PUNGGAWA
LAW REVIEW
Punggawa Law Review
Volume 1, Number 1, 2026
E-ISSN: xxxx-xxxx
Open Access: punggawajournal.com/plr

Parenting After Separation: Designing Legal Standards That Reduce Conflict, Not Just Resolve It

Fadhil Hayan Mochammad[1]
[1] Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Muhammadiyah Palu, Indonesia
Correspondence: fadhilhayan10@gmail.com

Article Info

Article history:
Received Feb 28, 2026
Revised Mar 1, 2026
Accepted Mar 4, 2026

Keyword:
Post-separation parenting; Parenting orders; Conflict reduction.

ABSTRACT

Post-separation parenting disputes often persisted despite final court orders because legal standards were commonly drafted to allocate parental time and authority rather than to govern the recurring coordination problems that generated repeat conflict. This article examined post-separation parenting as a governance challenge and assessed how legal standards could be designed to reduce conflict over time, not merely to resolve a single dispute. A doctrinal–normative analysis with a comparative policy lens was applied to identify where under-specified orders failed in practice, especially in schedules and handovers, shared decision-making, communication, and enforcement. The study developed a design framework that operationalized child-centred aims through mandatory minimum-content parenting plans, default rules for predictable flashpoints, defined decision domains with deadlock procedures, regulated communication protocols, and graduated enforcement that corrected minor breaches quickly while escalating responses for persistent non-compliance. The analysis also showed that cooperative models were unsafe or ineffective in high-conflict and high-risk families, requiring differentiated pathways such as parallel parenting and safety-sensitive restrictions. These findings supported a policy rubric for courts and legislators to draft standards that produced stability and reduced incentives for strategic obstruction.

INTRODUCTION

Separation and divorce rarely end parental conflict; they often reorganize it. What changes is not only the living arrangement but the institutional arena in which disagreement is fought. Once a relationship becomes a case file, many parents learn to translate ordinary parenting frictions into legal claims, procedural delay, or tactical non-compliance. Courts can "resolve" the dispute in the narrow sense by issuing custody and access orders, yet the lived reality for children frequently remains a rotating cycle of last-minute cancellations, contested handovers, disputes over school and health decisions, and the quiet weaponization of communication (Augustijn, 2021). This gap between formal resolution and practical stability is not a minor implementation problem. It reveals that post-separation parenting is governed by a rule system that can either dampen conflict or unintentionally reward it (Vowels et al., 2023). When legal standards are designed primarily to allocate time and authority, but not to manage the predictable points of friction that produce repeat litigation, the law becomes a stage for ongoing contest rather than a framework for reliable caregiving.

The dominant normative vocabulary in many jurisdictions is the "best interests of the child." Its appeal is obvious: it promises child-centred adjudication and moral legitimacy. Yet as a legal standard, it often operates at a high level of abstraction. Abstraction has a cost. First, it weakens predictability. Parents and lawyers may struggle to anticipate outcomes because the standard does not specify how recurring micro-disputes—holiday rotations, transportation duties, sick days, extracurricular activities, communication boundaries—should be handled. Second, it pushes problem-solving into discretionary judicial reasoning, where facts are frequently incomplete and where the legal

process itself can be leveraged by the more persistent or better-resourced party. Third, the elasticity of the "best interests" test can turn routine parenting decisions into fresh controversy. A standard meant to protect children can, in practice, incentivize strategic behaviour: repeated applications to modify orders, selective documentation, or systematic obstruction that forces the other parent to return to court. In that environment, conflict is not merely an emotional residue of separation; it becomes a rational strategy within an under-specified regulatory space .

This article treats post-separation parenting law as a form of dispute system design. The central claim is that family law should be assessed not only by the substantive fairness of its allocations but also by its capacity to reduce conflict over time. A conflict-reducing legal design does not aim to manufacture harmony. It aims to remove recurring opportunities for escalation, to lower the payoff of obstruction, and to create stable routines for children while preserving legitimate flexibility. That requires shifting attention from broad principles alone to operational standards that structure daily co-parenting (Xyrakis et al., 2024). The legal question is therefore more concrete than it first appears: what kinds of rules, presumptions, and enforcement ladders make parenting orders workable in the real world, and how can those instruments be tailored to different risk profiles—particularly where domestic abuse, coercive control, or severe power asymmetry renders "cooperation" unsafe?

