



Kinship Benefits and Penalties:

How gender, parenthood, and relationship duration shape emotional closeness and conflict in intergenerational relationships

Master's Degree Programme in Inequalities, Interventions and New Welfare State
Department of Social Research
Faculty of Social Sciences
Master's thesis

Author:

Mikaela Malka

Supervisor(s):

Mirkka Danielsbacka

Alyona Artamonova

25.2.2026

Turku

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

The originality of this thesis has been checked in accordance with the University of Turku quality assurance system using the Turnitin Originality Check service.

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

Master's thesis

Subject: INVEST

Author(s): Mikaela Malka

Title: Kinship Benefits and Penalties: How gender, parenthood, and relationship duration shape emotional closeness and conflict in intergenerational relationships

Supervisor(s): Mirkka Danielsbacka, Alyona Artamonova

Number of pages: 31 pages + 5 appendices pages

Date: 25.02.2026

Master's thesis

Abstract

This study examines how parenthood and relationship duration shape emotional closeness and conflict in intergenerational relationships, with particular attention to ties between partnered individuals aged 25 to 50, and their parents-in-law. Drawing on evolutionary theories of inclusive fitness and reproductive linking, as well as sociological perspectives on kin-keeping and intergenerational ambivalence, the analysis explores whether parenthood and time in partnership create both “kinship benefits” (greater closeness) and “kinship penalties” (greater conflict), and whether these dynamics differ for women and men. Using nationally representative survey data called Gentrans 2018 (n= 767), emotional closeness and conflict were measured separately in four dyads: own mother, own father, mother-in-law, and father-in-law. Logistic regression models, estimated separately for women and men, assessed the associations of parenthood and relationship duration with in-law closeness and conflict. Respondents reported higher closeness and somewhat more conflict with their own parents than with their in-laws. Parenthood significantly increased women’s emotional closeness to in-laws but showed no comparable effect for men. In contrast, longer partnership duration strongly predicted men’s closeness and conflict with mothers-in-law but had limited relevance for women. These findings highlight gender-specific pathways through which kinship ties evolve and demonstrate that emotional affinal relationships in Finland are shaped by both parenthood and relationship stability but the associations differ for men and women.

Keywords: parenthood; in-laws; emotional closeness; conflict; intergenerational relations; kinship penalty; Finland

Introduction

In many societies, family ties are seen as a source of support, stability, and continuity across various generations (Itahashi et al., 2020; Van der Ven, 2012). These intergenerational relationships become even more relevant during major life transitions, such as when a couple is becoming parents (Danielsbacka et al., 2015; Hank & Buber, 2009; Elder, 1994). While parenthood is commonly assumed to bring families emotionally closer to each other by aligning goals and increasing mutual dependency, there is a lack of research exploring the complexity of these relationships. Instead of only strengthening family bonds, parenthood may also introduce new conflict, particularly between new parents and their in-laws.

An evolutionary rationale for this ambivalence of ties is rooted in the notion of shared reproductive interest (Danielsbacka et al., 2015). When a child is born, the two-family lines, the parents' and the in-laws', become connected through a common descendant by blood. This means that both families have genetic and emotional ties to the next generation. This common interest makes affinal kin (in-laws) "more like" biological kin, which makes it easier for them to work together to support the child, but it also makes it more likely that they might compete with each other and get in the way of family decisions. The kinship benefit and penalty is a term that describes how emotional closeness and conflict are likely to coexist in family life (Danielsbacka et al., 2015; 2017).

Theoretical Framework and Previous Research

Earlier research has confirmed that parenthood affects closeness and conflict in intergenerational relationships. Danielsbacka et al. (2015) found that parenthood is associated with higher closeness with some grandparents, particularly maternal grandmothers, due to evolutionary and cultural pressures that make them traditionally kinkeepers and the "family relationship managers" (Hornstra & Ivanova, 2023; Rosenthal, 1985). In another study,

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

Danielsbacka, Tanskanen and Rotkirch (2017) showed that parents also report more conflicts with in-laws than childless couples, supporting the idea of a “kinship penalty.” Kinship networks are often referred to as extended family, which includes individuals who are connected by blood, marriage or in the case of fictive kin, by self-ascribed association, or more simply by choice (Nazarinia, Schumm, & Britt, 2013).

