

Child Adjustment in Joint-Custody Versus Sole-Custody Arrangements: A Meta-Analytic Review

Robert Bauserman

AIDS Administration/Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

The author meta-analyzed studies comparing child adjustment in joint physical or joint legal custody with sole-custody settings, including comparisons with paternal custody and intact families where possible. Children in joint physical or legal custody were better adjusted than children in sole-custody settings, but no different from those in intact families. More positive adjustment of joint-custody children held for separate comparisons of general adjustment, family relationships, self-esteem, emotional and behavioral adjustment, and divorce-specific adjustment. Joint-custody parents reported less current and past conflict than did sole-custody parents, but this did not explain the better adjustment of joint-custody children. The results are consistent with the hypothesis that joint custody can be advantageous for children in some cases, possibly by facilitating ongoing positive involvement with both parents.

Research evidence has clearly demonstrated that, on average, children from divorced families are not as well adjusted as those in intact families, although this relative disadvantage does not necessarily imply clinical levels of maladjustment (Amato & Keith, 1991b; Guidubaldi & Perry, 1985). Joint custody, an arrangement that involves shared legal and/or physical custody of children following divorce of their parents, has increased in popularity as an option in divorce since the 1970s, with many states now having either a preference or presumption for joint legal custody (Bender, 1994). An ongoing debate between proponents and opponents of joint custody has continued since the 1970s as well, with different researchers and authors expressing both strong opposition (e.g., Goldstein, Freud, & Solnit, 1973; Kuehl, 1989) and strong support (e.g., Bender, 1994; Roman & Haddad, 1978). Arguments in favor of joint custody have often focused on benefits for the child of maintaining relationships with both parents. In contrast, opponents have argued that joint custody disrupts needed stability in a child's life and can lead to harm by exposing children to ongoing parental conflict.

A variety of theoretical perspectives have been proposed to explain the links between divorce and child adjustment (Hetherington, Bridges, & Insabella, 1998): individual characteristics of the child that might increase vulnerability to maladjustment; the change in family composition and the possible negative effects of father absence in the typical maternal custody situation; the increased economic stress and problems in shifting from a two-parent to a one-parent

household; effects of parental distress on the child; and changes in family processes such as conflict and expression of emotion. Buchanan, Maccoby, and Dornbusch (1996) classified factors affecting children's postdivorce adjustment into three categories: loss of a parent, interparental conflict, and diminished parenting (in which the quality of parenting from the custodial parent deteriorates, typically during the first 2 years after divorce). In an analysis of several large-scale national samples, McLanahan (1999) found that father absence due to divorce is associated with less school achievement for both boys and girls, more labor market detachment (i.e., unemployment) for boys, and early childbearing for girls. The impact of father absence seemed to be mediated by several variables, including loss of parental resources (less involvement and supervision), loss of financial resources, and loss of community resources (the broader network of social involvement, interaction, and support obtained from each parent). In a meta-analysis of 63 studies of nonresident fathers' role in children's well-being, Amato and Gilbreth (1999) found that authoritative parenting and feelings of closeness between father and child related to well-being. In addition to child support payments, authoritative parenting by the father was the most consistent predictor of outcomes including school achievement, externalizing (behavioral) problems, and internalizing (emotional) problems.

Notably, joint custody (and joint physical custody in particular) is relevant to many of the issues raised by Buchanan et al. (1996), Amato and Gilbreth (1999), Hetherington et al. (1998), and McLanahan (1999). For example, ongoing and frequent access to both parents may mitigate potential effects of parental absence as seen in sole-custody households, and access to the households and resources of both parents may reduce economic stress and disadvantage for the child. On the other hand, as critics of joint custody have noted, close ongoing contact with both parents might expose the child to ongoing conflict. Thus, research on custody and adjustment needs to examine not just differ-

This research was not done as part of official duties with the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene or under its auspices.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Robert Bauserman, AIDS Administration/Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, 500 North Calvert Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202. E-mail: bauserman@dhhm.state.md.us

ences in adjustment across different custodial settings, but also how the factors identified here may relate to any adjustment differences found. It is important to recognize that such comparisons cannot establish a causal role for joint versus sole custody in child adjustment, because such research is necessarily relational rather than experimental in nature. However, it would still be possible to identify which custody type (if any) is associated with better adjustment in different areas, and what variables appear to moderate any relationship found.

During the past 20 years, an increasing body of research evidence on the adjustment of children in both types of custody settings has developed, and some reviewers have specifically compared child adjustment in joint- and sole-custody settings (e.g., Johnston, 1995; Twaite & Luchow, 1996). These reviewers presented varying conclusions: some argued that the research literature unequivocally supports joint custody (Bender, 1994); others argued that variables such as parental conflict are more important than custodial arrangement in determining child outcomes (Twaite & Luchow, 1996) and that joint custody is likely to be inappropriate in high-conflict situations (Johnston, 1995). Still others presented mixed findings in which no single custody arrangement can be assumed to be preferable (Kelly, 1993). These authors conducted traditional narrative literature reviews that attempt to organize and make sense of a literature by reporting on the findings of a number of relevant studies, noting significant and nonsignificant findings, and forming holistic impressions of the literature reviewed. However, such reviews are subject to a number of potential problems: selective citation of studies; reporting results consistent with the reviewer's perspective, combined with minimization or nonreporting of inconsistent results; focusing on statistical significance rather than on the magnitude of the relationship between variables; and failure to examine study characteristics as moderators of results (Johnson, 1989; Rosenthal, 1984).

In this review, a meta-analysis of child adjustment in sole- and joint-custody situations was conducted in order to avoid some of the problems of traditional literature reviews and to integrate as much of the relevant literature as possible. Meta-analytic reviews integrate research literature in a more systematic and quantitative fashion than traditional narrative reviews (Rosenthal, 1984) by converting different statistical results into a common metric of effect size such as Cohen's (1988) *d* and systematically examining the effect of various study qualities on the magnitude of the effect.

The goal of this review was to locate and meta-analytically integrate reports of child adjustment that directly compare children in joint-custody (legal and/or physical) and in sole-custody settings following divorce. Based on the arguments advanced in favor of joint custody (e.g., Bender, 1994), the literature demonstrating adjustment difficulties for children in sole-custody families when compared to children in intact families (e.g., Amato & Keith, 1991b; Guidubaldi & Perry, 1985), and the relevance of ongoing relationships with both parents to theoretical perspectives on child adjustment in divorce (e.g., Hetherington et al., 1998), it was hypothesized that on average children in joint-custody arrangements would demonstrate better ad-

justment than children in sole-custody arrangements. Although the suggested hypothesis (and subsequent hypotheses) is directional, all statistical tests were based on appropriately conservative two-tailed probabilities. As noted previously, joint custody cannot be proven to be the causal factor in any such difference. However, such an outcome would be consistent with suggestions that, by providing for an ongoing, close relationship with both parents in a way not possible in sole-custody arrangements that emphasize limited visitation with the noncustodial parents, joint custody may work to overcome the difficulties for the child potentially caused by the parental absence, economic stress, socioeconomic disadvantage, and changes in family processes that might accompany divorce. Exposure to parental conflict may potentially be greater in a joint-custody setting than in a sole-custody setting, and consequently offset some of these possible benefits, but this is a concern that can be examined empirically.

Because most sole-custody arrangements are maternal rather than paternal custody, the primary focus of the review was comparison of joint-custody samples with primarily or exclusively sole maternal custody samples. In addition, some studies also included separate paternal custody groups or intact family groups. These groups were used to conduct secondary meta-analyses comparing paternal custody and joint-custody children, and intact-family and joint-custody children. Based on the reasoning that joint custody is more beneficial than harmful because it provides a higher degree of ongoing support and resources from both parents than other custody arrangements, it was hypothesized that joint-custody children would be relatively better adjusted than paternal custody children. It was further hypothesized that joint-custody and intact-family children would be relatively equal in level of adjustment because both groups are maintaining ongoing relationships involving frequent contact with both parents.

A secondary goal of the current review was to examine how theoretically relevant characteristics of participant populations and of studies might moderate the relationship between custody arrangements and outcomes. For example, some critics of joint custody have expressed concern that this arrangement will expose children to ongoing parental conflict, resulting in more stress and adjustment problems. Thus, wherever possible joint-custody and sole-custody groups were compared on levels of conflict between parents either now or in the past, and conflict level was examined as a moderator of adjustment differences. Although interparental conflict might reduce potential benefits, joint-custody parents may experience lower levels of conflict at the time of divorce than sole-custody parents, which allows them to enter into joint-custody arrangements to begin with. The potential confounding role of conflict is also considered.

Other researchers have claimed that children in sole-custody arrangements are better adjusted when living with the same-sex than with the opposite-sex parent (e.g., Warshak, 1986), a variation of the family-composition perspective on the effects of divorce. Given that most sole-custody arrangements involve maternal custody, boys might therefore show more benefit than girls in a comparison of joint and maternal custody. Thus, one variable coded as a poten-

tial moderator was the proportion of boys in each study's sole-custody and joint-custody groups. It was hypothesized that the benefits of ongoing involvement with both parents would be robust, such that better adjustment for joint-custody children would be found even when controlling for a variety of participant and study characteristics as potential moderators.

Method

Sample of Studies

Studies were located through (a) electronic databases, including PsycINFO, Sociofile, and *Dissertation Abstracts International*, and (b) reference lists of relevant studies. Both narrowly focused searches (with the term "joint custody") and broader searches (combining the terms "custody" and "adjustment") were performed. The electronic databases were searched from the earliest available dates through December 1998. *Dissertation Abstracts International* was searched in an effort to incorporate as many unpublished findings as possible. Contacts with researchers in the field identified an additional study, which has since been published (Gunnoe & Braver, 2001).

To be included in this review, a study had to include groups of children living in joint legal or physical custody arrangements and in maternal or sole-custody arrangements, and had to report the statistical outcome of some test comparing psychological or behavioral adjustment between the groups. Studies that reported only qualitative descriptions of different groups, or that reported the adjustment of a joint-custody group without a sole-custody comparison group (e.g., Steinman, 1981), were therefore excluded. Similarly, studies that included both sole- and joint-custody children, and some measure of adjustment, were excluded if they did not provide any information (statistics or *p* values) on direct comparisons of the sole- and joint-custody groups (e.g., Kline, Tschann, Johnston, & Wallerstein, 1989).

Coding of Studies

For each study, the following information was coded: (a) statistics provided on adjustment for sole-custody and joint-custody children (and paternal custody and intact-family children, if included), including group sample sizes, means and standard deviations, *t* tests, *F* tests, correlations, and proportions; (b) the specific definition of joint custody used in the study (joint physical, joint legal, or undefined); (c) type of adjustment measure (described further below); (d) by whom the adjustment measure was completed; (e) ages of each group of children at the time of parental separation or divorce; (f) current ages (at time of study) of each group of children; (g) the proportion of boys in the joint-custody group and in the sole-custody group; (h) proportion of custodial mothers in the sole-custody group (usually 1.0, but less in some cases where authors did not report separate results for maternal and paternal sole-custody groups); (i) published versus unpublished status; (j) sex of first author, coded from the first name of the author; (k) sample source; (l) date of publication; (m) parental conflict in the past; and (n) parental conflict now.

Most studies included more than one codable measure of adjustment, which often represented conceptually different types of adjustment and were completed by different individuals. Effect sizes were calculated for each result, referred to here as *measure-level* effect sizes. Although this procedure meant that not all effect sizes were independent of one another, it allowed separate meta-analyses on the basis of type of adjustment measure (e.g., self-esteem) and the individual (e.g., child or parent) who completed

the measure. For each study with more than one measure-level effect size, all effect sizes were also averaged to obtain a single effect size, referred to here as *study-level* effect size (Rosenthal, 1984). Although this procedure meant that disparate measures might be averaged for some studies, it also meant that each effect size represented an independent study. This procedure allowed examination of study qualities, such as published versus unpublished status or sex of author, as potential moderators of effects. (The coding of some specific qualities is described in the following.) A total of 140 measure-level effect sizes were coded for the joint-custody and maternal custody comparisons.

For eight of the studies that were eventually included, statistics were provided that allowed calculation of effect sizes for some of the measures used, but not for others for which comparisons were reported to be nonsignificant. Rather than selectively include measures from these studies, effect sizes for these measures were set equal to zero and included in the measure-level meta-analyses and in calculation of the study-level effect sizes. This procedure provides a conservative and unbiased way to include these measures that does not favor either custody arrangement. As a result, a total of nine effect sizes estimated to be zero were included.

Definition of Joint Custody

The term *joint custody* can refer to either shared physical custody, with children spending equal or substantial amounts of time with both parents, or shared legal custody, with primary residence often remaining with one parent. Joint physical custody clearly implies ongoing close contact with both parents. However, joint legal custody implies shared decision making by the parents and ongoing, active involvement of the nonresidential parent in the child's life, even if residential custody remains primarily with one parent. Rather than exclude one form or the other from the current review, studies based on either joint physical or joint legal custody were included; study definitions were coded as "joint physical" or "joint legal" so that comparisons on the basis of definition would be possible. In 64% of the studies ($n = 21$), joint custody was defined specifically on the basis of time spent with each parent. Typically this meant at least 25% of the child's or adolescent's time was spent with each parent; schedules could and did vary widely from subject to subject and study to study, but in all of these cases involved a substantial proportion of time actually spent living with each parent. In an additional 18% of studies ($n = 6$), joint custody was self-defined by parents or was left undefined in the report of the study. For 12% of the studies ($n = 4$), joint custody groups combined joint legal and joint physical custody. Two studies (Isaacs, Leon, & Kline, 1987; Lerman, 1989) included separate joint physical custody and joint legal custody groups. However, there was only one sole-custody comparison group within each study, so comparisons of joint physical versus sole custody and joint legal versus sole custody were not independent within each study. In these two cases, measure-level and study-level effect sizes were calculated based on sole-custody comparisons with both the joint physical and joint legal groups. Only the joint physical/sole-custody comparisons were used in later analyses of measure-level effect sizes. Study-level effect sizes were computed for sole-custody comparisons with both the joint physical and joint legal groups in each study, and study-level comparisons of adjustment in joint and sole custody were computed using both (a) joint physical/sole-custody comparisons only, and (b) joint physical and joint legal comparisons with sole custody. For custody definition, studies were dummy-coded with "1" for time-based joint physical custody, and "2" for joint legal custody or samples that left joint custody undefined or combined the two types.

