

## NEVER PAINT BY THE NUMBERS

### A Response to Kelly and Lamb (2000), Solomon and Biringen (2001), and Lamb and Kelly (2001)

Jonathan W. Gould and Philip M. Stahl

---

As the debate continues on ways of thinking about access between separated and never-married parents and their very young children, the authors suggest a way that child custody evaluators can integrate this discussion into their evaluations. They conclude that evaluators must pay attention to family dynamics and all of the research when making specific recommendations to parents and the courts regarding the access and residential arrangements of very young children.

---

In recent issues of this journal, there have been ongoing discussions and proposed new ways of thinking about access between separated and never-married parents and their very young children (Kelly & Lamb, 2000; Warshak, 2000; Whiteside, 1998). As is obvious in the article by Solomon and Biringen (2001) and the response by Lamb and Kelly (2001) in this issue, the debate continues. As the guest editor for the issue on child custody evaluations who solicited the original Kelly and Lamb article (Stahl), and as child custody evaluators who have written about and trained others in the art and science of child custody evaluations (Gould, 1998, 1999a, 1999b; Gould & Bell, 2000; Gould & Stahl, 2000; Stahl, 1994, 1999), we wanted to share our thoughts about how child custody evaluators might integrate these ongoing ideas into their work.

The thoughtful article by Kelly and Lamb (2000) and the comments on that article by Solomon and Biringen (2001), as well as the follow-up comments offered by Lamb and Kelly (2001), are continued examples of the diversity and complexity of our fields of study. Since its publication, we have found the Kelly and Lamb (2000) article useful in designing recommendations for young children in child custody evaluations. When we have taught workshops over the past 2 years, we have referred to the Kelly and Lamb article as necessary reading for all involved in child custody evaluations, along with an earlier article by Whiteside (1998) and the article by Warshak (2000) on this topic.

Solomon and Biringen (2001) challenge Kelly and Lamb (2000) on several important issues, among them the research support for the recommendation that children younger than 2 years of age will profit from overnight parenting by the noncustodial parent. Lamb and Kelly (2001) argue that the research is indeed strong enough to support their recommendations for overnight contact between very young children and their noncustodial parents.

As we read the articles, we were struck by the high quality of professional exchange and the need for such dialogue in all areas of child custody evaluation. We observe that it is likely that different professional orientations might contribute to the different interpretation of the research. We recall that Emery (1999) suggested that those who read research must pay attention to the samples (size and heterogeneity), hypotheses, and biases of the researchers when they reach conclusions and discuss their findings. Ultimately, as consumers of these research articles and practitioners who use their recommendations, we are struck by the need

to figure out how we can understand such divergent interpretations of the research and integrate them into our work.

We also believe that sometimes practitioners become confused when there is controversy over research findings and that they tend to shy away from using newer findings because of the lack of clarity in the research. Often, this results in practitioners' making recommendations that are not based on current research but on their pet theories about human behavior.

Clinical experience and research are not parallel or equivalent. It is research that helps us to frame questions about relevant child custody factors in deciding how to apply the research to a particular case. Research should guide the application of that concept to a particular family system. A good evaluator knows how to interpret and use the research. A critical distinction is between applying research to individual cases in contrast to deciding when to apply the research and when to ignore it. Many practitioners ignore research when the controversy over its meaning is unclear. That is, too many practitioners appear to decide to ignore research rather than consider how to apply the particular research to a particular family system.

A properly crafted evaluation entails knowing the relevant research and applying that research to individual cases. We would never support the second option of deciding when to apply research and when to ignore it. Research lays the foundation for our ability to explain human behavior within the context of science.

We believe that what is needed is a discussion about how child custody evaluators can use the research while embracing the differences in interpretation of the research in their custody recommendations. We suggest that decision rules about how to use the research apply to both positions represented in this interesting and important debate. We propose a multipart analysis to deal with these issues.

First, when evaluators are asked to consider the best residential and access arrangements for a very young child, they need to look at the parenting history of the child. Whether one believes that very young children are able to have overnight parenting time with each parent, as suggested by Kelly and Lamb (2000), or that they need to have stable, single-night placement, as suggested by Solomon and George (2001), there is no substitute for researching the particular parenting history of the family being evaluated.