The inclusive fitness theory (Hamilton, 1964) explains these patterns by emphasizing that individuals are evolutionarily motivated to favor those with whom they share genetic connections. Parenthood aligns the reproductive goals of in-laws, turning them into cooperative but potentially conflict-prone partners. From this perspective, the birth of a child creates overlapping reproductive interests between two kin lineages, the parents’ and the inlaws’ which encourages cooperation in childrearing but also competition over influence and resources (Danielsbacka, Tanskanen & Rotkirch, 2017).

Hughes (1988) extends the underlying reasoning by formulating an inverse relatedness hypothesis, which posits that affinal relatives, while not being genetically related, become connected through a shared interest in common descendants. This gives him the concept of indirect or inverse relatedness, which is a bond of affinity that is tied together by a common genetic interest in the offspring. This "reproductive linking" provides the motivation for both alliance and conflict, as people are motivated to maximize the well-being of their own offspring while still cooperating with the affinity group (Hamilton, 1964). The state of parenthood thus can both strengthen and strain these extended family relationships and create at once kinship benefits and kinship penalties (Danielsbacka et al., 2015; 2017).

Drawing on these traditions, the intergenerational ambivalence theory developed by Lüscher and Pillemer (1998) provides a basic conceptual framework. Ambivalence theory means that positive and negative effects and feelings can occur together within family relationships, rather than standing at opposite ends of some linear scale. From this perspective, being a parent or a grandparent can make attachment stronger, but it can also be a

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

source of stress, especially in relationships with in-laws, as this relationship forms later in life. This perspective has much in common with the idea of kinship benefit and penalty (Danielsbacka et al., 2015; 2017) because both express the paradoxical tension-intimacy dynamic that characterizes familial relationships.

This research is also supplemented with the life course perspective by Elder (1994), which explains how individual lives unfold over time within structured social contexts. This theory takes a step back, and considers the human development a combination of age, biology, historical timing, social relationships and institutions. Becoming a parent is often a massive turning point that inevitably alters the intergenerational relationships. When a child is born, it is not just a matter of shifting roles and expectations for the parents and children, but for grandparents and other kin in the network as well, and how they communicate, help, and even possibly disagree. The concept of “linked lives” shows how a change in the life path of one kin member can alter others in the kin group (Elder, 1994).

Gender and lineage

Earlier studies also highlight the importance of gendered family roles. The relationship between generations is traditionally maintained by mothers and maternal lineage, while the paternal side and affinal bonds (in-laws) are potentially more distant and conflict-ridden (Dubas, 2001; Hornstra & Ivanova, 2023). It seems that the differences in intimacy and conflict may not only be the result of parenthood but also represent the gendered demands of family labor division (Rosenthal, 1985). Ambivalence theory also emphasizes that such expectations tend to induce conflicting pressures: for instance, daughters-in-law can have conflicting obligations of solidarity and autonomy, which is why mother-in-law–daughter-in-law relationships tend to be frequently characterized by increased tension (Fingerman et al., 2012).

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

A further theoretical framework relates to the composition of families and the possible presence of three generations. The relationships between generations simply means the presence or absence of grandparents, parents, and children at the same time (Goodman, 2007). The three-generation family network can offer a structural and emotional basis for support and care, but also ground for conflict exchange. Based on the study by Danielsbacka, Tanskanen, and Rotkirch (2017), the existence of a grandchild is related to changes in relationships between kin lineages, because it creates a common reproductive interest that ties together biological and affinal relatives. In contrast, life-long childlessness or lack of a third generation may decrease the incentive for maintaining high-quality relationships and the possibilities for conflict that emerge from shared childrearing and lineage investments (Hamilton, 1964; Danielsbacka et al., 2015). In childless families, there may be less emotional ambivalence, as they do not have the generational tie that typically forms the source of both affection and conflict in kin relationships.