Types of Adjustment Measures

Because of the possibility that differences between sole and joint custody children might be greater on some dimensions of adjustment (e.g., family relations) than others (e.g., measures of general adjustment), measures were categorized into the following groups: general adjustment, emotional adjustment, behavioral adjustment, self-esteem, family relations, academic performance, and divorce-specific adjustment.

General adjustment. This category included results reported for broad-based measures of adjustment covering a range of behavioral and emotional problems, including the Child Symptom Checklist; the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983); the Personality Inventory for Children, Adjustment subscale (Wirt, Lachar, Klinedienst, & Seat, 1984); the California Test of Personality (California Test Bureau, 1950); the Health Resources Inventory (Gesten, 1976); the Adaptive Behavior Inventory for Children (Mercer, 1979, ch. 15); the Louisville Behavior Checklist (Miller, 1977); and scales or items created by the authors included in the meta-analysis.

Behavioral adjustment. This category included measures specifically assessing behavioral problems, including the Conduct Disorder subscale of the Adolescent Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MPI; Duthie, 1985); the Behavior Problem Checklist (Quay & Peterson, 1979); the Externalizing subscale of the CBCL (when scale scores for the CBCL were reported rather than total scores), the Externalizing subscale of the Youth Self-Report Inventory (Achenbach, 1991), and various author-created scales for rating behavioral problems.

Emotional adjustment. This category included measures intended to assess emotional symptoms and reactions, including the Neuroticism subscale of the Adolescent MPI; the Internalizing subscale from the CBCL; the Children's Depression Inventory (Kovacs, 1981); the Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Inventory (Reynolds & Richmond, 1985); the Children's Social Desirability Questionnaire (Crandall, Crandall, & Katkovsky, 1965); the Draw-A-Person Test (Koppitz, 1966); the Differential Emotions Scale (Boyle, 1984); the House-Tree-Person Test (Buck, 1977); Locus of Control (Nowicki & Strickland, 1973); the Internalizing subscale of the Youth Self-Report Inventory; and various author-written items related to emotional problems and adjustment.

Self-esteem. This category included the California Attitude Survey; the Self-Esteem subscale of the Children's Personality Questionnaire (R. Porter & Cattell, 1968); the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967); the Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory; the Inferred Self-Concept Scale (Hughes, 1984); the Perceived Competence Scale for Children (Harter, 1982); the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (Piers, 1984; Piers & Harris, 1964); the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965); and author-written items or composites of self-esteem items.

Family relations. This category included the Child Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (Schaefer, 1965); items from the Cornell Parent Behavior Inventory (Devereaux, Bronfenbrenner, & Suci, 1962); the Draw-A-Family Test (Isaacs et al., 1987); the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES; Olson, 1986); the Family Relations Test (Anthony & Bene, 1957); the Kinetic Family Drawings Test (Burns & Kaufman, 1970); the Kvebaek Family Sculpture Test (Cromwell, Fournier, & Kvebaek, 1980); the Loyalty Conflict Assessment Test (Shiller, 1986); the Parental Acceptance and Rejection Questionnaire (Rohner, 1980); the Stepfamily Adjustment Scale (Crosbie-Burnett, 1991); and various author-created scales.

Academic/scholastic. This category included one measure specific to classroom behavior, the Classroom Adjustment Rating Scale (Lorion, 1975), and measures related to school performance

or intelligence such as grade-point average, IQ, and school attendance.

Divorce-specific. This category included the Children's Attitudes Toward Parental Separation Inventory (CAPSI; Berg, 1982); Children's Beliefs about Parental Divorce (CBAPD; Kurdek & Berg, 1987); the Structured Divorce Questionnaire (Kurdek & Siesky, 1980); the Divorce Experiences Scale for Children (Wolchik, Braver, & Sandler, 1985), and various author-written items specifically concerning adjustment to the divorce, such as parental ratings of whether the child was harmed by or benefited from the divorce, and positive versus negative experiences in the divorce.

Sample Source

There were five different types of sample sources identified. First were court and divorce records, in which researchers identified joint-custody families by examining court records of divorce and custody proceedings in specific jurisdictions. Second were convenience samples, in which researchers identified and recruited participants through such means as newspaper and media advertisements, word of mouth, and personal contacts. Third were school-based samples, in which participants were recruited within particular schools or school systems. Fourth were national samples (only one, Donnelly & Finkelhor, 1992). And finally, clinical samples of families undergoing counseling or other mental health services related to the divorce (only two, Johnston, Kline, & Tschann, 1989; Walker, 1985).

Conflict

Samples were also coded for measures of current conflict between parents (conflict now) and past conflict between parents (conflict then). Past conflict typically involved assessments of conflict during the marriage or around the time of separation. Measures of current conflict were coded from 14 studies and included such measures as the Straus Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979); the O'Leary-Porter Overt Hostility Scale (B. Porter & O'Leary, 1980); Ahrons's scales for various dimensions of parental conflict, communication, and support (Ahrons, 1979, 1981, 1983); and various author-created items or scales for parents (and sometimes children) to report on such constructs as discord, hostility, cooperation, and conflict over custody or other issues. Measures of past conflict were coded from 5 studies and included the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale (Locke & Wallace, 1959); the O'Leary-Porter Overt-Hostility Scale; the Straus Conflict Tactics Scale; and various author-created items or scales for parents or children to rate parental conflict in the past.

Analysis

Data analysis was carried out using DSTAT software for meta-analysis (Johnson, 1989). This program uses the Hedges and Olkin (1985) methods for meta-analysis for most calculations. For modeling of study qualities that are continuous rather than categorical variables, however, the program uses Rosenthal's (1984) techniques. This difference is reflected in the statistics reported for modeling of study qualities.

Results

Study Characteristics

A total of 33 studies, 11 published and 22 unpublished, were included (21 of the unpublished studies were doctoral

dissertations). The 33 studies contributed a total of 140 measure-level effect sizes. These studies dated from 1982 to 1999. The combined sample size across studies was 1,846 sole-custody and 814 joint-custody children. Over one third ($n = 12$) were convenience samples drawn from various sources such as child-care centers, single-parent groups, and word of mouth. Court records of divorce filings and litigation were the source of 11 samples: 6 were drawn from school populations; 2 from clinical samples; 1 from highly conflicted parents (Johnston et al., 1989); 1 from parents seeking counseling at a social services agency (Walker, 1985); and 1 from a national telephone survey (Donnelly & Finkelhor, 1992). Only 6 had a male first author, whereas 26 had a female first author (author sex could not be determined for one study, due to an ambiguous name; see Table 1).

Adjustment in Joint Versus Sole Custody

First, the study-level effect sizes for joint versus sole custody were analyzed (this analysis included only the joint physical custody effects for Isaacs et al., 1987, and Lerman, 1989, so there was only one effect size for every study). Across the study-level effect sizes, joint-custody children scored significantly higher on adjustment measures than sole-custody children, $d = .23$ ($SD = .27$, 95% confidence interval (CI) = .14–.32), corresponding to an r of .114. According to the guidelines described by Cohen (1988), this effect size is slightly greater than what would be considered a small effect size ($d = .20$). The effect sizes were not significantly heterogeneous, $Q(32) = 27.67$, $p = .62$, meaning that they were statistically consistent across studies. As noted earlier, the sole-custody groups were either exclusively maternal custody or primarily maternal custody with a small minority of paternal custody cases; a separate analysis (see the following) was conducted to compare joint and paternal custody children.

A second overall analysis was conducted using both the joint legal and joint physical samples from Isaacs et al. (1987) and Lerman (1989), so each of these studies contributed two effect sizes. As noted previously, each of these studies had only one sole-custody comparison group, so the study-level effect sizes for joint physical and joint legal custody were not truly independent of each other. Results were nearly identical to the first analysis, $d = .26$ ($SD = .28$, 95% CI = .17–.34), and effect sizes were not heterogeneous, $Q(34) = 32.06$, $p = .86$.

Because joint physical and joint legal custody may differ greatly in terms of time spent with each parent (with only the former clearly involving substantial amounts of time spent living with each parent), separate study-level analyses were conducted to compare joint physical custody and joint legal custody groups to sole-custody groups. In both cases, the joint-custody groups were better adjusted. For joint physical custody versus sole custody ($n = 20$ studies), $d = .29$ ($SD = .30$, 95% CI = .14–.42), and effect sizes were not significantly heterogeneous, $Q(19) = 18.80$, $p = .53$. For joint legal custody versus sole custody ($n = 15$ studies, including the joint legal samples from Isaacs et al., 1987, and Lerman, 1989), $d = .22$ ($SD = .24$, 95% CI = .10–.34),

and effect sizes were again not significantly heterogeneous, $Q(14) = 12.50$, $p = .64$. Without Isaacs et al. and Lerman, the effect size for the joint legal comparison was smaller but still significant, $d = .15$ ($SD = .21$, 95% CI = .01–.28), $Q(12) = 6.40$, $p = .93$. A direct contrast of the mean effect sizes for joint physical and joint legal samples revealed that they did not significantly differ from each other either including or excluding the Isaacs et al. and Lerman samples, $\chi^2 = 0.69$, $p = .40$, and $\chi^2 = 2.50$, $p = .12$, respectively. Based on these findings, the joint physical and joint legal custody comparisons to sole custody were combined for all further analyses.

Comparisons Based on Study-Level Effect Sizes

Modeling of both categorical and continuous study qualities was performed to determine whether specific qualities of studies or of samples moderated the difference between sole and joint custody. Although effect sizes were not significantly heterogeneous, this does not necessarily disallow examination of possible moderators of effect sizes. Rosenthal (1995) stated that contrasts can and should be computed among obtained effect sizes regardless of heterogeneity, because they may still reveal significant results and provide useful information. These analyses included only the joint physical custody effect size for Isaacs et al. (1987) and Lerman (1989), so each study was represented only by a single effect size.

Published and unpublished studies did not differ significantly in effect sizes, $QB(1) = 0.09$, $p = .76$. Sex of first author also did not moderate effect sizes, $QB(1) = 0.19$, $p = .66$. The proportions of boys in sole-custody groups and in joint-custody groups were not separately related to effect sizes, $Z = 1.39$, $p = .17$, and $Z = 1.32$, $p = .19$, respectively. Age at time of separation/divorce for sole-custody and joint-custody groups also did not relate to effect sizes, $Z = 0.31$, $p = .75$, and $Z = 0.34$, $p = .74$, respectively; neither did current age of child/adolescent for sole-custody and joint-custody groups, $Z = -0.44$, $p = .66$ and $Z = -0.33$, $p = .74$, respectively. The proportion of mothers in the sole-custody groups also did not affect the relationship between custody and adjustment, $Z = 0.59$, $p = .55$.

Importantly, sample source was unrelated to effect sizes, $QB(4) = 8.15$, $p = .09$ (studies not reporting sample source were excluded from this analysis). Effect sizes in each of the categories with more than one effect size (court, school, and convenience samples) were not significantly heterogeneous (only the national sample category had a single effect size; see Donnelly & Finkelhor, 1992, Table 1). When examined separately, overall effect sizes were significantly different from zero for convenience samples, $d = .28$ ($SD = .27$, 95% CI = .11–.45); samples based on court records, $d = .15$ ($SD = .08$, 95% CI = .02–.29); and samples obtained from in-school students, $d = .47$ ($SD = .29$, 95% CI = .24–.70). The combined effect size for the two clinical samples did not differ from zero, $d = .18$ ($SD = .49$, 95% CI = -.19–.56), and the single national sample had a negative effect size, indicating better adjustment for sole-custody children.