Against that background, the article asks two related questions. First, how should legal standards for post-separation parenting be designed so that they reduce conflict rather than simply record a judicial compromise? Second, what components make those standards predictable, enforceable, and genuinely child-centred without becoming rigid or punitive? The objective is not to propose a single universal custody model (Payne et al., 2022). It is to articulate a design framework that courts and legislators can use to evaluate and refine parenting standards: whether the rules specify default schedules and decision domains clearly enough to prevent endless renegotiation, whether they contain practical communication protocols, whether they provide fast and proportionate responses to minor non-compliance before it metastasizes into chronic instability, and whether they incorporate a safety lens for high-risk families where shared decision-making can function as a continuation of control.

The contribution is conceptual and practical. Conceptually, it reframes the evaluation of parenting law from the moment of adjudication to the trajectory of family governance after adjudication. The relevant measure is not merely whether an order appears balanced on paper, but whether it creates a predictable environment in which children can maintain relationships without being exposed to recurring parental warfare. Practically, it synthesizes tools that are often treated as ancillary—structured parenting plans, default rules, dispute-resolution pathways, and graduated enforcement—into a coherent normative architecture. This integration is presented as a response to a persistent blind spot in family justice: the tendency to treat post-separation conflict as a private failure of parental character rather than as a foreseeable outcome shaped by institutional incentives. If standards are drafted with attention to the real mechanics of conflict production, the legal system can move from merely terminating disputes to governing parenting in a way that makes repeated disputes less likely and less rewarding.

RESEARCH METHODS

This article uses a doctrinal–normative research design with a comparative policy lens to examine how post-separation parenting standards function as governance tools that can either dampen or reproduce conflict. The study applies a statute-and-case approach by analysing parenting-related legal standards (custody/residence arrangements, parental responsibility, parenting orders, modification and enforcement mechanisms, and court-linked dispute resolution) alongside judicial reasoning in recurring post-separation disputes (implementation failures, repeated non-compliance, relocation/schooling conflicts, and high-conflict patterns). The legal materials are complemented by peer-reviewed interdisciplinary scholarship on post-separation living arrangements, interparental conflict dynamics, coercive control, structured parenting plans, and programmatic interventions, used to inform functional evaluation rather than to replace legal doctrine. Materials were collected through systematic library and database searches of legislation, reported decisions, and recent journal literature, then analysed qualitatively by applying a design-focused rubric across the discussion sections—testing standards for operational clarity, conflict-reduction capacity, enforceability through graduated

responses, child-stability effects, and safety sensitivity in high-risk contexts—so the conclusions follow directly from the governance components and special-situation frameworks developed in the analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Diagnosing the Conflict Triggers: Where Legal Standards Often Fail

Post-separation conflict is sustained less by grand disagreements than by recurring, predictable flashpoints. Legal standards often fail because they treat parenting disputes as episodic events to be adjudicated rather than as ongoing coordination problems that require durable operating rules (Stolnicu et al., 2022). When an order allocates "time" without specifying the mechanics of transitions, when it declares "joint decision-making" without allocating decision domains and deadlock rules, and when it expects "reasonable communication" without defining channels and boundaries, the legal system leaves a large volume of daily life to be negotiated by people who may no longer trust each other and who may be actively incentivized to refuse cooperation. The resulting disputes do not look dramatic at first—ten minutes late, a changed pickup location, a child not answering a call—but they accumulate into instability and create the pattern that courts later describe as "high conflict."

The first trigger is schedule ambiguity, especially around handovers and routine exceptions. Parenting time orders frequently state broad allocations—alternate weekends, midweek contact, half of holidays—while leaving crucial details unstated. Who transports the child, and where is the exchange point? What happens if the child is ill, has a school event, or is invited to a birthday party? What is the default plan for public holidays that fall adjacent to weekends, or for school holidays that vary year to year? Ambiguity on these issues is not neutral. It creates bargaining opportunities (Nilsen et al., 2022). A parent who benefits from control can weaponize ambiguity by insisting on last-minute interpretations, by refusing proposed adjustments, or by framing any deviation as proof of the other parent's irresponsibility. The other parent responds with defensive documentation and, eventually, applications to court. The child experiences the consequences directly: rushed transitions, emotional tension at exchanges, and uncertainty about routines.