Relationship duration also acts as an important factor for the level of stability and consolidation within a partnership. Previous studies indicate that the initial years of cohabitation or marriage are usually marked by adjustment and negotiation, such as establishing new in-law relationships and boundaries, while searching common routines (Waite & Gallagher, 2003; Fingerman & Hay, 2002). Beyond an approximate period of five years, partnerships tend to display more established patterns of interaction and greater relational stability. On this basis, the current study adopts a five-year cut-off to distinguish shorter from longer relationships, representing a practical and empirically based indicator of stability rather than a theoretically absolute cut-off.

Besides the length of partnership as an indicator of relationship quality, it could also have gendered implications regarding the ways in which people interact with the partner's family. Evolutionary mating theory argues that men and women differ in the degree to which they invest in romantic relationships as part of mating strategies. The article by Pettay (et al.

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

2024) describes how, particularly for men, the investment in family relationships, such as partners' affinal relatives, is in some cases a result of their desire to maintain and develop the romantic relationship they are in. In the current study, the length of partnership could provide men with more opportunities to invest in relationships with in-laws as part of their overall investment in the romantic relationship, whereas women's relationships with in-laws are more directly related to their kin-keeping activities (Hornstra & Ivanova, 2023).

Gaps and the present study

Despite this theoretical and empirical foundation, several gaps remain. First, it has been found in previous studies that having children is generally associated with both increased closeness and conflict, especially with in-laws (Danielsbacka et al., 2015; 2017), but very little is known about the independent associations of relationship duration with these outcomes. Secondly, the existing literature has been more interested in support exchanges or grandparent involvement, rather than the co-occurrence of affection and conflict across life transitions. Finally, even though much of the literature has examined family dynamics at the higher level, there has been less attention given to how these dynamics function in smaller countries such as Finland, where demographic and cultural contexts influences family dynamics in a unique manner. Building on these demographic characteristics, the present study contributes to filling the gap by examining how parenthood and relationship duration shape emotional closeness and conflict in Finnish intergenerational relations of Finnish men and women.

Finnish context

Finland is an excellent location to look at couples' relations with parents. Fertility rates have dropped sharply in the last few decades. The total fertility rate (TFR) was 1.87 in 2010 and is currently 1.32, which is one of the lowest rates in Europe (Statistics Finland,

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

2023; Jalovaara, Andersson & Miettinen, 2022). Most Finnish families have one or two children, and families with three or more children are becoming less common (Jalovaara et al., 2022). These findings show that there are overall Nordic trends of delayed childbearing and rising lifelong childlessness, particularly among men and those of lower socioeconomic status (Jalovaara et al., 2022; Tanskanen & Danielsbacka, 2019).

However, the population is aging at a rate that is extremely rapid (Valkama and Oulasvirta, 2021). Over one-fifth of the Finnish population is aged 65 years or older, and this is set to rise to one-fourth by 2030 (Hämäläinen & Tanskanen, 2021). The number of grandparents has risen already to 1.26 million (Pietiläinen & Nikander, 2021), and almost 90% of Finnish kids have at least one living grandparent. However, living with grandparents is somewhat uncommon, as little as 2% of children live with a grandparent. The average distance between grandchildren and their maternal grandmothers is about 80 kilometers, and geographical distance has slightly increased over the years (Pietiläinen & Nikander, 2021; Hämäläinen & Tanskanen, 2021).

These demographic trends affect, and are affected by, the nature of kin ties. Finnish families are emotionally close but physically and functionally independent (Tanskanen, Danielsbacka & Erola, 2017; Mikkonen et al., 2023). In this "weak family, strong state" perspective (Mönkediek and Bras, 2014; Chung, 2019), relationships between generations are in essence voluntary, rather than economically or practically necessary. This makes Finland an excellent country for examining how emotional closeness and conflict manifest when family ties are largely autonomous and optional yet simultaneously remain emotionally connected.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study uses Finnish survey data from the Gentrans AL 2018 dataset, focusing only on partnered men and women aged 25–50, both with and without common children with their current partner. This stage of life marks the point at which relationships between generations are usually re-negotiated. The study investigates the independent relationship of parenthood and relationship length to the probability of emotional closeness and conflict with parents-in-law, and whether there is a difference for women and men. The analysis is restricted to main effects only and does not include the interaction of parenthood and relationship length. The study will incorporate both evolutionary family theory (inclusive fitness and shared reproductive interest) and sociological approaches (kin-keeping and intergenerational solidarity).