Table 1
Study Variables and Study-Level Effect Sizes

Author	Author sex	Sample size		Definition ^a	Proportion boys		Proportion mothers ^b	Current age		Age at divorce		Published	Study-level effect size
		Joint	Sole		Joint	Sole		Joint	Sole	Joint	Sole		
Bowman (1983)	F	28	54	2	.75	.65	1.00	8.6	9.0	4.2	2.5	N	.209
Bredfeld (1985)	M	20	20	1	.51	.51	1.00	9.1	9.7	9.8	9.8	N	.050
Buchanan et al. (1991)	F	52	384	1	.50	.50	.78	14.3	14.3	8.2	7.8	Y	.174
Cowan (1982)	F	20	20	1	.44	.44	1.00	10.5	10.5			Y	.193
Crosbie-Burnett (1991)	F	26	52	2	.63	.38	NA	15.0	15.0			Y	.067
Donnelly and Finkelhor (1992)	F	19	141	2	.65	.48	NA	12.4	12.4			Y	-.101
Glover and Steele (1989)	F	8	8	1	.48	.50	NA	10.6	11.1	8.6	9.0	Y	.665
Granite (1985)	F	20	19	2	.61	.49	.50	10.5	11.0	7.5	8.1	N	.005
Gunnoe & Braver (2001)	F	28	51	2	.63	.63	1.00	10.9	10.9	7.9	7.9	N	.176
Hendrickson (1991)	M	10	10	1			1.00	15.2	15.2	5.8	5.8	N	.455
Isaacs et al. (1987)	F	41	117	1			.71	10.5	10.5			Y	.609
joint physical		44	117	2									
joint legal		35	53	1	.50	.50	1.00	6.5	6.5	4.5	4.5	Y	.027
Johnston et al. (1989)	F	16	22	1	.44	.55		8.5	8.5	8.3	8.3	N	.284
Karp (1982)	F	17	13	1	.41	.38		9.9	9.8	4.7	4.8	N	.040
Kaufmann (1985)	F	40	40	1	.48	.50	.90	12.0	12.0	5.5	5.5	N	.101
Lakin (1994)	M	20	39	2	.45	.48	1.00	7.5	7.5	4.0	4.0	N	-.216
Lee (1993)	NA												
Lerman (1989)	F	30	30	1	.43	.43	1.00	9.5	9.6	5.9	5.7	N	.977
joint physical		30	30	1									
joint legal		30	30	2									
Livingston (1984)	F	32	54	2	.53	.48	.59	11.4	11.8	9.8	8.6	N	.132
Luepitz (1982)	F	25	34	1	.59	.46	1.00	9.5	9.5	6.0	8.2	Y	.151
Mann (1984)	M	32	26	1	.61	.61	.88	12.5	12.5			N	.068
Mensink (1987)	M	8	64	2	.45	.45	.92	8.1	8.1			N	.276
Noonan (1985)	F	20	20	1	.50	.50		9.5	9.5			N	.246
Noonan (1980)	F	20	20	2								N	.340
Nunan (1980)	F	20	20	1	1.00	1.00						N	.688
Pojman (1981)	M	20	20	1	.48	.48	1.00	10.3	10.5	7.1	4.4	N	.220
Rockwell-Evans (1991)	F	21	21	1	1.00	1.00		8.5	8.5	5.0	5.0	N	.674
Shiller (1986)	F	20	20	1	.52	.52	.83	16.5	16.5	6.8	6.8	Y	.114
Silitky (1996)	M	32	169	2	.47	.50	1.00	10.1	10.0	6.5	5.6	N	.652
Spence (1992)	F	15	30	2								N	.253
Vela-Trujillo (1996)	F	19	26	2								N	.724
Walker (1985)	F	12	15	1								N	.038
Warren (1983)	F	17	37	1	.50	.50	1.00	14.5	14.5	12.3	12.3	N	.702
Welsh-Osga (1982)	F	10	10	1	.55	.39	.50	9.9	9.9	7.1	7.1	N	.251
Wolchik et al. (1985)	F	44	89	2			1.00	11.1	11.7	9.9	10.5	Y	

Note. Mean weighted effect size, $d = .23$; mean unweighted effect size (each study = 1), $d = .27$; median effect size, $d = .209$ (Bowman, 1983). F = female; M = male; N = not published; Y = published. NA = not available. Detailed information on the measure-level effect sizes from each study are available from the author.

^a A code of 1 means joint custody was defined on the basis of time spent with each parent (joint physical custody); a code of 2 refers to joint legal custody, mixed samples, or undefined. ^b The proportion of mothers with physical custody in the sole custody group.

Comparisons Based on Measure-Level Effect Sizes

Measure-level effect sizes were used for meta-analysis of the effects of type of adjustment measure and identity of the person evaluating the child's adjustment. The measure-level effect sizes obtained for this analysis are displayed in stem-and-leaf format in the Appendix.

Type of adjustment measure. Type of measure did not significantly moderate effect sizes, $QB(6) = 4.85, p = .56$. For all categories of adjustment except academic adjustment, joint-custody children were better adjusted than sole-custody children: for general (broad) measures of adjustment ($n = 24$), $d = .29$ ($SD = .41, 95\% CI = .18-.41$); for family relations ($n = 41$), $d = .23$ ($SD = .42, 95\% CI = .14-.32$); for self-esteem ($n = 22$), $d = .30$ ($SD = .47, 95\% CI = .17-.43$); for emotional adjustment ($n = 20$), $d = .21$ ($SD = .38, 95\% CI = .11-.32$); for behavioral adjustment ($n = 12$), $d = .25$ ($SD = .18, 95\% CI = .12-.38$); and for divorce-specific adjustment ($n = 14$), $d = .13$ ($SD = .42, 95\% CI = .01-.25$).

For several categories of adjustment measures, the homogeneity statistic Q indicated that the effect sizes were significantly heterogeneous. The largest outlier for each of these categories was removed and the homogeneity rechecked; the procedure was repeated if effect sizes remained nonhomogenous. The DSTAT program identifies the largest outlier as that effect size which, if removed, would reduce the homogeneity statistic Q by the largest amount. Measures of general adjustment were rendered homogenous by removal of two outliers, resulting in an adjusted $d = .29$ ($95\% CI = .18-.41$). Family adjustment effect sizes were homogenous after removal of one outlier, adjusted $d = .19$ ($95\% CI = .09-.28$). Academic adjustment effects also were homogenous after removal of a single outlier, adjusted $d = .06$ ($95\% CI = -.17+.30$), as were divorce-specific effects, adjusted $d = .19$ ($95\% CI = .07-.32$).

Person completing measure. The identity of the person completing the adjustment measure did not significantly moderate effect sizes, $QB(5) = 6.74, p = .24$. For all categories of persons completing the adjustment measure, joint custody children were better adjusted than sole-custody children, with the 95% confidence interval excluding zero: for child-completed measures ($n = 81$), $d = .19$ ($SD = .44, 95\% CI = .13-.25$); for mother-completed measures ($n = 18$), $d = .32$ ($SD = .39, 95\% CI = .20-.45$); for father-completed measures ($n = 17$), $d = .30$ ($SD = .18, 95\% CI = .12-.48$); for measures completed by an unspecified parent ($n = 17$), $d = .19$ ($SD = .31, 95\% CI = .07-.31$); for teacher-completed measures ($n = 9$), $d = .40$ ($SD = .37, 95\% CI = .16-.64$); and for measures completed by clinicians ($n = 7$), $d = .27$ ($SD = .45, 95\% CI = .07-.46$).

The Role of Conflict

Effect sizes were calculated comparing joint-custody and sole-custody groups on the basis of conflict now ($n = 14$ studies) and conflict in the past ($n = 5$ studies). The remaining studies did not report conflict data. For current

conflict, joint-custody groups reported significantly less across the 14 studies, $d = .24$ ($SD = .58, 95\% CI = .11-.37$). For past conflict, joint-custody groups again reported less across the 5 studies, $d = .33$ ($SD = .20, 95\% CI = .10-.55$). Next, both past and current conflict were tested as moderators of the adjustment difference between joint and sole custody. Neither was a significant predictor of the joint-custody advantage in adjustment (for past conflict, $Z = 0.505, p = .61$; for current conflict, $Z = 1.349, p = .18$). One problem that may have obscured a potential relationship was the relatively small proportion of studies that actually provided codable data on group differences in conflict; for past conflict in particular, only 5 studies allowed such a comparison.

Adjustment in Joint Versus Paternal Custody

A total of 8 studies included paternal custody groups composed entirely of custodial fathers (Granite, 1985; Hendrickson, 1991; Johnston et al., 1989; Luepnitz, 1982; Mensink, 1987; Spence, 1992; Warren, 1983; Welsh-Osga, 1982). Separate groups of custodial mothers from these studies were included in the joint- versus sole-custody comparisons already examined. Because of the relatively small number of samples, analyses were conducted based on study-level effect sizes only, and study qualities were not analyzed as moderators of this comparison. As with sole custody, these effect sizes were obtained by calculating measure-level effect sizes and then averaging for each study (there were a total of 40 effect sizes across all 8 studies). Overall, differences in adjustment were in the direction of better adjustment for joint-custody children, $d = .20$, but this difference was nonsignificant ($95\% CI = -.06-.46$). Effect sizes were not significantly heterogeneous, $Q(7) = 5.26, p = .63$.

Adjustment in Joint Custody Versus Intact Families

A total of 8 studies compared joint-custody children with intact-family children, with 45 effect sizes (Glover & Steele, 1989; Hendrickson, 1991; Ilfeld, 1989; Karp, 1982; Mensink, 1987; Pojman, 1981; Spence, 1992; Welsh-Osga, 1982). Again, average effect sizes were computed for each study and comparisons were based on the study-level effects. As with the joint-custody/paternal custody comparison, study qualities were not analyzed as moderators of the adjustment comparisons. There was no difference between joint-custody and intact-family children, $d = -.0002$ ($95\% CI = -.027-.027$). Again, the effect sizes were not significantly heterogeneous, $Q(7) = 5.34, p = .62$.

Discussion

Based on these results, children in joint custody are better adjusted, across multiple types of measures, than children in sole (primarily maternal) custody. This difference is found with both joint legal and joint physical custody and appears robust, remaining significant even when testing various categorical and continuous qualities of the research studies as moderators. For measure-level effect sizes, the effect

sizes do not significantly differ across types of adjustment measures. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis that joint custody can be beneficial to children in a wide range of family, emotional, behavioral, and academic domains. Similarly, Amato and Gilbreth's (1999) meta-analysis of non-resident father involvement showed that closeness to the father and authoritative parenting by the father were positively associated with behavioral adjustment, emotional adjustment, and school achievement. Joint-custody children showed better adjustment in parental relations and spent significant amounts of time with the father, allowing more opportunity for authoritative parenting. The findings for joint legal custody samples indicate that children do not actually need to be in joint *physical* custody to show better adjustment, but it is important to note that joint legal custody children typically spent a substantial amount of time with the father as well. Importantly, a causal role for joint custody cannot be demonstrated because of the correlational nature of all research in this area.

The effect size did not significantly vary according to the identity of the person completing the adjustment measure, indicating that on average mothers, fathers, children, teachers, and clinicians, all rated child adjustment as better in joint-custody settings. The ratings by mothers are notable because mothers might perceive joint custody as a loss of expected control as primary custodians and be less likely to perceive children as benefiting. Some authors have claimed that mothers are the primary "losers" in joint-custody situations (Kuehl, 1989). However, mothers appear just as likely as other evaluators to perceive joint custody as beneficial to their children's adjustment.

For study-level effect sizes, the better adjustment in joint custody did not vary according to the age of the children in either the sole- or joint-custody groups. Although the period from early childhood through adolescence is marked by many developmental tasks and changes, it may be that ongoing positive involvement with both parents at any of these ages can prove beneficial. The effect sizes also did not significantly vary according to characteristics of the study, such as unpublished versus published status. Unlike research literature in some areas, the literature on child adjustment in different custody arrangements does not show a bias toward larger effect sizes in published studies.

Notably, the source of the sample (court, convenience, or school-based) did not moderate effect sizes either. The effect size for the single national sample (Donnelly & Finkelhor, 1992) was not significantly different from zero, but this telephone survey included only three questions about parent-child relationships only. The two clinical samples also did not show an advantage for joint custody, but at least one of these (Johnston et al., 1989) was specifically selected for unusually high levels of parental conflict. Further research with a variety of sample types, especially national samples if possible, is clearly needed.

Given the relevance of parental conflict to child adjustment, the fact that lesser conflict in joint-custody groups did not significantly predict the better adjustment of children in joint custody may seem puzzling. The result may be an artifact of the small amount of variance found on this measure. Effect sizes for joint-custody/sole-custody conflict

comparisons tended to be small, as shown previously, so the small differences found when comparing groups may have obscured a genuine relationship between parental conflict and child adjustment within groups. For past conflict, the small number of studies where such a comparison was possible ($n = 5$) may also have limited power to detect a significant relationship. Future research on custody and adjustment should measure, and statistically control for, the effects of level of parental conflict.

It is also surprising that the majority of the studies reviewed did not attempt to statistically control for parental conflict levels, or even directly compare levels of conflict between joint- and sole-custody parents. In those studies that did examine conflict, joint-custody couples reported less conflict at the time of separation or divorce. This is consistent with the argument that joint-custody couples are self-selected for low conflict and that better adjustment for their children may reflect this lack of conflict; parental conflict remains an important confound in research comparing adjustment in different custody settings. However, some research that has controlled for preexisting levels of conflict continues to show an advantage for child adjustment in joint custody (Gunnoe & Braver, 2001). The fact that joint-custody couples also reported less current conflict is important because of the concern that joint custody can be harmful by exposing children to ongoing parental conflict. In fact, it was the sole-custody parents who reported higher levels of current conflict.

It is also possible that direct comparisons of conflict between joint- and sole-custody parents may not be especially meaningful. King and Heard (1999) analyzed the relationships between father contact, parental conflict, and mother satisfaction in divorced families and found no simple, direct relationship among these variables. Conflict was highest at middle levels of visitation and lower when father contact was very high (as in joint physical custody) or very low. Mother satisfaction was higher at the most and least frequent levels of visitation, and highest with high levels of paternal contact and low levels of conflict. Conflict did not moderate or mediate the relationship between father contact and mother satisfaction. King and Heard argue that some mothers may be grateful for ongoing father contact even if some conflict occurs. Low conflict could signal either good parental relations or very little or no father contact (due to maternal desires, father withdrawal, etc.).