The second trigger is escalation dynamics caused by weak early correction mechanisms. Many systems operate with a steep enforcement cliff: minor non-compliance is treated as too trivial for judicial intervention, while serious sanctions are reserved for extreme cases. This creates a perverse learning environment. If a parent can repeatedly breach an order in small ways without swift correction shortening contact by an hour, "forgetting" to pass on school notices, failing to facilitate phone calls those actions can cumulatively undermine the other parent's relationship with the child while remaining below the threshold that courts are willing to punish. Over time, the injured parent learns that waiting for major breaches is too costly, and the breaching parent learns that the system tolerates persistent low-level obstruction. The conflict then becomes self-reinforcing: the more one parent breaches, the more the other litigates; the more litigation occurs, the more the first parent frames resistance as self-protection. A legal standard that lacks a graduated, fast response track effectively turns chronic non-compliance into an efficient strategy (Ridhwani et al., 2026).

The third trigger is unenforceability orders that are not realistically executable in the families' actual lives. Courts may craft orders that assume cooperative behaviour: flexible adjustments "by agreement," shared decision-making "in consultation," or broad access to information "as reasonably requested." These phrases appear sensible but often collapse under stress. An obligation to consult is only meaningful when there is a defined process for consultation, including timing, form, and consequences of silence or refusal (Schrodt, 2025). An order that assumes parents will agree on extracurricular activities, school selection, or medical decisions can function as a standing invitation to sabotage when disagreement is foreseeable. Unenforceable orders also encourage posturing. A parent can comply formally while undermining practically attending "consultation" but refusing to disclose information, agreeing in principle but delaying implementation until it is useless. When enforceability is weak, the law loses credibility as a governance tool and becomes a repository of aspirational language that parents manipulate.

The fourth and most serious trigger is the failure to integrate domestic abuse, coercive control, and power asymmetry into the design of parenting standards. A legal regime that presumes cooperation may unintentionally compel ongoing interaction between a victim and an abuser, treating communication and shared decision-making as markers of "good parenting." Coercive control theory highlights how post-separation control can be exercised through exactly the channels that family law often mandates:

frequent messaging, demands for information, constant renegotiation of schedules, and threats of litigation. In such contexts, "co-parenting" is not a neutral ideal; it can be a continuation of domination. When legal standards do not contain a clear risk assessment lens and do not offer alternative models parallel parenting, supervised exchanges, protected communication platforms, or restrictions on direct contact they increase the probability that conflict will remain chronic and that the child will remain exposed to hostility and fear (Zvika Orr & Mimi Ajzenstadt, 2020).

These triggers share a common structural theme: under-specification. Legal standards that speak in broad principles without operational detail shift the burden of governance onto the parties' capacity to cooperate, even when cooperation is precisely what is absent. The law then misdiagnoses its own product. It frames recurring disputes as "parental failure" rather than as the predictable outcome of a system that leaves too many high-friction issues to ad hoc negotiation and provides too little swift correction when negotiation breaks down (McCormack, 2025). A conflict-reducing approach begins by mapping these triggers as design vulnerabilities. Once those vulnerabilities are visible, the task of legal reform becomes concrete: reduce ambiguity in high-frequency disputes, provide early and proportionate correction mechanisms, draft orders for enforceability in real-world routines, and build safety-sensitive pathways for families in which power and violence make cooperation impossible or dangerous.

2. Designing Standards That Reduce Conflict: Core Components

A conflict-reducing parenting regime is built less on inspirational language and more on operational architecture. The aim is to make everyday coordination predictable, to narrow the space for strategic obstruction, and to provide responses that are quick enough to matter before conflict becomes entrenched (Huerta et al., 2025). The design question is therefore practical: what elements should a legal standard reliably produce in the resulting parenting order, and what mechanisms should surround the order so that compliance is the easiest path and escalation is the least rewarding one?