Hypotheses

(Hypothesis 1 [H1]) Respondents will report higher closeness and conflict with own parents than with in-laws.

(Hypothesis 2 [H2]) Compared to childlessness, parenthood will be associated with higher likelihood of both greater emotional closeness and more frequent conflict with inlaws, reflecting simultaneous kinship benefits and penalties.

(Hypothesis 3 [H3]) Longer relationship duration will be associated with a lower likelihood of conflict and a higher likelihood of emotional closeness with in-laws.

(Hypothesis 4 [H4]) The effects of parenthood and relationship duration on emotional closeness and conflict with parents-in-law will differ for women and men, with women expected to show stronger parenthood-related differences and men stronger partnership duration-related differences.

Data and Methods

Data

This study uses the third wave of the Gentrans AL dataset (2018), which provides detailed information on Finnish baby boomers and their adult children (Gentrans, n.d.). The Gentrans project is a nationally representative survey examining intergenerational relationships, support exchanges, and emotional dynamics in Finnish families. The 2018 wave, the most extensive, focused on adults aged approximately 25–50 and was conducted by the Family Federation of Finland in cooperation with Statistics Finland.

The analytical sample consists of partnered adults, both with and without children with their current partner. The analysis employs dyadic approach (relationship with own mother, own father, mother-in-law, and father-in-law). Although the Gentrans dataset also includes 2007 and 2012 waves, they are not used in the main analyses because they lack direct measures of relationship length, one of the most central explanatory variables in this study. Additional analysis attempted to impute this variable by linking respondents across the 2012 and 2018 waves, but the resulting matched sample ($n = 19$) was too limited to draw reliable conclusions. Consequently, this study relies exclusively on the 2018 data, where relationship duration is measured directly and the sample size is somewhat larger.

Descriptive tables

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the analytical sample

Panel A. Sample composition ($n = 767$)

Variable	Categories	N	Percent (%)
Parenthood status *	No children	40	6.7%
	Has children	560	93.3%
Relationship length	< 5 years	80	10.6%
	≥ 5 years	676	89.4%
Gender	Women	317	41.33%

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

	Male	450	58.67%
Education (respondent)	Elementary school	9	1.2%
	Upper secondary	34	4.4%
	Vocational school	120	15.6%
	Post-secondary vocational	87	11.3%
	University of applied science	223	29.1%
	Master's degree / above	260	33.9%
	Other / missing	34	4.4%

*Note: Only partnered respondents with valid closeness and conflict dyad information. * 167 missing values on parenthood status variable.*

Panel B. Overall means

Variable	Mean	SD	N
<i>Age (years)</i>	41.11	5.50	767
<i>Relationship length (years)</i>	14.39	7.46	756

Note: Relationship length is missing for 11 respondents.

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the analytical sample, which consists of all partnered respondents in the 2018 Gentrans survey who provided valid information on emotional closeness and conflict for each dyad (own mother, own father, mother-in-law, father-in-law). After applying these restrictions, the analytical sample includes 767 respondents, however, there were some noticeable missingness in the parenthood status variable.

Within this analytical sample, 93% had at least one shared child with their current partner, while 7% had no shared children in the current union. A large majority (89%) reported being in long-term relationships lasting five years or longer. Compared to the full Gentrans survey, which slightly overrepresents women, this analytical sample contains more men (59%) than women (41%), reflecting probably that women were more likely to have missing information on partner characteristics or dyad-specific variables and were therefore excluded through listwise deletion. Educational attainment follows a typical Finnish

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

distribution: approximately one-third hold a master's degree or higher, and nearly one-third have a university of applied sciences degree. The mean age in the analytical sample is 41.1 years (SD = 5.5). The average relationship length is 14.4 years (SD = 7.5), although information on relationship duration is missing for 11 respondents.

The descriptive statistics are based on all partnered respondents with valid dyad information on emotional closeness and conflict (N = 767). However, the logistic regression models rely on complete-case estimation. Because some respondents have missing values on parenthood status, relationship duration, or control variables, the effective sample size varies across models (see Tables 6–7 for model-specific Ns). The reduction in sample size reflects listwise deletion and does not substantively alter the pattern of results.