If the child has had a history of joint caretaking and has shown little, if any, difficulty being parented and cared for by each parent while the family was intact, then one might look closely at continuing the parenting arrangement that existed prior to the separation. That is, if both parents were actively involved in the infant's, or toddler's daily care and nighttime rituals, it might be developmentally appropriate to continue to foster the relationship between the young child and each parent by including overnight parenting time with the mother and father. If there has been one primary parent, and that parent has done the majority of caregiving, it might be more appropriate to continue the primary relationship while gradually encouraging the other parent to increase his or her involvement with and parenting of the child.

A second dimension that the evaluator needs to critically examine is the attachment history between the infant and each parent. The evaluator needs to critically explore the skills that each parent brings to the task of parenting the infant or toddler. It might be necessary to assess parenting skills across different caretaking domains to understand what access and living arrangements are best. This might include assessing both daytime parenting and caretaking behaviors as distinct and separate from nighttime parenting and caretaking rituals. This will help evaluators consider the different (or relatively equal) styles between parents and their children across both daytime and nighttime dimensions.

Third, evaluators must always recognize that parents have different strengths and weaknesses in their parenting. When living together, many parents tend to complement each other in various ways. An analysis of parenting skills may determine that the mother is competent in some areas in which the father is less skilled, whereas the father is more competent in some areas in which the mother is less skilled. When living apart, there is no complementary relationship for the child. Instead, each parent is asked to fulfill the responsibilities of both parents during the time that the child is in his or her care. This often results in more apparent weaknesses, with the child having to make adjustments to routines, rituals, schedules, and habits.

With this in mind, a competent evaluator needs to critically examine the complementary fit that existed during the marriage in order to understand the advantages and disadvantages each parent brings to the infant or toddler when parenting the child alone. Understanding the previous complementary parenting relationship might help shed light on the nature and quality of parenting that the infant or toddler will be exposed to during the separation. We propose that when there are significant differences in competence, the evaluator work to craft parenting recommendations that allow each parent to have care of his or her young child in a way to maximize the strengths and minimize the weaknesses of each parent and parent-child interactions.

A fourth dimension to be considered by the evaluator is the temperament of the child. Some children, regardless of the parents' relative strengths and weaknesses, may have a temperament that requires more stability and consistency and a routine that is primarily with one parent. Other children, who are more flexible and easygoing, will be able to move more easily between households as long as both parents are relatively equal in their daytime and nighttime parenting abilities.

A fifth dimension to be considered is the communication between the parents. Even if parents cannot discuss their child very well because of a high level of conflict, they can still use a parent book or some other mechanism to discuss important issues about their child. Parents who share information about a wide array of developmental issues (such as medications and illnesses, developing language, soothing techniques, sleeping and eating routines) are usually more successful in sharing their child than are parents who do not. When making recommendations, evaluators will want to explore how parents communicate about their child and which parent is more likely to be obstructing such communication. When there are problems in the communication, evaluators can recommend ways to enhance communication about the child, regardless of overnight access.

A final dimension to consider is the care being given to the child by a caregiver (or more than one caregiver) other than the parents when both parents are unavailable. If parents use a nanny to go back and forth between each parent's home with the child, and if parenting competencies are relatively equal, it is more likely that the child can successfully spend relatively equal time with both parents. Because children potentially develop multiple attachments with multiple caregivers (both parents and one or two daytime caregivers), an analysis along this dimension will help the evaluator when considering access and residential arrangements.

In conclusion, it seems to us that regardless of whether one agrees with the position that infants and toddlers are able to accommodate overnight parenting arrangements with each parent or that they need a single, stable overnight placement, the art of child custody evaluations is applying the results from aggregate research results to the specific, ideographic (and idiosyncratic) needs of a particular family. Research results are important in their ability to guide our thinking about how specific results might be relevant to a particular family system.

He  
dy:  
cot  
tio  
  
res  
ato  
jud  
tio  
(K  
ass-  
We  
pre-  
rest  
our  
Staf  
of tl  
nee-  
into

Amer  
d.  
Austi  
C  
Ellis,  
o  
Emer  
Gouic  
Gouic  
ra  
C  
Gould  
ch  
Gould  
ju  
38  
Gould  
sic  
Kelly,  
the  
Kelly,  
sio  
Lamb,  
yoi  
Solom  
"U:  
ily-  
Stahl, I  
Stahl, I

However, there is never any substitute for exploring the parenting history and relevant dynamics of a particular family and then integrating that data with current research. Of course, evaluators will include collateral contacts along with interviews and direct observations in evaluating the above dimensions.

