable was tested without finding any 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. 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 income and shared physical custody was tested without finding any increase in model goodness of fit.

Concluding remarks

Like some other recent studies of emotional outcomes of shared physical custody this study shows that sharing residence equally after a parental union disruption may not be harmful for children. On the contrary children in 50/50 shared residence have markedly lower likelihood of experiencing high levels of stress confirming positive findings on other aspects of emotional well-being. The results can be interpreted as evidence for a positive effect of continuing everyday-like parental relationships after a family dissolution and as support for the finding from Amato and Gilbreth's (1999) meta-analysis that authoritative parenting benefits children's development.

The research field is however still rather new but under rapid development. It has hitherto been dominated by small sample studies, often based on high conflict cases such as custody cases in courts. To draw inference from this to a general population of children in shared physical custody arrangements is of course as fruitful as basing analysis on marital happiness on divorce court proceedings. More studies on large population based samples and on different aspects of shared physical custody are needed. Besides other aspects of well-being, also differences in the effects by for example child's gender, age or time in different custodial and residential settings would be most welcome. It is also important to dig deeper into the causal mechanisms behind any association between child outcomes and shared custody. In order to do this it is necessary that questions on residential arrangements are included in data collection both in prospective survey designs as well as in the form of retrospective residential histories. By doing this we can start to explain how custody arrangements affect children. But from the results of the present analysis as well as other recent studies we can however at least start to say that shared physical custody does not seem to be harming children who have experienced a parental separation.

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 Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis, *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61(3): 557-573
- Andersson, G. (2002). Children's experiences of Family Disruption and Family Formation: Evidence From 16 FFS Countries. *Demographic Research* 7:343-64.
- Bauserman, R. (2002) Child Adjustment in Joint-Custody Versus Sole-Custody Arrangements: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Family Psychology*, (16)1: 91-102
- 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
- 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. (2010). 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(3-4): 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.
- Emery, R. (1999). *Marriage, divorce, and children's adjustment* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Engzell, P. and Jonsson, J. (2013). *Misreport and Non-Response Bias in Estimates of Socioeconomic and Ethnic Gradients in Schooling: Linking Pupil Reports, Parental*

Reports, and Registers. Paper presented at the ECSR Spring School on the Analysis of Educational Inequalities, Collegio Carlo Alberto, Turin, 18 - 22 March.

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(3): 318-337

Gilmore, S. (2006) Contact/Shared residence and Child Well-Being: 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(3): 257-274.

Härkönen, J. and Dronkers, J. (2006). Stability and change in the educational gradient of divorce: A comparison of seventeen countries. *European Sociological Review*, 22(5): 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 Österberg, 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(1): 157-172.

Kitteröd, R. and Lyngstad, J. (2012). Untraditional caring arrangements among parents living apart: The case of Norway. *Demographic Research* 27(5):121-152

Lareau, A. (2003) *Unequal Childhoods. Class, Race and Family Life*. Berkeley: University of California press.

Lesthaeghe, R. (2010) The Unfolding Story of the Second Demographic Transition. *Population and Development Review* (36)2:211-251

Lundström, K. (2009) Växelvis boende ökar bland skilsmässobarn. *Välfärd*, nr. 4.

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.
- Nielsen, L. (2011). Shared Parenting After Divorce: A Review of Shared Residential Parenting Research, *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 52(8): 586-609
- Raneke, A. (2011). Separerade föräldrar bor närmare varandra. *Välfärd*, nr. 4.
- 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(1):7-22.
- Smyth, B. (2009). A 5 year retrospective of shared care research in Australia. *Journal of Family Studies* (15): 36–59.
- Spruijt, E. and Duindam, V. (2010) Joint Physical Custody in The Netherlands and the Well-Being 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.
- Stjernström, O. & Strömgren, M. (2012) Geographical Distance between Children and Absent parents in Separated Families. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*,(94)3: 239–253
- Sweeney, M. (2007). Stepfather families and the emotional well-being of adolescents. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 48: 33 – 49
- Thomson, E., Hanson, T. L., and McLanahan, S. S. (1994). Family Structure and Child Well-Being: Economic Resources vs. Parental Behaviors. *Social Forces*, 73(1): 221-242.
- 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)2: 395-408.
- Van de Kaa, D. J. (2001). Demographic Transition, *Second. International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5: 3486-3488.
- Waters, E., Stewart-Brown, S. and Fitzpatrick, R. (2003) Agreement between adolescent selfreport and parent reports of health and well-being: results of an epidemiological study. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 29(6):501-509.
- Öberg, B. and Öberg, G. (2004). *Skiljas - men inte från barnen* (2nd ed.). Stockholm: Mardeld.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics.