Table 2A. Predictor means by parenthood status

Variable	No children Mean (SD)	N	Has children Mean (SD)	N
Age (years)	42.43 (5.57)	40	41.39 (5.13)	560
Relationship length (years)	5.95 (3.73)	38	15.97 (6.99)	555

Note: N:s vary due to missing information on relationship length. Relationship length is missing for 7 parents and 2 childless respondents.

Table 2B. Predictor means by relationship duration

Variable	< 5 years Mean (SD)	N	≥ 5 years Mean (SD)	N
Age (years)	37.71 (5.96)	80	41.53 (5.27)	676
Relationship length (years)	2.91 (1.01)	80	15.75 (6.69)	676
Has children (%)	58.70%	46	96.53%	547

Note: Means are based on the analytical sample of partnered respondents with valid dyad information (N = 756 for relationship length). Parenthood percentages are conditional on relationship duration and based on respondents with valid information on both variables (N = 593).

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

Table 2C. Predictor means by gender

Variable	Men Mean (SD)	N	Women Mean (SD)	N
Age (years)	40.50 (5.62)	450	41.99 (5.21)	317
Relationship length (years)	14.91 (7.69)	443	13.65 (7.08)	313
Has children (%)	92.80%	361	94.14%	239

Note: Means are based on the analytical sample (N = 767 for age; N = 756 for relationship length). Parenthood percentages are conditional on gender and based on respondents with valid information on both variables (N = 600).

Table 2A–2C further describe the distribution of the main explanatory variables across key subgroups. Table 2A shows that respondents without shared children in the current union are slightly older on average than those with shared children (42.4 vs. 41.4 years). This difference does not necessarily indicate lifetime childlessness, as the measure captures only joint children with the current partner. As expected, relationship duration differs substantially by shared parenthood status: respondents without shared children report an average relationship length of 6.0 years, whereas those with shared children have been in their partnership for nearly 16 years on average. Table 2B demonstrates the strong association between partnership duration and parenthood. Among relationships of five years or longer, 96.5% have children, compared to 58.7% among those in shorter relationships. Respondents in longer partnerships are also older on average (41.5 vs. 37.7 years).

Finally, Table 2C shows modest differences by gender. Women are slightly older on average than men (42.0 vs. 40.5 years), while relationship duration is somewhat longer among men. Parenthood prevalence is high for both genders (93–94%), indicating that gender differences in the regression models are unlikely to be driven by large compositional differences in parental status. Taken together, these descriptive patterns indicate that the analytical sample captures a group of partnered, midlife adults whose demographic

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

characteristics make them fitting for examining gendered patterns of emotional closeness and conflict in intergenerational relationships.

Variables

The dependent variables are emotional closeness and conflict frequency, measured separately for each dyad. For descriptive analyses, particularly those related to Hypothesis 1, the variables are treated as continuous scales and reported as mean values. For regression analyses, both outcomes are dichotomized. Closeness is coded as 1 if the respondent reported feeling “somewhat close” or “very close,” and 0 otherwise. Conflict is coded as 1 if the respondent reported experiencing conflict “somewhat often” or “often,” and 0 otherwise.

The primary independent variable is parenthood status indicating if the respondent has a common child with their current partner (parents vs. childless). Relationship duration serves as a second key explanatory variable and is measured both continuously (years) and as a dichotomous indicator (≥ 5 years vs. < 5 years). All regression models adjust for respondents' education, partner's education, and frequency of contact with each relative. Contact frequency is included as a structural control, although its causal direction cannot be established. All analyses were stratified by gender. Models were also estimated stepwise, beginning with parenthood and relationship duration separately, followed by combined models with controls.

Results

This section presents the empirical findings in three steps. First, descriptive comparisons across relationship types. Second, gender- and parenthood-specific descriptive patterns are examined. Finally, logistic regression models evaluate the associations between parenthood, relationship duration, and emotional closeness and conflict with in-laws.