The effect size indicating better adjustment of joint-custody versus paternal custody children was statistically nonsignificant, failing to support the hypothesis of better adjustment for joint-custody children. However, the effect was almost the same in magnitude as the effect size favoring joint over maternal/sole custody. With only 8 studies for the joint versus paternal comparison, but 33 for the broader joint- versus sole-custody comparison, lack of statistical power may have been a problem. Given the relatively small magnitude of the apparent effect size, if joint-custody and paternal custody children really do differ in adjustment, more studies with larger samples may be needed to detect the effect at the level of statistical significance.

As hypothesized, joint custody and intact family children did not differ in adjustment. This finding is consistent with

the argument made by some researchers that joint custody is beneficial because it provides the child with ongoing contact with both parents. At the same time, as mentioned earlier, selection bias cannot be ruled out. Parents who have better relationships prior to, or during, the divorce process may self-select into joint custody, such that quality of parental relationship is confounded with custody status. The lower level of conflict in joint-custody families, relative to sole-custody families, is consistent with this alternative hypothesis. Further research that controls for parental conflict prior to, during, and after divorce may be the only practical way to compensate for this possibility. Another possibility for controlling selection bias might be separate comparisons of sole custody with voluntary and court-imposed joint custody.

Implications for Application and Public Policy

A major shortcoming of many of the studies reviewed was inadequate reporting of statistical results; many did not provide basic information on means and standard deviations of adjustment measures in the different custody groups, even when *t* tests or other statistical tests were reported and indicated significant differences. In some cases where differences were reported to be nonsignificant, means were reported but no standard deviations, making it necessary to estimate standard deviations from published norms for the measures used. Some studies failed to report any useful statistics at all, simply stating that there were no significant differences between groups (e.g., Ilfeld, 1989), which required that effect sizes be set to zero to allow inclusion of the study. Future researchers need to report statistical findings more carefully to make sure their results are useful for quantitative as well as qualitative reviews.

Larger sample sizes would also be valuable in future research. The effect size favoring joint custody in the current meta-analysis ($d = .23$) is just above what Cohen (1988) labeled a small effect size. Statistical significance is a function of both the effect size, or magnitude, of the phenomenon being studied and the sample size used in the research. Thus, the small size of many of the joint- (and sole-) custody groups in the research to date increases the risk of Type II error (failure to detect real differences). Of the 33 studies included in the meta-analysis, 23 had joint-custody groups and 16 had sole-custody groups with fewer than 30 participants. Especially in studies involving relatively small numbers of participants, researchers should report basic data for each group on each adjustment measure to help reviewers assess the magnitude of effects.

A further need exists for longitudinal research to assess the relative advantage of joint over sole custody across time. More follow-up studies reporting on the same sample over time, beyond adolescence and into adulthood, are needed. In general, researchers have found that as adults, children from divorced family backgrounds continue to have more difficulties than those from intact-family backgrounds (Amato & Keith, 1991a). Comparison of college or community samples of adults from joint- versus sole-custody backgrounds would be especially useful in determining whether joint-custody benefits extend into adulthood, because most

of the research to date has been limited to convenience samples or samples from court records.

The current results appear favorable to advocates of joint custody (e.g., Bender, 1994) who favor a presumption of joint custody in divorce cases. By the early 1990s, most states had introduced laws making joint custody available as an option, or even as a rebuttable presumption, in divorce cases (Bruch, 1992). However, current research suggests that judges in some areas continue to show a strong preference for maternal custody and tend to oppose joint physical custody (Stamps, Kunen, & Rock-Facheux, 1997). It is important to recognize that the findings reported here do not demonstrate a causal relationship between joint custody and better child adjustment. However, the research reviewed here does not support claims by critics of joint custody that joint-custody children are likely to be exposed to more conflict or to be at greater risk of adjustment problems due to having to adjust to two households or feeling "torn" between parents. Joint-custody arrangements (whether legal or physical) do not appear, on average, to be harmful to any aspect of children's well-being, and may in fact be beneficial. This suggests that courts should not discourage parents from attempting joint custody.

It is important to recognize that the results clearly do not support joint custody as preferable to, or even equal to, sole custody in all situations. For instance, when one parent is clearly abusive or neglectful, a sole-custody arrangement may be the best solution. Similarly, if one parent suffers from serious mental health or adjustment difficulties, a child may be harmed by continued exposure to such an environment. Also, some authors have proposed that in situations of high parental conflict, joint custody may be detrimental because it will expose the child to intense, ongoing parental conflict (e.g., Johnston et al., 1989). However, this last argument may be applicable mainly to extremes of parental conflict. Some research indicates that joint custody may actually work to reduce levels of parental conflict over time, meaning that whatever risk exposure to parental conflict involves will be reduced (Bender, 1994).

Results of custody and adjustment studies need to be communicated more widely to judges, lawyers, social workers, counselors, and other professionals involved in divorce counseling and litigation, as well as divorce researchers in general. Such communication could lead to better-informed policy decisions based on research evidence, and better-informed decision making in individual cases. There continues to be an urgent need for additional research on child custody and adjustment that corrects problems such as small sample sizes, inadequate control of confounding variables, and inadequate reporting of statistical results. However, the available research is consistent with the hypothesis that joint custody may be beneficial to children, and fails to show any clear disadvantage relative to sole custody.

References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the meta-analysis.

Achenbach, T. M. (1991). *Manual for the Youth Self-Report and Profile*. Burlington: University of Vermont.

- Achenbach, T. M., & Edelbrock, C. S. (1983). *Manual for the Child Behavior Checklist and Revised Child Behavior Profile*. New York: Queen City Printers.
- Ahrons, C. R. (1979). The binuclear family. *Alternative Lifestyles*, 2, 499–515.
- Ahrons, C. R. (1981). The continuing coparental relationship between divorced spouses. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 51, 415–428.
- Ahrons, C. R. (1983). Predictors of paternal involvement postdivorce: Mother's and father's perceptions. *Journal of Divorce*, 6(3), 55–69.
- Amato, P. R., & Gilbreth, J. G. (1999). Nonresident fathers and children's well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 557–573.
- Amato, P. R., & Keith, B. (1991a). Parental divorce and adult well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 43–58.
- Amato, P. R., & Keith, B. (1991b). Parental divorce and the well-being of children: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110, 26–46.
- Anthony, E., & Bene, E. (1957). A technique for the objective assessment of the child's family relationships. *Journal of Mental Science*, 103, 541–555.
- Bender, W. N. (1994). Joint custody: The option of choice. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 21(3–4), 115–131.
- Berg, B. (1982). *Children's attitudes toward parental separation inventory manual*. OH: University of Dayton.
- *Bowman, M. E. (1983). Parenting after divorce: A comparative study of mother custody and joint custody families. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 44, 578.
- Boyle, G. J. (1984). Reliability and validity of Izard's Differential Emotions Scale. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 5, 747–750.
- *Bredfeldt, G. M. (1985). Joint custody and remarriage: Its effects on marital adjustment and children. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46, 952–953.
- Bruch, C. S. (1992). And how are the children? The effects of ideology and mediation on child custody law and children's well-being in the United States. *Family & Conciliation Courts Review*, 30, 112–134.
- *Buchanan, C. M., Maccoby, E. E., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Caught between parents: Adolescents' experience in divorced homes. *Child Development*, 62, 1008–1029.
- Buchanan, C. M., Maccoby, E. E., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1996). *Adolescents after divorce*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Buck, J. (1977). *The House–tree–person technique*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Burns, R. C., & Kaufman, S. H. (1970). *Kinetic Family Drawings (K–F–D): An introduction to understanding children through kinetic drawings*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- California Test Bureau. (1950). *California Test of Personality: Summary of investigations* (vol. 1). Monterey: Author.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analyses for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteem*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- *Cowan, D. B. (1982). Mother custody versus joint custody: Children's parental relationships and adjustment. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 43, 726.
- Crandall, V. C., Crandall, V. J., & Katkovsky, W. (1965). A children's social desirability questionnaire. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 29, 27–36.
- Cromwell, R., Fournier, D., & Kvebaek, D. (1980). *The Kvebaek Family Sculpture technique*. TN: Pilgrimage.
- *Crosbie-Burnett, M. (1991). Impact of joint versus sole custody and quality of coparental relationship on adjustment of adolescents in remarried families. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 9, 439–449.
- Devereaux, E. C., Jr., Bronfenbrenner, U., & Suci, G. J. (1962). Patterns of parent behavior in the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany: A cross-national comparison. *International Social Science Journal*, 14, 488–506.
- *Donnelly, D., & Finkelhor, D. (1992). Does equality in custody arrangement improve the parent–child relationship? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 837–845.
- Duthie, B. (1985). *Manual for the Adolescent Multiphasic Personality Inventory*. Seattle, WA: Pacific Psychological.
- Fitts, W. H. (1965). *Manual for the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale*. Nashville, TN: Counselor Recordings and Tests.
- Gesten, E. L. (1976). A health resources inventory: The development of a measure of personal and social competence of primary-grade children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 44, 775–786.
- Goldstein, J., Freud, A., & Solnit, A. J. (1973). *Beyond the best interests of the child*. New York: Free Press.
- *Glover, R. J., & Steele, C. (1989). Comparing the effects on the child of post-divorce parenting arrangements. *Journal of Divorce*, 12(2–3), 185–201.
- *Granite, B. H. (1985). An investigation of the relationship among self-concept, parental behaviors, and the adjustment of children in different custodial living arrangements following a marital separation and/or divorce. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46, 2232.
- Guidubaldi, J., & Perry, J. D. (1985). Divorce and mental health sequelae for children: A two-year follow-up of a nationwide sample. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 24, 531–537.
- *Gunnoe, M. L., & Braver, S. L. (2001). The effects of joint legal custody on mothers, fathers, and children, controlling for factors that predispose a sole maternal versus joint legal award. *Law & Human Behavior*, 25, 25–43.
- Harter, S. (1982). The perceived competence scale for children. *Child Development*, 53, 87–97.
- Hedges, L. V., & Olkin, I. (1985). *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- *Hendrickson, R. (1991). Child custody in divorce: A comparison of sole and shared custody arrangements, and inter-parental support/conflict levels. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52, 3277–3278.
- Hetherington, E. M., Bridges, M., & Insabella, G. M. (1998). What matters? What does not? Five perspectives on the association between marital transitions and children's adjustment. *American Psychologist*, 53, 167–184.
- Hughes, H. M. (1984). Measures of self-esteem for preschool- and kindergarten-age children: Teacher report instruments. *Child Study Journal*, 14, 157–169.
- Ifeld, H. Z. (1989). Children's perceptions of their relationship with their fathers in three family constellations: Mother sole custody, joint custody, and intact families. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 5318.
- *Isaacs, M. B., Leon, G. H., & Kline, M. (1987). When is a parent out of the picture? Different custody, different perceptions. *Family Process*, 25, 101–110.
- Johnson, B. (1989). *DSTAT: Software for the meta-analytic review of research literatures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Johnston, J. R. (1995). Research update: Children's adjustment in sole custody compared to joint custody families and principles for custody decision making. *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*, 33, 415–425.
- *Johnston, J. R., Kline, M., & Tschann, J. M. (1989). Ongoing postdivorce conflict: Effects on children of joint custody and