Then, evaluators can discuss, often in the evaluation report or in direct testimony, how the research may or may not apply to the particular family system under examination. The evaluator should also be clear, both in the report and in testimony, to distinguish between clinical judgments, research-based opinions, and philosophical positions (American Bar Association, 2000). Evaluators need to work toward understanding all of the research on divorce (Kelly, 2000) and the risk factors related to parenting (Ellis, 2001) and to consider a risk assessment model that speaks to the psychological best interests of the child (Austin, 2000). We suggest that evaluators should never blindly apply research drawn from group data and presume that research will automatically apply to a particular family system or reject research simply because it does not fit one's bias or because it is confusing. That is why, in our recent article, we talked about the art and science of child custody evaluations (Gould & Stahl, 2000). The research and the family data are our brushes, but the evaluator is in charge of their application. We paint the canvas. Evaluators never paint by the numbers. We always need to consider the best application for each family we assess, integrating all of the research into our understanding of the particular family and the particular child's needs.

#### REFERENCES

- American Bar Association, Family Law Section (2000). *High-conflict custody cases: Reforming the system for children* (Report of the Wingspread Conference). Washington, DC: Author.
- Austin, W. (2000). A forensic psychology model of risk assessment for child relocation law. *Family & Conciliation Courts Review, 38*, 192-207.
- Ellis, E. M. (2001). Guidelines for conducting parental fitness evaluations. *American Journal of Forensic Psychology, 19*(1), 5-40.
- Emery, R. (1999). *Marriage, divorce, and children's adjustment* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gould, J. W. (1998). *Conducting scientifically crafted child custody evaluations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gould, J. W. (1999a). Scientifically crafted child custody evaluations. Part 1: A model for interdisciplinary collaboration in the development of psycholegal questions guiding court-ordered child custody evaluations. *Family & Conciliation Courts Review, 37*, 64-73.
- Gould, J. W. (1999b). Scientifically crafted child custody evaluations. Part 2: A paradigm for forensic evaluation of child custody determination. *Family & Conciliation Courts Review, 37*, 159-178.
- Gould, J. W., & Bell, L. C. (2000). Forensic methods and procedures applied to child custody evaluations: What judges need to know in determining a competent forensic work product. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 38*(2), 21-27.
- Gould, J. W., & Stahl, P. M. (2000). The art and science of child custody evaluations: Integrating clinical and forensic mental health models. *Family & Conciliation Courts Review, 38*, 392-414.
- Kelly, J. (2000). Children's adjustment in conflicted marriage and divorce: A decade review of research. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 39*(8), 963-973.
- Kelly, J. B., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Using child development research to make appropriate custody and access decisions for young children. *Family and Conciliation Courts Review, 38*, 297-311.
- Lamb, M. E., & Kelly, J. B. (2001). Using the empirical literature to guide the development of parenting plans for young children: A rejoinder to Solomon and Biringen. *Family Court Review, 39*, 365-371.
- Solomon, J., & Biringen, Z. (2001). Another look at the developmental research: Commentary on Kelly and Lamb's "Using child development research to make appropriate custody and access decisions for young children." *Family Court Review, 39*, 355-364.
- Stahl, P. M. (1994). *Conducting child custody evaluations: A comprehensive guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stahl, P. M. (1999). *Complex issues in child custody evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Warshak, R. (2000). Blanket restrictions: Overnight contact between parents and young children. *Family & Conciliation Courts Review*, 38, 422-445.
- Whiteside, M. (1998). Custody for children age 5 and younger. *Family & Conciliation Courts Review*, 36, 479-502.

*Jonathan W. Gould, Ph.D., is a practicing forensic and clinical psychologist in Charlotte, North Carolina. He is a frequent presenter at AFCC meetings. He has done extensive writing in the field of child custody evaluations, and his most recent book is Conducting Scientifically Crafted Child Custody Evaluations (Sage, 1998).*

*Philip M. Stahl, Ph.D., chair of the AFCC's Child Custody Evaluation Interest Group, is a psychologist in private practice in Danville, California, specializing in custody evaluations. He is a frequent presenter at meetings of the AFCC and APA. He has done extensive writing in the field of high-conflict divorce, and his most recent books are Complex Issues in Child Custody Evaluations (Sage, 1999) and Parenting After Divorce (Impact Publishers, 2000). He was guest coeditor of the June 2000 special issue of Family & Conciliation Courts Review on the topic of child custody evaluations.*