The first core component is the parenting plan as a "micro-constitution" for post-separation life (Wang et al., 2021). Many systems treat parenting plans as optional, informal, or negotiable appendices to an order. A conflict-reducing design treats them as mandatory structure, whether they are parent-generated, professionally assisted, or court-imposed. The plan is not a symbolic commitment to cooperation; it is a governance document that anticipates recurring disputes and resolves them in advance through defaults. At minimum, it should set a baseline schedule with precise start and end times, clear exchange locations, and transport responsibilities. It should also contain a holiday and school-break calendar method that can be applied each year without renegotiation. Crucially, it must regulate foreseeable exceptions: illness, school events, family ceremonies, religious observances, extracurricular activities, and travel. The point is not to micromanage family life but to reduce the number of occasions that require fresh bargaining. Where a plan remains silent, conflict fills the silence. When a plan specifies defaults, parents can adjust by agreement, but they cannot weaponize uncertainty.

A second component is the strategic use of default rules and presumptions to prevent endless bargaining. Post-separation parenting is particularly vulnerable to "negotiation fatigue": one party proposes adjustments, the other withholds consent, and the child's routine becomes a rolling negotiation. Defaults solve this problem by creating a baseline that applies unless there is a concrete reason to deviate. A default is not a claim that all families are identical . It is an institutional tool that narrows disagreement and reduces the ability to extract concessions through refusal. For example, a jurisdiction may adopt standard holiday rotations, presumptive exchange points, or default make-up time rules when contact is missed. The benefit is predictability. Predictability reduces litigation because it lowers the informational advantage of repeat players and reduces the incentive to "try one more application" in search of a better discretionary outcome. Defaults also support settlement because they give parties a clear reference point: deviation must be justified, not merely demanded.

A third component is the explicit allocation of decision domains—who decides what, and how deadlocks are resolved. Many high-conflict disputes are not about parenting time but about authority: school choice, tutoring, medical treatment, mental health services, religion, travel, passports, and increasingly, digital life. A vague order requiring "joint decisions" invites deadlock. A conflict-reducing order disaggregates authority. It identifies domains in which one parent has final decision-making power after consultation, domains that require joint consent, and domains reserved to the primary care context in which the child is physically present. Consultation should be defined procedurally: the initiating parent must provide relevant information, propose options, and allow a reasonable response

window; the responding parent must reply within that window; silence has specified consequences. Deadlock rules should be layered. Low-stakes disputes may default to the status quo pending review; high-stakes disputes may be referred to expedited mediation, a parenting coordinator, or a narrowly framed judicial determination. The legal system reduces conflict when it reduces the number of situations in which disagreement automatically becomes a crisis.

A fourth component is an enforceable communication protocol. Courts frequently order parents to "communicate respectfully" or to "keep each other informed." These phrases are morally appealing but operationally weak. Communication is a major conflict channel: it can be used to provoke, to harass, to control, or to manufacture a record for court. A conflict-reducing design therefore treats communication as a regulated interface (Rahman et al., 2024). The order should specify the primary channel (a dedicated co-parenting application, email, or another verifiable platform), permitted hours for routine messages, maximum response windows for non-urgent and urgent matters, and the categories of information that must be shared (school notices, medical appointments, travel plans) with defined timeframes. It should prohibit communication through the child and regulate contact during the other parent's time to avoid undermining routines. Where appropriate, it should require that contentious issues be raised in a standardized format: a clear request, relevant information attached, and proposed options. This is not about policing tone for its own sake; it is about reducing ambiguity, limiting harassment opportunities, and creating a reliable record that discourages manipulation.

A fifth component is a graduated enforcement ladder that provides swift, proportionate correction. Parenting orders often fail not because they are wrong in principle, but because compliance is not credibly enforced. A conflict-reducing design treats enforcement as part of the standard itself, not as an afterthought. The ladder begins with low-cost corrective tools. If a parent unreasonably denies contact, the default response can include automatic make-up time within a specified period. If breaches recur, the system may require structured mediation or parenting coordination with narrow authority to resolve logistical disputes (Schafer et al., 2023). Persistent non-compliance can trigger evidentiary directions—such as producing communication logs or school records—so that patterns are visible without a full trial. Only when breaches are serious or repeated should stronger measures apply: fines, costs orders, modification of the schedule, or findings of contempt where available. The key is timing. Correction must arrive while the breach still affects the child's routine. Delayed enforcement teaches parents that non-compliance is worth attempting because the remedy arrives too late to restore what was lost.