- frequent access. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 59, 576–592.
- *Karp, E. B. (1982). Children's adjustment in joint and single custody: An empirical study. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 43, 3735.
- *Kauffmann, K. (1985). Custody arrangement and children's adjustment after parental separation. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46, 289.
- Kelly, J. B. (1993). Current research on children's postdivorce adjustment: No simple answers. *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*, 31, 29–49.
- King, V., & Heard, H. E. (1999). Nonresident father visitation, parental conflict, and mother's satisfaction: What's best for child well-being? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 385–396.
- Kline, M., Tschann, J. M., Johnston, J. R., & Wallerstein, J. S. (1989). Children's adjustment in joint and sole physical custody families. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 430–438.
- Koppitz, E. (1966). Emotional indicators on human figure drawings of children: A validation study. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 22, 313–315.
- Kovacs, M. (1981). Rating scales to assess depression in school-aged children. *Acta Paedopsychiatrica*, 46, 305–315.
- Kuehl, S. J. (1989). Against joint custody: A dissent to the General Bull moose theory. *Family & Conciliation Courts Review*, 27(2), 37–45.
- Kurdek, L. A., & Berg, B. (1987). Children's beliefs about divorce scale: Psychometric characteristics and concurrent validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 712–718.
- Kurdek, L., & Siesky, A., Jr. (1980). Children's perceptions of their parents' divorce. *Journal of Divorce*, 3, 339–378.
- *Lakin, M. J. (1994). Domestic migrations: Effects on youngsters of postdivorce joint physical custody circumstances. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56, 528.
- *Lee, M.-Y. (1993). *Post-divorce parenting arrangements, family processes, children's emotional processes and children's behavioral adjustment*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- *Lerman, I. A. (1989). Adjustment of latency age children in joint and single custody arrangements. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 3704.
- *Livingston, J. A. (1984). Children after divorce: A psychosocial analysis of the effects of custody on self-esteem. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 44, 2560.
- Locke, H. J., & Wallace, K. M. (1959). Short marital adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. *Marriage and Family Living*, 21, 251–255.
- Lorion, R. (1975). Normative and parametric analyses of school maladjustment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 3, 291–301.
- *Luepnitz, D. A. (1982). *Child custody: A study of families after divorce*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- *Mann, D. J. (1984). Children's adjustment to divorce as related to sole and joint custody. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46, 948.
- 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* (pp. 117–145). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- *Mensink, D. L. (1987). A comparative analysis of school-aged children living in intact, one-parent, and remarried families. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48, 1988–1989.
- Mercer, J. (1979). *System of multicultural pluralistic assessment*. New York: Psychological Corporation.
- Miller, L. C. (1977). *Louisville Behavior Checklist manual*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- *Noonan, P. L. (1985). *Effects of long-term parental conflict on personality functioning of children of divorce*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wright Institute Graduate School of Psychology, Berkeley, CA.
- Nowicki, S., Jr., & Strickland, B. (1973). A locus of control scale for children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 40, 148–154.
- *Nunan, S. A. (1980). Joint custody versus single custody effects on child development. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41, 4680–4681.
- Olson, D. H. (1986). Circumplex Model VIII: Validation studies and FACES II. *Family Process*, 25, 337–351.
- Piers, E. V. (1984). *Revised manual for the Piers–Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Piers, E., & Harris, D. (1964). Age and other correlates of self-concept in children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 55(2), 91–95.
- *Pojman, E. Q. (1981). *Emotional adjustment of boys in sole custody and joint custody divorces compared with adjustment of boys in happy and unhappy marriages*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California Graduate Institute, Los Angeles.
- Porter, B., & O'Leary, K. D. (1980). Marital discord and childhood behavior problems. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 8, 287–295.
- Porter, R., & Cattell, R. (1968). *Handbook for the Children's Personality Questionnaire*. Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Chicago.
- Quay, H. C., & Peterson, D. R. (1979). *Behavior Problem Checklist manual*.
- Reynolds, C. R., & Richmond, B. O. (1985). *Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- *Rockwell-Evans, K. E. (1991). Parental and children's experiences and adjustment in maternal vs. joint custody families. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52, 1910.
- Rohner, R. P. (1980). *Handbook for the study of parental acceptance and rejection*. Storrs: University of Connecticut.
- Roman, M., & Haddad, W. (1978, September). The case for joint custody. *Psychology Today*, p. 96.
- Rosenthal, R. (1984). *Meta-analytic procedures for social research*. London: Sage.
- Rosenthal, R. (1995). Writing meta-analytic reviews. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118, 183–192.
- Schaefer, E. S. (1965). Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory. *Child Development*, 36, 413–424.
- *Shiller, V. M. (1986). Joint versus maternal custody for families with latency age boys: Parent characteristics and child adjustment. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 56, 486–489.
- *Silitsky, D. (1996). Correlates of psychosocial adjustment in adolescents from divorced families. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 26(1/2), 151–169.
- *Spence, L. (1992). Furthering our understanding of post-separation behavioral adjustment of children in three post-divorce family types: Mother-custody, father-custody, and joint-custody families. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Stamps, L. E., Kunen, S., & Rock-Facheux, A. (1997). Judges' beliefs dealing with child custody decisions. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 27(1/2), 105–122.
- Steinman, S. (1981). The experience of children in a joint custody arrangement: A report of a study. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 51, 403–414.
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 41, 75–86.
- Twaite, J. A., & Luchow, A. K. (1996). Custodial arrangements

- and parental conflict following divorce: The impact on children's adjustment. *The Journal of Psychiatry and Law*, 24, 53–75.
- *Vela-Trujillo, V. (1996). Post-divorce adjustment of latency-aged children as a function of custody arrangement, parent-child contact, and interparental relationship: *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58, 99.
- *Walker, A. (1985). *Satisfaction of adolescents experiencing various patterns of visitation with their divorced fathers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- *Warren, J. A. (1983). Adolescent adjustment to parental divorce as a function of custody arrangements. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 45, 136–137.
- Warshak, R. A. (1986). Father-custody and child development: A review and analysis of psychological research. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 4, 112–135.
- *Welsh-Osga, B. K. (1982). The effects of custody arrangements on children of divorce. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42, 4946.
- Wirt, R. D., Lachar, D., Klinedienst, S. K., & Seat, P. D. (1984). *Multi-dimensional description of child personality: A manual for the Personality Inventory for Children*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- *Wolchik, S. A., Braver, S. L., & Sandler, I. N. (1985). Maternal versus joint custody: Children's postseparation experiences and adjustment. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 14, 5–10.

Appendix

Stem-and-Leaf Display of Measure-Level Effect Sizes

Extremes: 1.36, 2.50

1.2	8
1.1	5 9
1.0	2 9
0.9	7 8 9
0.8	2 3 4 4 6
0.7	0 2 2 8 8
0.6	0 1 7 8
0.5	1 1 1 3 4 5 5 6 8
0.4	0 1 2 2 3 5 5 5 6 6 7 8 8 9
0.3	0 2 4 6 7 7 7 9 9
0.2	0 0 0 1 1 2 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 7 7 7 7 9
0.1	0 0 0 2 2 2 3 3 4 4 4 6 6 6 7 7 7 8 8
0.0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 9
-0.0	1 4 4 6 7
-0.1	0 3 4 6
-0.2	4 5 6 9
-0.3	0 0 0 2 6 8
-0.4	3
-0.5	1 4

Extremes: -0.74, -1.13

High: 2.5
 75th percentile: 0.48
 Median: 0.23
 25th percentile: 0.01
 Low: -1.13

Received September 6, 2000
 Revision received March 13, 2001
 Accepted July 25, 2001 ■

共同監護と単独監護における子供の適応性の比較メタ分析報告

ロバート・バウザーマン

エイズ管理局/保健・精神衛生省

本論考の著者は実質上・法律上の共同監護下にある子供の適応状況を単独監護と比較する諸研究のメタ分析を行い、可能な範囲で父親監護や二親家庭との比較研究も分析対象に取り入れた。実質上あるいは法律上の共同監護を受ける子供は、単独監護下の子供よりも適応性があったが、両親のある子供との間には差異は見られなかった。総合的適応・家族関係・自尊心・心理・行動・離婚など各項目の適応性比較において、共同監護下の子供の方がよりよい適応性を示していた。共同監護を行う親は単独監護の親に比べて過去・現在における対立が少ないと回答しているが、このために共同監護下の子供の適応性がよくなったとの説明には至らなかった。これらの諸結果は、双方の親との前向きなかわりを続行できるなど、共同監護が子供に有益な場合がある、とする仮説に一致した。

相対的不利が、不適応の臨床レベル（アマトとキース、1991b; ガイドゥバルディとペリー、1985）を意味するとは限らないにも関わらず、平均的に見て、親の離婚を経験する子供が正常な家庭の子供ほどは適応が良くないという事が、研究によって明確に証明されている。両親の離婚後、子供の法的・身的監護権を分担するという共同監護権は、多くの州で現在、共同監護権の方を好む、あるいはそれを認定する方向に向かうという状況の中で、1970年代以降離婚におけるオプションとして人気が高まっている（ベンダー、1994）。共同監護権の支持者と反対論者の間において現在も進行中の議論は、同じく1970年代より続いており、多くの異なる研究者や著者が強い反論（例：ゴールドスタイン、フロイドとソルニット、1973；クエール、1989）及び強い支持（例：ベンダー、1994；ローマンとハダッド、1978）を示している。共同監護権の支持者の意見は、大抵、子供が双方の親との関係を維持できるという有利な点を強調している。これに対し、反対論者は共同監護権が子供の生活において必要な安定性を崩壊し、現在進行する親同士の争いに子供をさらす事により害を与える可能性があると呼ぶ。

多様な理論上の見方が、離婚と子供の適応の間の結びつきを説明するために提案されている（ヘザリントン、ブリッジスとインサベラ、1998）。不適応に対する弱みを増大させるかもしれないそれぞれの子供の性格、家族構成における変化と典型的な母方監護権において、父親不在がもたらす可能性のある否定的な影響、経済的ストレスと2人親から1人親家庭への移行において生じる問題の増大、親の悩みが子供に対して与え

る影響、及び争いや感情表現に見られる家族経緯の変化。ブキャナン、マコービーとドーンブッシュ（1996）は、離婚後の子供の適応に影響する要因を3つのカテゴリーに分けた。1）親の不在、2）親同士の争い、3）親業の減少（監護権を擁する親の親業の質が、離婚後最初の2年の間に特に悪化する。）マックラナハン（1999）は、いくつかの大規模な全国的標本を分析し、離婚による父親の不在が男女両方の子供の成績低下と関係があり、男子にとっては職離れ（例：失業）がより多く、女子にとっては早期の出産が見られる事を発見した。父親不在の影響はいくつかの変数要因によって仲裁された。例えば、親の資源の損失（より少ない親の関与や管理）、経済援助の損失、社会資源（より広域なネットワークにおける社会との関与、相互作用、双方の親からの支え）の損失等。不在の父親が子供の幸福に果たす役割を研究した63のメタ分析において、アマトとギルブレス（1999）は権威ある親業と、父親と子供との親密感に幸福に関係があることを発見した。子供の養育費の支払いに加え、父親による権威ある親業は、学校の成績、外面上の（行動面の）問題、内面上の（精神面の）問題を含む結果を最も確実に予測するものであった。

特に共同監護権（とりわけ身上共同監護権）は、ブキャナン他（1996）、アマトとギルブレス（1999）、ヘザリントン他（1998）、マックラナハン（1999）によって取り上げられた問題の多くに関連している。例えば、両親との現行の頻繁な接触は、単独監護権の場合に見られるように、親の不在によって起こり得る影響を少なくする可能性があり、双方の親の家庭や資源へ接近する事により、子供に対する経済的ストレスと不利な点を減少させる可能性がある。その一方で、共同監護権の批判者が述べている様に、両親との現在の密接な接触は子供を現行の争いにさらすかもしれない。このようにして、監護権とその適応に対する研究は、異なる監護権の状況における適応の違いだけでなく、ここで挙げられた要因が、どのようにしてすでに確認されている全ての適応の違いに関係しているのか、を調査する必要がある。このような比較が子供の適応における共同対単独監護権の因果的役割を確立する事が出来ない、という事を認識するのは重要である。というのは、このような研究は本来、必然的に、実験的というよりは関連性のあるものだからである。しかしながら、どちらの監護権が（もしそうであれば）異なる分野においてよりよい適応と関連しているか、あるいはどのような変数が、発見された如何なる関係を緩和しているかを認める事は依然として可能である。

過去20年間において、両方の監護権設定における子供の適応についての研究証拠数は増加し、ある評論家は特に共同監護権と単独監護権設定の子供の適応を比較している（例：ジョンストン、1995；トゥエイトゥとルチョー、1996）。これらの評論家は様々な結果を提示した。ある人は研究文献が明らかに共同監護権を支持していると言い（ベンダー、1994）、その他の人は親の争いのような変数が、子供の適応への

結果を決定する際に監護権の取り決めよりもより重要であるとし（トゥエイトゥとルチヨ一、1996）、共同監護権が、より争いの激しい状況においては適切でないとした（ジョンストン、1995）。更にその他の評論家は、どれか一つの監護権の取り決めが良いとは言えない、など様々な結果を出した（ケリー、1993）。これらの著者は、多数の関連する研究における発見を報告したり、意味のある、又は意味のない発見に言及したり、再検討された文献に対して全体的な印象を作り出したりして文献をまとめ、その意味が通じるようにする伝統的な説明的文献の再検討を行った。しかしながら、この様な再検討には多くの問題が潜んでいる可能性がある。極めて少ない研究の抜粋引用、評論者の見解と一致し、最小限にとどめられた結果の報告、一致しない結果の未報告、変数同志の関係の重要さよりも統計上の意義に重点を置いている事、そして結果の調整役としての研究の特徴を調査し損じている、という事（ジョンソン、1989；ローゼンタール、1984）。

この再考において、伝統的な文献再検討に見られるいくつかの問題点を回避する為に、もしくは出来るだけ多くの関連する文献をまとめる為に、単独・共同監護権設定における子供の適応のメタ分析が行われた。メタ分析再考は、コーエン（1988）のdのように、異なる統計上の結果を、分散を示す普通の測定基準に換算し、影響の大きさに対する様々な研究の質の影響を系統的に検討する事により、従来の説明的な再検討（ローゼンタール、1984）よりもより体系的で、量も多い形式で研究文献をまとめた。

この再考の目標は、離婚によって生じる共同監護権（法的・身的両方、或いはどちらか）と、単独監護権における子供の直接的な比較を行う子供の適応の報告の位置を明らかにし、総合的にまとめる事であった。共同監護権に賛成する議論に基づき（例：ベンダー、1994）、文献は、正常な家庭の子供と比較した際に、単独監護権の家庭の子供の方が適応が困難であると言う事を実証し（例：アマトとキース、1991b；ガイドゥバルディとペリー、1985）、両方の親との現行の関係と、離婚における子供の適応に対する理論上の見解との関連性に基づき（例：ヘザリントン他、1998）、平均的に共同監護権の子供は単独監護権の子供より、より良く適応出来る、という仮説がたてられた。提示されている仮説（及びそれに続く仮説）が方向付けされているとはいうものの、全ての統計テストは、適度に保守的な両側の見込みに基づいていた。前に述べられた様に、共同監護権はいかなる相違においても、原因となる要素であるという事は証明できない。しかしながら、この様な結果は、監護権のない親との限られた面会を強調している単独監護権においては不可能な方法で、双方の親との現行の近い関係をもたらす事により、共同監護権が離婚に伴って起こる可能性のある、親の不在、経済的ストレス、社会経済的な不利、及び家庭経過における変化等が原因で起こり得る子供への困難を克服する事が出来るかもしれないという提案と一致している。親の争いを目的

当たりにする機会は、単独監護権より共同監護権の方が高い可能性があり、その結果としてこの様な利点と相殺し合うことになるかもしれないが、これは経験に基づいて検討されうる懸念である。