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

Own parents versus in-laws

Table 3. Mean (SD) of emotional closeness and conflict by relationship type

Relationship	Closeness Mean (SD)	N	Conflict Mean (SD)	N
Own mother	4.26 (0.88)	767	2.05 (0.79)	767
Own father	3.96 (0.99)	767	2.02 (0.78)	767
Mother-in-law	3.38 (0.87)	767	1.63 (0.76)	767
Father-in-law	3.15 (0.92)	767	1.46 (0.68)	767

Note. Closeness is measured on a 1–5 scale (higher values indicate greater emotional closeness). Conflict is measured on a 1–4 scale (higher values indicate more frequent conflict). *N*s vary across dyads due to missing responses.

Table 3 presents overall mean levels of emotional closeness and conflict across relationship types among partnered respondents. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, respondents report higher emotional closeness toward their own parents than toward parents-in-law. Closeness is highest toward own mothers, followed by own fathers, and lower toward both mothers- and fathers-in-law. A similar pattern is observed for conflict. Although overall levels of conflict are moderate, respondents report more frequent conflict with their own parents than with in-laws. Taken together, these descriptive differences support the expectation that lineal ties are emotionally stronger and somewhat more ambivalent than affinal ties.

Paired-samples *t*-tests confirmed that respondents reported significantly higher emotional closeness to their own parents than to parents-in-law. Closeness to own mothers ($M = 4.26$) was significantly higher than to mothers-in-law ($M = 3.38$), $t(766) = 22.23$, $p < .001$. Similarly, closeness to own fathers ($M = 3.96$) exceeded closeness to fathers-in-law ($M = 3.15$), $t(766) = 18.53$, $p < .001$. Conflict levels followed the same pattern. Respondents reported significantly more frequent conflict with their own mothers ($M = 2.05$) than with mothers-in-law ($M = 1.63$), $t(766) = 11.62$, $p < .001$. Likewise, conflict with own fathers (M

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

= 2.02) was significantly higher than with fathers-in-law ($M = 1.46$), $t(766) = 16.39$, $p < .001$.

Descriptive Patterns of Closeness and Conflict

Tables 4 and 5 below present gender-stratified descriptive patterns of emotional closeness and conflict with parents and parents-in-law by both parenthood status and partnership duration. Across all dyads, respondents report greater closeness with their own parents than with in-laws, also confirming the expected distinction between biological and affinal ties.

Table 4. Emotional closeness to parents and in-laws by parenthood and partnership duration (gender-stratified)

Panel A: Women

Relationship	No children Mean (SD)	N	Has children Mean (SD)	N	<5 years Mean (SD)	N	≥5 years Mean (SD)	N
Own mother	4.29 (0.83)	14	4.17 (0.85)	225	4.38 (0.62)	29	4.14 (0.88)	284
Own father	3.29 (1.33)	14	4.01 (0.88)	225	4.24 (0.87)	29	3.96 (0.93)	284
Mother-inlaw	3.07 (0.62)	14	3.41 (0.76)	225	3.34 (0.55)	29	3.35 (0.81)	284
Father-inlaw	3.07 (0.62)	14	3.30 (0.84)	225	3.28 (0.75)	29	3.25 (0.87)	284

Note: Closeness is measured on a 1–5 scale, where higher values indicate greater emotional closeness. Means and standard deviations are reported. Ns vary across dyads and subgroups due to item nonresponse.

Partnership duration is measured as <5 years and ≥5 years. Results are shown separately for women and men.

Panel B: Men

Relationship	No children Mean (SD)	N	Has children Mean (SD)	N	<5 years Mean (SD)	N	≥5 years Mean (SD)	N
Own mother	3.96 (1.11)	26	4.38 (0.83)	335	4.29 (0.83)	51	4.32 (0.90)	392
Own father	3.54 (1.17)	26	3.99 (0.98)	335	3.67 (1.19)	51	3.98 (1.00)	392
Mother-inlaw	2.96 (0.87)	26	3.44 (0.94)	335	3.12 (0.89)	51	3.45 (0.92)	392
Father-inlaw	2.65 (1.02)	26	3.12 (0.95)	335	2.75 (0.84)	51	3.13 (0.96)	392

Note: Closeness is measured on a 1–5 scale, where higher values indicate greater emotional closeness. Means and standard deviations are reported. Ns vary across dyads and subgroups due to item nonresponse.