A sixth component is differentiation by conflict and risk profile. A regime that assumes cooperative co-parenting as a default can be counterproductive when the parents' relationship is characterized by high hostility or by safety concerns. A conflict-reducing standard therefore includes decision rules for selecting governance models. In lower-conflict cases, shared decision-making and flexible scheduling may be appropriate because the parties can negotiate in good faith. In high-conflict cases, the system should move toward parallel parenting structures that minimize direct interaction: rigid schedules, limited communication to functional topics, and exchanges in controlled settings. In abuse-implicated cases, the design must prioritize safety and autonomy. Communication may need to be routed through monitored platforms, exchanges may be supervised, and decision-making authority may be allocated to prevent continued control. Differentiation is essential because "more cooperation" is not always feasible and may not always be safe.

Finally, conflict-reducing design requires procedural integration: the standards must be supported by institutional pathways that match their logic. If parenting plans are expected, courts must have templates or minimum-content requirements. If expedited correction is necessary, courts must have fast-track enforcement procedures or delegated dispute resolution mechanisms. If communication protocols are mandated, the system should recognise the evidentiary value of structured platforms and discourage informal channels that are harder to monitor. Without institutional support, well-drafted standards become symbolic and families return to the same patterns of contested negotiation.

Taken together, these components translate child-centred commitments into governable structures. They do not promise to eliminate conflict, because conflict can be rooted in grief, resentment, or strategic domination. They instead aim to change the payoffs: to shrink the space in which conflict can be produced, to make compliance more predictable, and to ensure that when breaches occur, the system responds quickly enough to restore stability in the child's life. This is how parenting law can move from adjudicating the past to governing the future.

3. Special Situations: Standards for High-Conflict and High-Risk Families

A parenting standard that reduces conflict in ordinary cases can still fail in families where conflict is chronic or where safety risks make cooperation unrealistic. In these settings, the legal mistake is often the same: treating "more communication" and "more shared decision-making" as universal indicators of good parenting. For high-conflict and high-risk families, the design objective shifts from facilitating collaboration to preventing predictable harm—harm to the child's stability, harm to the vulnerable parent, and harm created by ongoing exposure to domination through legal and communicative channels (Spearman et al., 2023). A credible regime therefore needs differentiated tools that recognise when cooperative co-parenting is not a plausible governance model.

The first special situation is the high-conflict case in which hostility is persistent but not necessarily linked to physical violence. These families are characterised by repeated litigation, intense mistrust, and frequent disputes over minor details. In such cases, parallel parenting is often more conflict-reducing than co-parenting. Parallel parenting is not a moral judgement that parents should not cooperate; it is a pragmatic acknowledgement that interaction itself is the fuel. The model reduces interaction points by using fixed schedules, clear exchange procedures, and communication limited to essential logistical and child-related information. Decision-making is also structured to avoid deadlocks: each parent exercises autonomy during their own parenting time for day-to-day matters, while major decisions are either allocated to one parent after defined consultation or channelled into a specialised dispute resolution route. The legal logic is to lower the frequency of negotiations and to replace open-ended bargaining with predetermined defaults (Gymnastia et al., 2025). When this model is properly designed, it reduces opportunities for provocation and makes compliance assessable without interpretive battles over "reasonableness."

Relocation, schooling disputes, and other high-stakes decisions constitute a second special situation because they are disproportionately likely to trigger litigation and because they can produce irreversible changes. A conflict-reducing standard should not treat these cases as purely discretionary contests in which each side presents a competing story of what is best. It should impose a structured test with clear factors and defined evidentiary expectations. For relocation, the inquiry should focus on the necessity and purpose of the move, the feasibility of maintaining a meaningful relationship with the non-moving parent, the stability benefits for the child, and the moving parent's plan to preserve contact through realistic travel and communication arrangements (Chaudhary, 2024). For schooling, the standard should prioritise continuity and educational needs, and it should require parents to disclose objective information—school reports, distance, costs, support services—rather than relying on moralised claims about the other parent's motives. The design point is to reduce the value of strategic narrative by raising the value of concrete planning. A parent seeking change should be required to present an implementable plan; a parent opposing change should be required to propose feasible alternatives. Structured tests channel conflict into solvable questions rather than escalating into character attacks.