ほとんどの単独監護権は、父方より母方の方にあるため、再考の主な焦点は、共同監護権の標本を、主に、或いは特に母方監護権のみの標本と比較する事であった。それに加え、ある研究には別個の父方の監護権グループ、あるいは正常な家庭のグループも含まれていた。これらのグループは、父方監護権と共同監護権の子供の比較、及び正常な家庭と共同監護権の子供の比較を、二次的メタ分析を行う為に使った。共同監護権は他の監護権の取り決めに比べて、両親より得られる現在のサポート及び資源が多いため、共同監護権は有害と言うよりむしろ利点があるという推論に基づき、共同監護権の子供の方が父方監護権の子供より比較的適応が良いという仮説が立てられた。更に共同監護権の子供と、正常な家庭の子供は適応のレベルにおいて比較的等しい、と言う仮説が立てられた。何故なら、どちらのグループにおいても、両方の親と頻繁に接触するという関係が続いているからである。

この再考の二次的な目標は、参加者の数及び研究と関連する特徴が、監護権取り決めとその結果の関連性をどれだけ理論的に緩和する事が出来るかを再検討する事であった。例えば、共同監護権に対するある批判家は、この取り決めは親の現行の争いに子供をさらし、その結果ストレス及び適応に際して起こる問題を増大させるのではないかという懸念を示している。この様にして、共同監護権と単独監護権のグループは、現在あるいは過去における親同士の争いの程度に応じて可能な限り比べられ、この争いのレベルは適応の相違の調整役として検討された。親同士の争いは、今後の利点を減らしてしまう可能性があるが、共同監護権の親は単独監護権の親より、離婚時の争いのレベルが低い、という事を経験するかもしれない。これは、当初より共同監護権を選択すると言う事を可能にする。起こり得る争いの混乱も又、考慮されている。

他の研究者は、単独監護権の子供は異性の親と住むより、同性の親と住む方がより良く適応できるという事を明示している（例：ワーシャック、1986）。これは、離婚の影響に対する家族構成への見解が変形したものである。ほとんどの単独監護権の取り決めが母方の監護権である事を考え合わせると、共同監護権と母方監護権の比較において、女子より男子の方により多くの利点があるかもしれない。このようにして、調整役となりうる1つの変わり易い符合は、それぞれの研究に見られる単独監護権と共同監護権の男子の割合であった。両親との現行の関係から生まれる利点は、強壯な物であり、故に様々な参加者と研究の特徴を可能な調整役として抑制している時でさえ、共同監護権の子供の方が適応が良いという仮説が立てられた。

方法：

研究標本

研究は、a) PsycINFO, Sociofile, Dissertation Abstracts International の3つを含む電子データベース及び、b) 関連研究の参考リストの2つに入っている。共同監護権という言葉に絞った検索と、より広義な検索（監護権と適応性の2つを合わせて）の両方が行われた。電子データベースの検索は1998年2月までに至る1番最初の日付から行われた。Dissertation Abstracts International は可能な限り多くの未発表の調査結果を合わせるように検索された。関連分野における研究者との連絡は更なる研究をもたらし、その研究は、それ以来発表されている（ガンノーとブレーバー、2001）。

この再考に包含する為には、研究には法的共同監護権又は身上共同監護権における子供、及び母方監護権あるいは単独監護権における子供のグループを含める必要があり、グループ間における精神面あるいは行動面の適応を比較するテストの統計結果を報告する必要があった。それ故、異なるグループの性質上の記述のみの報告、あるいは単独監護権の比較グループの入っていない共同監護権グループの適応を報告したもの（例：スタインマン、1981）は除外された。同様に、単独・共同両方の監護権の子供を含む研究、及び適応の測定方法は、もしそれが単独・共同監護権グループにおける直接的な比較についてのいかなる情報（統計あるいはP値）を出していなければ、除外された（例：クライン、ティッシュハン、ジョンストン、とウォーラースタイン、1989）。

研究の符号化

各々の研究に対し、以下の情報が符号化された。

- a) 単独・共同監護権の子供の適応についての統計（及び、もし含まれるとすれば、父方監護権と正常な家庭の子供も）これにはグループの標本サイズ、手段、標準偏差、tテスト、Fテスト、相互関係、及び割合が含まれる。
- b) 研究で使われる共同監護権の明確な定義（身上共同、法的共同、あるいは不定義の）
- c) 適応の測定方法のタイプ（後に詳しく記述）
- d) 適応の測定が誰によって完結されたか。
- e) 両親の別居時、或いは離婚時の各々のグループの子供の年齢
- f) 現在の（研究時の）各々のグループの子供の年齢
- g) 共同監護権と単独監護権グループの男子の割合

- h) 単独監護権グループにおいて監護権を持つ母の割合（たいていは1.0であるが、著者が母方と父方の単独監護権グループに対してそれぞれの結果を報告しなかった場合には、それ以下であった。）
- i) 発表済みか未発表かという状況
- j) 最初の著者の性別（著者の下の名前から符号化）
- k) 標本の出典
- l) 公表日付
- m) 過去における親の争い
- n) 現在における親の争い

ほとんどの研究には1つ以上の符号化できる適応の測定方法があり、これはしばしば概念的に異なる適応のタイプを表し、別の人によって行われる。分散はそれぞれの結果に応じて計算され、ここでは**測定レベル分散**と呼ばれている。この過程では、全ての分散がそれぞれ独立している訳ではないが、適応測定の種類（例えば自尊心）や測定を終えた個人（例えば子供や親）を基準として別個のメタ分析を可能にした。1つ以上の測定レベルの分散がある研究に対しては、全ての分散が、1つの分散を伴うように平均化され、ここでは**研究レベル分散**（ローゼンタール、1984）と呼ばれている。この過程は、異なる測定手段がある研究に対しては平均化出来るかも知れないと言うことを示しているが、同時にそれぞれの分散が独立した研究を示していることを意味する。この過程は、影響に対して可能性のある調整役として発表・未発表状況、或いは著者の性別等の研究の質の考察を可能にした（ある特定の質の符号化は以下に記載してある）。延べ140の測定レベル分散が、共同監護権と母方監護権の比較に対して符号化された。

最終的に含まれる事になった8つの研究に対しては、使用されたいくつかの測定手段に対して、分散の計算を可能にした統計値が示された。しかし、その比較が関連性が無いと報告された研究に対しては、統計が出なかった。これらの研究測定値を抜粋的に含めるよりはむしろ、これらの測定値の分散を0に設定し、測定レベルのメタ分析及び研究レベルの分散の計算に含めた。この過程では、どちらの監護権の取り決めにも賛成しない測定方法を包含する保守的で且つ偏見の無い方法が取られている。その結果として、0と見なされる計9つの分散が含まれた。

共同監護の定義

「共同監護」とは、子供が「かなりの時間」あるいは「ほぼ同等の時間」をそれぞれの親と過ごす実質上の共同監護をさす場合と、もっぱら片親の家で生活する、いわば法律上の共同監護をさす場合とがある。「実質上の共同監護」では双方の親が子供との関わ

り合いを維持していることは明らかである。また「法律上の共同監護」では片方の親が主に同居監護する場合にも他方の親もその子供の養育への関わりを維持し、子供に関する事項決定は双方の親で行うものとする。本論考では一方を取り上げて他方を退けることをせず、法律上の共同監護を扱う研究も実質上の共同監護を扱う研究も共に検討材料に取り入れた上で、これらの違いに基づく比較を可能にするため「実質上」と「法律上」の共同監護をコード化した。対象研究のうち64%(n=21)が共同監護を「各親と過ごす時間数」で定義している。通常これは青少年が自分の時間の25%ずつ以上をそれぞれの親元で過ごすというもので、その時間帯については個人間・研究間で大幅なばらつきがあるものの、どのケースも実際にかかなりの時間をそれぞれの親元で生活している。また対象研究のうち18%(n=6)は、共同監護であるかどうかを親の自己申告に任せるか、あるいは未定義のままで発表している。対象研究のうち12%(n=4)は、法律上と実質上の共同監護とをまとめて「共同監護」として扱っている。2件の研究(Isaacs, Leon, & Kline, 1987; Lerman, 1989)では「実質上の共同監護」と「法律上の共同監護」を別々の群として扱っている。ただしどちらの研究でも「単独監護」の比較群は1群しかなかったため、「『実質上の共同監護』対『単独監護』」および「『法律上の共同監護』対『単独監護』」の対比は行われていない。これら2研究における測定項目レベルと研究レベルの効果量は「単独監護」を「実質上と法律上の共同監護を併せたもの」に比較して算出した。のちの測定項目レベルの効果量分析には「実質上の共同監護」と「単独監護」のみの対比を用いた。研究レベルの効果量は、実質上共同監護および法律上共同監護を単独監護に対比させて研究ごとに算出し、各研究における適応性の共同監護対単独監護の比較については、(a) 単独監護を実質上の共同監護のみと比較する手法、あるいは(b) 単独監護を実質上共同監護および法律上共同監護と比較する手法、の双方を用いた。監護の定義については、時間を基準として「共同監護」としたものには“1”のコードを、また法律上での共同監護または共同監護が未定義のものあるいは両タイプを統合したものには“2”のコードを付記した。

適応性の測定項目

子供の適応性は、測定項目によって単独監護と共同監護とにおける差異が大（家族関係のよしあしなど）であったり小（全体的な適応状況など）であったりする可能性をふまえ、測定は総合的・心理・行動・自尊心・家族関係・成績・離婚問題などの適応性項目に分類した。

総合的な適応性。行動面・心理面における広範囲にわたる適応性の測定結果をこのカテゴリーに含めた。Child Symptom Checklist; Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983); Personality Inventory for Children, Adjustment subscale (Wirt, Lachar, Klinedienst, & Seat, 1984); California Test of Personality (California Test Bureau, 1950); Health

Resources Inventory (Gesten, 1976); Adaptive Behavior Inventory for Children (Mercer, 1979, ch. 15); Louisville Behavior Checklist (Miller, 1977)などのほか、各研究著者の考案した尺度や項目もメタ分析の対象に取り入れた。

行動面での適応性。 行動面に限定した測定結果をこのカテゴリーに含めた。Conduct Disorder subscale of the Adolescent Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MPI; Duthie, 1985); Behavior Problem Checklist (Quay & Peterson, 1979); CBCLの外在化下位尺度 (レポートされた得点が総合評価ではなくCBCLスコアの時)、Youth Self-Report Inventoryの外在化下位尺度 (Achenbach, 1991)のほか、各研究著者の考案による行動面の評価尺度を取り入れた。

心理面での適応性。 心理的な症状や反応の測定を試みた結果をこのカテゴリーに含めた。青年期MPIの神経症下位尺度; CBCLの内在化下位尺度 (Kovacs, 1981); Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Inventory (Reynolds & Richmond, 1985); Children's Social Desirability Questionnaire (Crandall, Crandall, & Katkovsky, 1965); Draw-A-Person Test (Koppitz, 1966); Differential Emotions Scale (Boyle, 1984); House-Tree-Person Test (Buck, 1977); Locus of Control (Nowicki & Strickland, 1973); Youth Self-Report Inventoryの内在化下位尺度のほか、心理症状と適応性を評価するため各研究著者が考案した評価尺度を取り入れた。

自尊心。 このカテゴリーにはCalifornia Attitude Survey; Self-Esteem subscale of the Children's Personality Questionnaire (R. Porter & Cattell, 1968); Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967); Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory; Inferred Self-Concept Scale (Hughes, 1984); Perceived Competence Scale for Children (Harter, 1982); Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (Piers, 1984; Piers & Harris, 1964); Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965)のほか、各研究著者が考案・合成した自尊心に関する評価尺度を取り入れた。

家族関係。 このカテゴリーではChild Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (Schaefer, 1965); Cornell Parent Behavior Inventory (Devereaux, Bronfenbrenner, & Suci, 1962)の一部; Draw-A-Family Test (Isaacs et al., 1987); Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES; Olson, 1986); Family Relations Test (Anthony & Bene, 1957); Kinetic Family Drawings Test (Burns & Kaufman, 1970); Kvebaek Family Sculpture Test (Cromwell, Fournier, & Kvebaek, 1980); Loyalty Conflict Assessment Test (Shiller, 1986); Parental Acceptance and Rejection Questionnaire (Rohner, 1980); Stepfamily Adjustment Scale (Crosbie-Burnett, 1991)のほか、研究著者が考案した評価尺度を取り入れた。

成績・学業。 このカテゴリーにはクラス内での態度を測定するClassroom Adjustment Rating Scale (Lorion, 1975)と、成績平均点、IQ、出席率などの学業や知能に関する評価尺度を取り入れた。

離婚問題。このカテゴリーにはChildren's Attitudes Toward Parental Separation Inventory (CAPSI; Berg, 1982); Children's Beliefs about Parental Divorce (CBAPD; Kurdek & Berg, 1987); Structured Divorce Questionnaire (Kurdek & Siesky, 1980); Divorce Experiences Scale for Children (Wolchik, Braver, & Sandler, 1985), さらに離婚で子供が受けた打撃や恩恵、離婚の長短に関する親の体験評価など、離婚への適応性について各研究著者が考案した評価尺度を多様に取り入れた。

サンプルの種類

サンプルは5種類のタイプがあった。1つめは裁判所や離婚の記録資料。限定された管轄区域における離婚審理や親権審理の記録から研究者が共同監護の家族を抽出。2つめは便宜上のサンプル。新聞やメディア広告・ロコミ・知りあいの紹介などで研究参加者を募集。3つめは学校名簿にもとづくもの。特定の学校や校区から研究参加者を募集。4つめは全米規模のサンプル (Donnelly & Finkelhor, 1992の1件のみ)。5つめは離婚にまつわるカウンセリングなどの精神衛生事業における家族のサンプル (Johnston, Kline, & Tschann, 1989; Walker, 1985の2件のみ)。