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Number of respondents	850	100%
Child is stressed several times per week		
Yes	653	77%
No	197	23%
Child has 50/50 shared residence		
Yes	235	28%
No	615	72%
Income category		
Lowest 25%	217	26%
MId 50%	484	57%
Highest 25%	149	17%
Age of child		
10-12	319	36%
13-15	307	36%
16-18	234	28%
Age of adult respondent		
≤35	119	14%
36-40	209	24%
41-45	287	34%
≥46	235	28%
Sex of child		
Boy	438	52%
Girls	412	48%
Sex of parent		
Man	235	28%
Woman	615	72%
Non-European immigrant		
No	811	95%
Yes	39	5%
Number of children in household		
1	203	24%
2	336	39%
3	227	27%
≥4	84	10%
Place of residence		
Metropolitan Stockholm	132	15%
Metropolitan Gothenburg	66	8%
Metropolitan Malmö	41	5%
Rest of Sweden	611	72%
Parental conflict		
No	688	81%
Yes	162	19%
Parent-child conflict		
No	790	93%
Yes	60	7%
Stepfamily		
No	542	64%
Yes	308	36%

Data source: Child-ULF 2001, 2002 & 2003

Table 2: Descriptive statistics. All variables by type of custody.

Variable	50/50 shared residence		Not 50/50 shared residence	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Child is stressed several times per week				
Yes	42	21%	155	79%
No	193	30%	460	70%
Income category				
Lowest 25%	29	13%	188	87%
Mid 50%	136	28%	348	72%
Highest 25%	70	47%	79	53%
Age of child				
10-12	105	34%	204	66%
13-15	88	29%	219	71%
16-18	42	18%	192	82%
Age of adult respondent				
≤35	22	18%	97	82%
36-40	65	31%	144	69%
41-45	97	34%	190	66%
≥46	51	22%	184	78%
Sex of child				
Boy	131	30%	307	70%
Girl	104	25%	308	75%
Sex of parent				
Man	124	53%	111	47%
Woman	111	18%	504	82%
Non-European immigrant				
No	231	28%	580	72%
Yes	4	10%	35	90%
Number of children in household				
1	39	19%	164	81%
2	108	32%	228	68%
3	71	31%	156	69%
≥4	17	20%	67	80%
Place of residence				
Metropolitan Stockholm	53	40%	79	60%
Metropolitan Gothenburg	10	15%	56	85%
Metropolitan Malmö	4	10%	37	90%
Rest of Sweden	168	28%	443	73%
Parental conflict				
No	203	30%	485	70%
Yes	32	20%	130	80%
Parent-child conflict				
No	228	29%	562	71%
Yes	7	12%	53	88%
Stepfamily				
No	161	30%	381	70%
Yes	74	24%	234	76%

Data source: Child-ULF 2001, 2002 & 2003

Table 3: Logistic regression: probability of child having 50/50 shared residence.

Variable	Odds ratio	Robust S.E.	P-value
Child has 50/50 shared residence			
No	ref.		
Yes	0.56	0.14	0.021
Income category			
Lowest 25%	ref.		
Mld 50%	1.98	0.52	0.010
Highest 25%	2.76	0.97	0.004
Age of child			
10-12	0.68	0.16	0.106
13-15	ref.		
16-18	1.17	0.27	0.499
Age of adult respondent			
≤35	ref.		
36-40	0.87	0.32	0.700
41-45	0.78	0.30	0.516
≥46	0.71	0.27	0.369
Sex of child			
Boy	ref.		
Girls	1.90	0.35	0.000
Sex of parent			
Man	ref.		
Woman	1.05	0.24	0.846
Non-European immigrant			
No	ref.		
Yes	1.91	0.90	0.167
Number of children in household			
1	ref.		
2	0.82	0.19	0.400
3	1.02	0.28	0.947
≥4	1.06	0.48	0.899
Place of residence			
Metropolitan Stockholm	ref.		
Metropolitan Gothenburg	0.86	0.38	0.729
Metropolitan Malmö	0.62	0.30	0.324
Rest of Sweden	0.69	0.21	0.216
Parental conflict			
No	ref.		
Yes	1.56	0.34	0.042
Parent-child conflict			
No	ref.		
Yes	1.39	0.48	0.340
Stepfamily			
No	ref.		
Yes	1.04	0.22	0.867
Constant	0.21	0.11	0.002

Data source: Child-ULF 2001, 2002 & 2003