A third special situation involves patterns of gatekeeping: persistent interference with contact, strategic cancellations, or the subtler practice of making contact technically possible but practically unworkable. Gatekeeping is especially damaging because it often presents as a series of small events rather than a single dramatic breach. A conflict-reducing regime should therefore treat patterns as legally salient. The standard can define indicators of obstruction, such as repeated last-minute cancellations without a valid reason, failure to provide timely information about school and medical matters, refusal to facilitate communication, or insistence on unnecessary conditions for exchanges (Zhang et al., 2021). Once a pattern is established, the system should respond in a way that is both corrective and deterrent. Automatic make-up time is a starting point, but chronic gatekeeping may require schedule modification, the use of neutral exchange locations, structured communication platforms, or, where permitted, cost consequences and sanctions. The aim is to remove the incentive to erode the other parent's relationship through low-level non-compliance.

The fourth special situation is the abuse-implicated case, including coercive control. Here, the standard must be safety-sensitive, because post-separation parenting can become a continuation of control through mandated interaction. Coercive control is not primarily about isolated incidents; it is about a pattern of domination—monitoring, intimidation, manipulation, and restriction of autonomy. Legal requirements that parents communicate frequently, negotiate adjustments, or share decision

authority can become tools for harassment . A conflict-reducing design therefore needs a clear threshold for shifting from cooperative expectations to protective governance. Communication may be restricted to written channels with boundaries on frequency and content, exchanges may be supervised or conducted through third parties, and direct contact may be minimised. Decision-making authority may need to be allocated asymmetrically to prevent ongoing interference. Where the child's safety is implicated, supervised contact or staged reintroduction may be necessary. Importantly, safety-sensitive design does not treat "both parents' rights" as symmetrical abstractions; it treats the child's security and the vulnerable parent's autonomy as preconditions for stable parenting.

Across these special situations, one principle holds: the legal system should not demand a level of cooperation that the case facts make implausible or unsafe. A conflict-reducing standard differentiates. It offers parallel parenting for hostility-driven conflict, structured tests for relocation and schooling disputes, pattern-based responses for gatekeeping, and protective pathways for abuse-implicated families. This differentiation is not discretionary improvisation; it is part of a coherent legal architecture that aims to reduce conflict by matching governance tools to the family's actual risk and conflict profile (Bianco et al., 2022).

CONCLUSION

Post-separation parenting law succeeds when it governs the future, not when it merely justifies a past-facing allocation of time and authority. A child-centred standard is operationally credible only if it reduces predictable conflict triggers through structured parenting plans, usable default rules, clearly defined decision domains, and communication protocols that can be complied with and verified. Just as importantly, it must be backed by a graduated enforcement ladder that corrects minor breaches quickly enough to preserve routines, while reserving stronger interventions for persistent or serious non-compliance so that obstruction does not become an efficient strategy.

The same design logic requires differentiation. Cooperative co-parenting cannot be treated as a universal aspiration when high conflict, coercive control, or domestic abuse makes ongoing interaction unsafe or inherently escalatory. Conflict-reducing standards therefore need parallel parenting options, structured tests for relocation and schooling disputes, pattern-based responses to gatekeeping, and protective pathways that limit contact and allocate authority in ways that prioritise safety and stability. When these elements are integrated, family law can move from repeatedly "resolving" the same dispute to building a governance framework that makes repeat disputes less likely and less rewarding.