対立・葛藤

サンプルには現在および過去の両親の対立状況もコードを付記した。過去の対立とは夫婦としての、あるいは離婚前後の対立状況の評価である。現在の対立は14件の研究からコード分けを行い、Straus Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979)やO'Leary-Porter Overt Hostility Scale (B. Porter & O'Leary, 1980)、Ahrnsによる両親の対立・対話・サポートの多角的評価 (Ahrns, 1979, 1981, 1983)のほか、各研究著者の考案により不和、敵意反感、協力態度、さらに監護権をはじめとする諸問題での対立や葛藤などの構成概念を両親（場合によっては子供）が評価した測定尺度を多様に取り入れた。過去の対立は5件の研究からコード分けを行い、Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale (Locke & Wallace, 1959)、O'Leary-Porter Overt-Hostility Scale、Straus Conflict Tactics Scaleのほか、各研究著者の考案により過去の対立を両親・子供に評価させる測定尺度を多様に取り入れた。

分析

データ分析にはDSTATメタ分析ソフト(Johnson, 1989)を用いた。このプログラムはメタ分析の大部分をHedges and Olkin (1985) 手法で算出する。ただしカテゴリー別ではなく継続的な研究特色のモデリングにはRosenthal (1984) 手法が用いられている。この違いは研究特色モデリングの統計に反映されている。

結果

研究の特徴

計33の研究（公表済11、未公表22）が含まれた。（未公表のうち21は博士論文である。）この33の研究からは140の測定レベルの分散が分かる。これらの研究は1982年から1999年の間に行われたものである。研究において組み合わされた標本の規模は、1846の単独監護権と814の共同監護権の子供であった。3分の1以上（ $n=12$ ）は便宜的標本と呼ばれるもので、これはチャイルドケアセンターや一人親のグループ、或いは口コミといったような様々なところが出典元となっていた。離婚の申し立てや起訴の法廷記録は11の標本出典元となっていた。6つは学校の数から、2つは臨床標本から、1つは争いが激しかった親から（ジョンストン他、1989）、1つは社会福祉事務所でカウンセリングを受けていた親から（ウォーカー、1985）、1つは全国的に行った電話による調査（ドネリーとフィンケルフォー、1992）から出ていた。6つのみが、男性が主著となり、これに対して26が女性の主著となっていた（1つの研究において、著者の名前が曖昧な為、性別が判断できないものがあった）。

共同監護権 対 単独監護権の適応

まず初めに、共同対単独監護権の研究レベル分散が分析された（この分析には、1987年のアイザック他や1989年のラーマンの身上共同監護権分散のみが含まれる為、各々の研究に対して一つの分散しか示されていない）。研究レベル分散においては、共同監護権の子供が単独監護権の子供より $d=0.23$ というはるかに高い適応の数値を示し（ $SD=.27, 95\%$ の信頼区間（CI）=.14-.32）、これは.114の r に相当する。コーエン（1988）のガイドラインによると、この分散は小規模の分散と見なされる値（ $d=.20$ ）よりほんの少し高いだけであった。分散はかなり不均一という事はなく（ $Q(32)=27.67, p=.62$ ）、この事はこれらが研究にわたって統計的に一貫している事を示していた。前述されたように、単独監護権のグループは独占的に母方の監護権であるか、ほんの少しの父方の監護権を伴う主に母方の監護権の場合のどちらかであった。別個の分析（以下参照）が共同と父方監護権の子供の比較のために行われていた。

二つ目の総合分析は、アイザックス他（1987）、ラーマン（1989）の法的共同と身上共同の両方の標本を使って行われた。それ故、これらの研究のそれぞれに2つの分散が見られた。前にも述べたように、この各々の研究には一つの単独監護権の比較グループしかなく、身上共同と法的共同監護権への研究レベルの分散は必ずしもお互いに依存していなかった。結果は、 $d=.26$ （ $SD=.28, 95\%CI=.17-.34$ ）でほとんど第一の分析と同じであり、分散は不均一ではなかった（ $Q(34)=32.06, p=.86$ ）。

身上共同と法的共同監護権においてはそれぞれの親と過ごす時間が大いに異なる可能性がある為（前者のみが明らかにそれぞれの親と暮らす実質的時間を含む）、別個の研究レベル分析が、身上共同・法的共同監護権を単独監護権のグループと比べる為になされた。両方のケースにおいて、共同監護権のグループの方が適応が高かった。身上共同監護権対単独監護権においては（ $n=20$ 研究）、 $D=0.29$ ($SD=.30$, $95\% CI=.14-.42$)であり、分散に大きな差は無かった（ $Q(19)=18.80$, $p=.53$ ）。法的共同対単独監護権（ $n=15$ 研究で、アイザックス他（1987）とラーマン（1989）の法的共同の標本を含む）においては、 $D=0.22$ ($SD=.24$, $95\% CI=.10-.34$)で、分散は同じように、大して異ならなかった。アイザックス他とラーマンを除くと、法的共同比較の分散はより小さかったが、依然として意義のあるものであった（ $d=.15$ ($SD=.21$, $95\% CI=.01-.28$, $Q(12)=6.40$, $p=.93$)。身上共同と法的共同の標本に対する平均的な分散の直接的対比はそれぞれそれほど異なる事はなく（アイザックス他・ラーマンの例を含む、含まないに関わらず）、値はそれぞれ $X^2=0.69$, $p=.40$, $X^2=2.50$, $p=.12$ であった。これらの調査結果に基づいて身上共同・法的共同と単独監護権との比較はこれからの分析に向けてまとめられた。

研究レベルの分散に基づく比較

研究或いは標本の特定の質が単独と共同監護権の違いを緩和する役割を果たしているかどうかを決める為、分類別及び継続的研究の両方の質がモデリングされた。分散は意味深く異なる事はなかったが、これによって分散の可能性のある調整役の検討を必ずしも認めないとは限らない。ローゼンタール（1995）によると、異なるかどうかとは関係なしに、対比は、結果の出ている分散においてなされうるし、なされるべきだと述べていた。というのは、それらは意義のある結果をもたらすかもしれないし、有効な情報を提供するかもしれないからである。これらの分析は、アイザックス他（1987）・ラーマン（1989）の身上共同監護権の分散を含んでいるに過ぎないので、各々の研究は一つの分散によってのみ表された。

発表済・未発表の研究は、分散においては大して差が無かった（ $QB(1)=0.09$, $p=.76$ ）。主著の性別は分散を緩和する事が無かった（ $QB(1)=0.19$, $p=.66$ ）。単独監護権と共同監護権のグループの男子の割合は、個別に分散との関連は無かった。（それぞれ $Z=1.39$, $p=.17$ 及び $Z=1.32$, $p=.19$ ）単独監護権と共同監護権グループの別居・離婚時の年齢（それぞれ $Z=0.31$, $p=.75$ 及び $Z=0.34$, $p=.74$ ）も単独監護権と共同監護権グループの子供・青年の現在の年齢（それぞれ $Z=-0.44$, $p=.66$ 及び $Z=-0.33$, $p=.74$ ）も、分散とは関連が無かった。単独監護権のグループの母親の割合も、監護権と適応の関係には影響を与えていなかった（ $Z=0.59$, $p=.55$ ）。

重要な事に、標本の出典元は、分散とは関係がなかった ($QB(4)=8.15, p=.09$)。
(標本の出典元が報告されていない研究はこの分析からは除外されている。) 一つ以上の分散を含むそれぞれの分野(法廷、学校、便宜的標本)における分散に大して差は無かった。(全国的標本分野のみが一つの分散を示していた。ドネリーとフィンケルホー(1992)の表1を参照) 個別に検討される時、総合的な分散は $d=.28$ で、便宜的標本においては0とは飛躍的に異なっていた ($SD=.27, 95\%CI=.11-.45$)。法廷記録に基づく標本においては、 $d=0.15$ ($SD=.08, 95\%CI=.02-.29$) であり、学校内の子供から入手された標本においては $d=0.47$ ($SD=.29, 95\%CI=.24-.70$) であった。二つの臨床標本をまとめた分散は $d=0.18$ ($SD=.49, 95\%CI=-.19-.56$) で、0ではなかった。そして一つの全国的標本には否定的な分散が見られ、これは単独監護権の子供の方が適応に優れている事を示した。

(96ページの表は別紙参照の事)

測定レベルの分散に基づく比較

測定レベルの分散は、測定方法のタイプの影響と子供の適応を評価する人物のアイデンティティのメタ分析のために使われた。この分析のために入手された測定レベルの分散は、追記の幹葉形式にまとめられている。

適応測定の種類： 測定タイプは意義深く、分散を緩和する事はなかった

($QB(6)=4.85, p=.56$)。学校での適応を除く全ての適応の分野において、共同監護権の子供は単独監護権の子供より適応に優れていた。適応の一般的(広義の)測定方法 ($n=24, d=.29(SD=.41, 95\%CI=.18-.41)$)、家族関係 ($n=41, d=.23(SD=.42, 95\%CI=.14-.32)$)、自尊心 ($n=22, d=.30(SD=.47, 95\%CI=.17-.43)$)、感情面の適応 ($n=20, d=.21(SD=.38, 95\%CI=.11-.32)$)、行動面の適応 ($n=12, d=.25(SD=.18, 95\%CI=.12-.38)$)、特に離婚への適応 ($n=14, d=.13(SD=.42, 95\%CI=.01-.25)$)。

適応測定のある分野においては、同種統計Qが、分散が大変異なっている事を示していた。これらの分野に対して一番かけ離れているものは削除され、同種のもものが再度チェックを受けた。その過程は分散が同一ではない場合は再度繰り返し行われた。DSTATプログラムは、もし削除されていたら、一番最大限に同種のQ値を減少させた事であろう分散を、一番かけ離れたものとして認識している。一般的適応の測定方法は、二つのかけ離れたものを除去する事により異なっているとみなされ、その結果、調整されて $D=0.29(95\%CI=.18-.41)$ となった。家族適応の分散は一つのかけ離れたものを取り除いた後で異なっていたが、調整後 $d=.19(95\%CI=.09-.28)$ となった。学校の適応の分

散は、一つのかげ離れたものを取って異なったものとなり、 $d=.06(95\%CI=-.17+.30)$ に調整。特に離婚に限られた分散は $d=.19(95\%CI=.07-.32)$ に調整された。

測定を完結する人：適応測定の作業を行う人物のアイデンティティは、分散を著しくは緩和しなかった ($QB(5)=6.74, p=.24$)。適応測定を行う人物全ての分類に対して、共同監護権の子供は単独監護権より、より適応が高く、0を除き95%の信頼区間があった。子供による測定は($n=81$), $d=.19(SD=.44, 95\%CI=.13-.25)$ 、母親による測定は($n=18$), $d=.32(SD=.39, 95\%CI=.20-.45)$ 、父親による測定は($n=17$), $d=.30(SD=.18, 95\%CI=.12-.48)$ 、明記されていない人物による測定は($n=17$), $d=.19(SD=.31, 95\%CI=.07-.31)$ 、先生による測定は($n=9$), $d=0.40(SD=.37, 95\%CI=.16-.64)$ 、医療機関の人による測定は($n=7$), $d=.27(SD=.45, 95\%CI=.07-.46)$ であった。

争いの役割

分散は現在 ($n=14$ 研究) と過去 ($n=5$ 研究) の争いに基づき、共同監護権と単独監護権のグループを比較して算出された。残りの研究では争いについてのデータが報告されていなかった。現在の争いについては、14の研究において共同監護権のグループの争いが著しく少なかったと報告された ($d=.24(SD=.58, 95\%CI=.11-.37)$)。過去の争いにおいては、ここでも共同監護権が5つの研究において少なかったと報告された ($d=.33(SD=.20, 95\%CI=.10-.55)$)。次に、現在と過去の争いが共同と単独監護権における適応の違いの調整役としてテストされた。そのどちらも適応においては、共同監護権の方が有利であると言う意義のある予測が出来なかった (過去の争いについて $Z=0.505, p=.61$ 、現在の争いについて $Z=1.349, p=.18$)。可能性のある関係を隠してしまったのかもしれない1つの問題は、争いに置けるグループの相違の符号化可能なデータを実際に提供した研究の割合が、比較的小さい事であった。特に過去の争いについては、5つの研究のみが、この様な比較を可能にした。

共同監護権 対 父方監護権の適応

計8つの研究に、監護権を持つ父親のみで形成される父方監護権のグループが含まれていた (グラナイト、1985; ヘンドリックソン、1991; ジョンストン他、1989; ループニッツ、1982; メンシンク、1987; スペンス、1992; ウォーレン、1983; ウェルッシュオスガ、1982)。これらの研究の別の母方監護権グループは、すでに検討された共同対単独監護権の中に含まれていた。標本の数が比較的少ないため、分析は研究レベルの分散のみに基づいて行われ、研究の質はこの比較の調整役としては分析されなかった。単独監護権に見られるように、この分散は測定レベル

の分散を計算し、それから各々の研究に対して平均化する事によって求められた（8つの研究で全40の分散があった）。全体として、適応における違いは、共同監護権の子供の方がより適応が高いという方向に向かっていたが（ $d=.20$ ）、この相違には意味がなかった（ $95\%CI=-.06-.46$ ）。分散は著しく異なっていた（ $Q(7)=5.26, p=.63$ ）。