REFERENCES

Augustijn, L. (2021). The relation between joint physical custody, interparental conflict, and children's mental health. *Journal of Family Research*, *33*(3), 613–636. https://doi.org/10.20377/jfr-621

Bianco, A., Licata, F., Nobile, C. G., Napolitano, F., & Pavia, M. (2022). Pattern and appropriateness of antibiotic prescriptions for upper respiratory tract infections in primary care paediatric patients. *International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents*, *59*(1), 106469. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2021.106469

Chaudhary, S. (2024). The value of feminist legal methods in adjudicating women's issues: a critical comparison of two judicial approaches from India. *Indian Law Review*, *8*(1), 66–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/24730580.2024.2332821

Gymnastia, H. N., Sundari, N., & Mashudi, E. A. (2025). Dampak Co-Parenting Orang Tua terhadap Perkembangan Sosial-Emosional Anak Usia Dini : Sebuah Studi Kasus. *Aulad: Journal on Early Childhood*, *8*(1), 525–541. https://doi.org/10.31004/aulad.v8i1.1079

Huerta, A. T., Orellana, N. V., Sala, F. G., & Pérez, M. T. (2025). Scoping Review of the Scientific Production on Parenting Coordination. *Anuario de Psicología Jurídica*, *35*, 53–61. https://doi.org/10.5093/apj2025a4

McCormack, M. (2025). Litigation in Family Court as Post-Separation Control. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*.

Nilsen, S. A., Askeland, K. G., Bøe, T., Sivertsen, B., Heradstveit, O., & Hysing, M. (2022). Joint physical custody and academic achievement among youth: A population-based study with registry linkage. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *36*(8), 1351–1362. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0001015

Payne, J. L., Smyth, B. M., Irving, M., Heard, G., & Althor, G. (2022). Family law professionals' views of post-separation parenting apps. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family*, *36*(1). https://doi.org/10.1093/lawfam/ebac029

Rahman, F., Bahfiarti, T., & Kahar, K. (2024). Identifikasi Konflik Komunikasi Interpersonal Orang Tua Tunggal dan Anak Akibat Perceraian. *JIIP - Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, *7*(6), 5353–5359. https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v7i6.4462

Ridhwani, L. G., Setianto, M. J., & Yudiawan, I. D. G. H. (2026). Tinjauan yuridis terhadap mekanisme eksekusi putusan hak asuh anak pasca perceraian di Indonesia. *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, *4*(1), 7242–7248.

Schafer, M., Lachman, J. M., Gardner, F., Zinser, P., Calderon, F., Han, Q., Facciola, C., & Clements, L. (2023). Integrating intimate partner violence prevention content into a digital parenting chatbot intervention during COVID-19: Intervention development and remote data collection. *BMC Public Health*, *23*(1), 1708. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-16649-w

Schrodt, P. (2025). Interparental conflict and parent–child triangulation: a meta-analytical review of children feeling caught between parents. *Human Communication Research*. https://doi.org/10.1093/hcr/hqaf018

Spearman, K. J., Hardesty, J. L., & Campbell, J. (2023). Post-separation abuse: A concept analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *79*(4), 1225–1246. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.15310

Stolnicu, E., De Mol, J., Hendrick, S., & Gaugue, J. (2022). Healing the separation in high-conflict post-divorce co-parenting. *Frontiers in Psychology*.

Vowels, L. M., Comolli, C. L., Bernardi, L., Chacón-Mendoza, D., & Darwiche, J. (2023). Systematic review and theoretical comparison of children's outcomes in post-separation living arrangements. *PLOS ONE*, *18*(6), e0288112. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0288112

Wang, F., Lu, J., Lin, L., Cai, J., Xu, J., & Zhou, X. (2021). Impact of parental divorce versus separation due to migration on mental health and self-injury of Chinese children: a cross sectional survey. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, *15*(1), 71. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13034-021-00424-z

Xyrakis, N., Aquilina, B., McNiece, E., Tran, T., Waddell, C., Suomi, A., & Pasalich, D. (2024). Interparental Coercive Control and Child and Family Outcomes: A Systematic Review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *25*(1), 22–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221139243

Zhang, Y., Zhang, J., & Rehmus, K. W. (2021). Reciprocating and Connecting: The Ritual Structure and Social Functions of Yao Huan Jia Yuan in Huangdong, Southwest China. *Religions*, *12*(7), 526. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12070526

Zvika Orr, & Mimi Ajzenstadt. (2020). Beyond Control: the Criminalization of African Asylum Seekers in Israel. *International Review of Sociology*, *30*(1), 142–165.