共同監護権 対 正常な家庭における適応

計8つの研究において、共同監護権と正常家庭の子供の比較が行われ、45の分散が示された（グローバーとスティール、1989；ヘンドリックソン、1991；イルフェルド、1989；カープ、1982；メンシンク、1987；ポジマン、1981；スペンス、1992；ウェルツシュオルガ、1982）。ここでも、又、平均分散は各々の研究に対して出され、比較は研究レベルの分散に基づいていた。共同監護権・父方監護権の比較に見られるように、研究の質は適応比較の調整役としては分析されていなかった。共同監護権と正常家庭の子供には差は無い（ $d=-.0002(95\%CI=-0.27-0.27)$ ）。やはりここでも、分散は著しく異なっていた（ $Q(7)=5.34, p=.62$ ）。

考察

こうして得られた結果からは、共同監護下にある子供の方が（主に母親の）単独監護下の子供よりも複数の測定項目でよりよい適応を示していることがわかる。この差異は法律上の共同監護でも実質上の共同監護でも共に認められており、異なるカテゴリーや継続性など研究特色による変数調整後も有意性が保たれており、かなり確かなものと見受けられる。測定項目レベルの効果量は、適応性の項目間でさほどの違いはない。この結果は家族関係・心理面・行動面・学業面などのさまざまな方面で共同監護が子供に有益な場合がありうるという仮説に一致する。同様に別居中の父親の親近度に関するAmatoとGilbrethのメタ分析(1999)でも、父親が身近に存在して権威ある父親教育をほどこすことと、子供の行動面・心理面での適応性および学業の向上との前向きな関連性が示されている。共同監護下の子供は親子関係面でよりよい適応性を示し、父親ともかなりの時間を過ごすため、権威ある養育を受けやすい。法律上の共同監護サンプルの検討を通じて子供は実質上の共同監護でなくてもよりよい適応性を示すことが認められたが、法律上の共同監護の子供は典型的に実質的な時間を父親と過ごしていることにも留意すべきである。この分野の諸研究がみな相関的であり、共同監護の持つ要因的な役割の証明が無理な点も特記すべきである。回答者別の適応性評価テストの効果量にはさほどの差異が無かったが、これは平均的に母親・父親・子供・教師・臨床医らがみな共同監護の方

が子供の適応がよいと評価したことを示している。母親は看護者としての自分の立場が脅かされることをきらい、共同監護の子供への恩恵を低めに評価することもありうるので、母親らが共同監護を前向きに評価したことも特筆に値する。共同監護では主に母親が「損をする」とする研究者 (Kuehl, 1989) もある中で、母親の「共同監護は子供の適応性に役立つ」とする評価は他の評価者とほとんど同程度である。研究レベルの効果量でも共同監護の方が適応性が優れており、単独監護・共同監護のいずれにも子供の年齢による差異は見られなかった。幼児期から青年期までには数々の発達課題や変遷過程があるが、双方の親との前向きな関わり合いは年齢にかかわらず子供のためになるということかもしれない。研究の特徴（公表・未公表など）で効果量が大きく変化することもなかった。他分野での研究とは異なり、監護権と子供の適応性に関する諸研究においては公表文献の効果量が高くなる偏りは見られなかった。さらにサンプルの出所（法廷記録、便宜的、学校単位など）が効果量に影響することもなかった。全米規模サンプル (Donnelly & Finkelhor, 1992) の効果量はほとんどゼロに近かったが、この電話調査には親子関係に関する質問は3問しかなかった。2つの臨床サンプルからも共同監護をよしとする結果は出ていないが、うち1件 (Johnston et al., 1989) は両親の対立度が非常に高いサンプルを選んでいる。今後はより広範にわたる、特に全米規模のサンプルでの研究が必要である。両親の対立度が子供の適応性に関係するとしたとき、共同監護群の対立の低さから子供の適応性を有意に導き出せなかった点はやや不可解ではあるが、この測定方法における微小のばらつきが結果に尾を引いた可能性もある。前述したように共同監護と単独監護の対立を比較する効果量は少ない傾向があり、群間の微小な差異が群における両親の対立と子供適応性との実際の関連性を歪曲した可能性もある。過去の対立についても、比較に用いることができる研究の数が少数 ($n = 5$) しかなく、有意な関連性の検出力が低かった可能性がある。監護と適応性に関する今後の研究では、両親の対立レベルの影響を統計的に管理できる形で測定することが望まれる。今回対象となった研究の大部分が、両親の対立度になんら統計的管理を試みておらず、単独監護両親と共同監護両親の対立レベルの直接比較さえ行っていなかったのは意外であった。対立を検討した研究は、共同監護の両親の方が別居時・離婚時の対立が少なかったと報告しているが、これは共同監護を行う元夫婦はおのずから対立度が低いため、子供の適応性もそれを反映しているとする説にも適うため、異なる監護状況を比較する研究において両親の対立は未だに大きな混乱要因となっていることがわかる。ただし既存の対立レベルに制御をほどこした研究では、共同監護の子供によりよい適応性が示されている (Gunnore & Braver, 2001)。共同監護の弊害として親の対立に継続的に子供をさらすことが懸念される中で、共同監護の親の方が現在の対立状況も少ないと回答している事実は重要である。実際のところ単独監護の親の方が現在の対立レベルは高かった。ただし共同監護と単独監護の親の対立状況の単純比較など、ほとんど無意味かもしれない。King と Heard

(1999)は離婚家庭における父親との関わり合い・両親の対立度・母親の満足度の関係を分析し、これらの変数の間には単純な直接的関係は見いだせなかったとしている。両親の対立度は父親との面会率が中程度のときに最も高く、父親との接触が（共同監護のように）頻繁なときと、父親が最も疎遠なときに低かった。母親の満足度は面会の頻度が最高・最低のときに高く、最も高かったのは父親との関わり合いが最も多く、両親の対立が低いときであった。父親との関わり合いと母親の満足度との関連性を対立度が抑制・促進することはなかった。KingとHeardは、多少の対立が生じても父親との関わり合いを継続する方が望ましいとする母親もあるとしている。対立が低いときは両親の関係が良好であるか、あるいは父親との接触がほとんどないもの（母親の希望、父親の失踪など）と判断できる場合がある。共同監護の子供の方が父親監護の子供よりも適応性があるとする効果量には統計的な有意性はなく、共同監護の子供の方が適応性があるという仮説を支持するには至らなかった。ただしその効果は共同監護が母親/単独監護よりも望ましいとする効果量とほぼ同規模であった。これは共同監護と父親監護とを比較した研究数がわずかに8件であり、広範な単独監護と比較した研究が33件であったことから検出力不足の可能性もある。今回の効果量が比較的小規模であったことから、もしも共同監護と父親監護の子供の適応性に差異があるのならば、今後さらに多数のサンプルを用いて統計的に有意なレベルの効果を検出する必要がある。仮説で示された通り、共同監護と両親のある家庭の子供との間には適応性の差異は無かった。この結果は双方の親との関わり合いを維持できる共同監護を望ましいものであるとする説に一致するものである。ただし先述のごとく選出に偏りがある可能性も否めない。共同監護方式を選んだ両親は、離婚前あるいは離婚当時から良好な関係を維持できていた元夫婦であるとも考えられるため、両親の間柄のよしあしと監護方式との関連は不透明である。共同監護家庭での対立度が単独監護家庭よりも低いことも、その代替仮説と一致する。両親の離婚前・離婚時・離婚後の対立度を制御することが今後の研究でこうした不透明さを補正する唯一の実用的手段であろう。自主的選択の単独監護と裁判所の指示による単独監護とを別々に比較するなども、こうした選出の偏りを制御するための一案である。

実践面・政策面への影響

対象諸研究の多くに見られた欠点は、結果を統計学的にレポートできていない点であった。tテストなどの統計的試験で有意差が報告されている場合でさえも異なる監護方式の各群における適応度項目の平均値や標準偏差などの基礎的な情報が欠落していた。有意差は認められないとしながら平均値だけレポートして標準偏差を報告していないケースもいくつかあり、同様の測定方法を用いた公表論文から標準偏差を推定するなどの方策も迫られた。中には有効な統計情報を全く盛り込んでおらず、群の間に有意差は無

しとだけする(Ilfeld, 1989など)研究もあり、これらを取り入れるためには効果量をゼロに設定せざるをえなかった。今後の研究では統計学的結果をより慎重に割り出し、定性的な評価はもとより定量的な評価にも使えるレポートを作成すべきである。研究のサンプル数をより広げていくことも有益となろう。今回のメタ分析で共同監護がより好ましいとした効果量($d=.23$)はCohen (1988)によるところの小規模な効果量をわずかに上回るにすぎない。統計的有意性は、効果量すなわち研究対象となる現象の規模と、研究対象のサンプル数の両方を用いた関数である。つまりこれまでの研究では共同監護・単独監護の群が小さかったために(本来の有意差の検出に失敗する)タイプIIのエラーを出す危険が大きかった。今回のメタ分析で取り扱った33件のうち、23件は共同監護の参加者が、また16件は単独監護の参加者が30名以下であった。特に少数の参加者を扱う研究では、のちに結果の規模を評価できるように、条件ごとの各群に関する基本的データを記載しておくべきである。単独監護と比較した共同監護の経時的な長所を論究する長期的な研究もさらに必要である。青少年の成人後も同一サンプルの経時的な追跡研究も必要である。一般論としてこれまでの研究からは成人後も離婚家庭の子供は両親のある家庭の子供よりも問題が多いという結果が出ている(Amato & Keith, 1991a)。これまでの研究サンプルは便宜的なものや裁判所の記録資料に限定されていたため、今後は共同監護と単独監護をそれぞれ背景とする大学生や地域社会のサンプル比較が特に有益となろう。現在の研究報告を見る限り、離婚時の監護権は共同とするべきとの共同監護側が優勢である。合衆国ではほとんどの州で1990年初期までに共同監護がオプションまたは反証を許す共同監護となっている(Bruch, 1992)。ところが現時点の研究報告によれば依然として裁判官が母親に親権を認め、実質上の共同監護を阻もうとする傾向が地域によっては見られる。ここで報告する研究結果は、共同監護と子供の適応性との因果関係を示すものではないことをよく認識しておく必要がある。だがここに検討した研究は共同監護に対する批判、すなわち別々の家庭に順応しなければならない苦労や、両親に引き裂かれる感情などへの懸念から共同監護の子供は対立葛藤にさらされやすく適応性の育成を阻まれるとする説は支持していない。概して共同監護には(法律上も実質上も)子供を害するような面は見受けられず、むしろ子供のためになるとさえ言える。すなわち裁判所は共同監護を試みようとする親の意思を阻害すべきではない。ただし今回の研究結果は必ずしも全ての状況下で共同監護が単独監護にまさっている、あるいは同等である、と明示してはいないこともよく認識しておくべきである。例えば一方の親に明らかかな虐待・育児放棄の姿勢が見られる場合は最善策として単独監護が望ましいであろう。また一方の親が精神的に不安定であったり適応困難な状態にあるときも、そのような環境にさらされ続けることは子供にとって有害であろう。さらに両親の対立が激しい場合には、両親の熾烈な対立に子供をさらし続ける共同監護は有害であるとする著者(例: Johnston et al., 1989年)もある。しかしこのような説は、両親の対立が極端な場合にもつ

ばら当てはまると思われる。長期的には共同監護を通じて両親の対立が緩和するとの研究もあり、これは子供を両親の対立にさらすリスクそのものの減少にもつながる。今後、監護権と適応性とを取り扱う研究の成果は裁判官、弁護士、民生委員、カウンセラーなど離婚訴訟や離婚カウンセリングに関わる専門家や離婚問題の研究者により広く知ってもらわなければならない。こうした情報伝達は研究にもとづく実証的なよりよい政策判断、さらに個々のケースにおけるより賢明な判断につながるであろう。監護と子供の適応性に関する新たな研究を通じて、不十分なサンプル数、変数の制御不足による混同、結果報告の統計学的な不備などを修正していくことは今後の緊急課題である。しかしこれまでの研究成果は共同監護が子供に有益であるとする仮説を支持しており、単独監護よりも明らかに劣っている点を指し示すことはなんらできなかった。

参考文献

星印の付いた参考文献は、メタ分析に含まれている研究であることを示す。リスト省略。

追記（102ページ）

測定レベル分散の幹葉表示

極端な値（高い値と低い値において）

高い値

75パーセンタイル値

中央値

25パーセンタイル値

低い値

別紙（96ページの言葉の訳）

表1 研究変数及び研究レベル分散

(左より) 著者、著者の性別、標本サイズ (共同・単独)、定義、男子の割合 (共同・単独)

母の割合、現在の年齢 (共同・単独)、離婚時の年齢 (共同・単独)、発表済み、研究レベル分散

(表の下) 注: 平均加重分散、 $d=.23$; 平均未加重分散 (各研究 = 1)、 $d=.27$; 中央値分散、

$d=.209$ (バウマン、1983)。F=女性; M=男性; N=未発表; Y=発表済み。

NA=入手不可。各研究の測定レベル分散についての詳細は、著者から入手可能。

αコード1は共同監護権が、それぞれの親と過ごした時間に基づいて定義されている事を意味し (身上共同監護権)、コード2は法的共同監護権、混合標本、或いは未定義を意味する。

β 単独監護権グループにおいて身上監護権を持つ母親の割合

アメリカ心理学会 「家族心理学ジャーナル 2002 年」 掲載 "Joint Custody VS Sole Custody Arrangements: A Meta-Analytic Review"

著者 Robert Bouserman Phd.

下訳 カール裕子

監修 (株) DOUBLET (ドゥブレ)
翻訳・ソフト/ホームページ多言語化
通訳・海外コーディネーション
香川県高松市国分寺町福家甲 2382-5

エラリー ジャンクリストフ
Jean-Christophe Helary