Partnership duration is measured as <5 years and ≥5 years. Results are shown separately for women and men.

These descriptives are based on partnered respondents with valid information on all four dyads (own mother, own father, mother-in-law, father-in-law), which substantially

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

reduces the number of respondents without shared children. Among women (Table 4, Panel A), emotional closeness to own parents is high across all groups. Differences by parenthood status are mild for respondents own parents but more visible for in-laws. Women with children report higher closeness to mothers-in-law (3.41 vs. 3.07) and fathers-in-law (3.30 vs. 3.07) compared to women without shared children with their partner. Partnership duration shows a somewhat different pattern. Women in shorter relationships (4.38 vs. 4.14 for own mothers; 4.24 vs. 3.96 for own fathers) report slightly higher closeness to their own parents than those in longer relationships. In contrast, closeness to mothers-in-law is nearly identical across relationship durations (3.34 vs. 3.35), and differences for fathers-in-law are minimal (3.28 vs. 3.25), suggesting that relationship length is only weakly associated with women's affinal closeness.

Among men (Panel B), fatherhood is clearly associated with greater closeness to one's own mother (4.38 vs. 3.96) and also to one's own father (3.99 vs. 3.54). Similar to women, men with shared children with their partner report higher closeness to in-laws than men without shared children, particularly toward mothers-in-law (3.44 vs. 2.96). With regard to partnership length, men in longer relationships (5 or more years) report slightly higher closeness to both own parents and in-laws compared to those in shorter unions (e.g., mothers-in-law 3.45 vs. 3.12; fathers-in-law 3.13 vs. 2.75), indicating that relationship stability over time may reinforce better kin integration. Overall, both shared parenthood and partnership duration are descriptively associated with stronger affinal ties, though the magnitude and direction of these differences vary by gender and lineage.

Table 5. Conflict with parents and in-laws by parenthood and partnership duration (genderstratified)

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

Panel A: Women

Relationship	No children		Has children		<5 years		≥5 years	
	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	N
Own mother	1.86 (0.77)	14	1.91 (0.77)	225	2.03 (0.78)	29	1.90 (0.74)	284
Own father	2.07 (1.07)	14	1.88 (0.66)	225	1.97 (0.63)	29	1.95 (0.73)	284
Mother-inlaw	1.14 (0.36)	14	1.56 (0.70)	225	1.14 (0.44)	29	1.53 (0.68)	284
Father-inlaw	1.07 (0.27)	14	1.42 (0.62)	225	1.17 (0.47)	29	1.39 (0.59)	284

Note: Conflict is measured on a 1–4 scale, where higher values indicate more frequent conflict. Means and standard deviations are reported. Ns vary across dyads and subgroups due to item nonresponse. Partnership duration is measured as <5 years and ≥5 years. Results are shown separately for women and men.

Panel B: Men

Relationship	No children		Has children		<5 years		≥5 years	
	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	N
Own mother	2.35 (0.80)	26	2.13 (0.78)	335	2.16 (0.78)	51	2.16 (0.80)	392
Own father	2.46 (0.86)	26	2.07 (0.83)	335	2.25 (0.84)	51	2.05 (0.82)	392
Mother-inlaw	1.46 (0.71)	26	1.82 (0.82)	335	1.29 (0.54)	51	1.80 (0.81)	392
Father-inlaw	1.46 (0.71)	26	1.55 (0.76)	335	1.31 (0.58)	51	1.55 (0.75)	392

Note: Conflict is measured on a 1–4 scale, where higher values indicate more frequent conflict. Means and standard deviations are reported. Ns vary across dyads and subgroups due to item nonresponse. Partnership duration is measured as <5 years and ≥5 years. Results are shown separately for women and men.

Among women (Panel A), conflict levels are generally low across all dyads.

Parenthood is associated with slightly higher conflict with in-laws, particularly mothers-in-law (1.56 vs. 1.14) and fathers-in-law (1.42 vs. 1.07). Differences toward one's own parents are small. Partnership duration reveals a modest pattern: women in shorter relationships report slightly higher conflict with own mothers (2.03 vs. 1.90), while conflict with mothers-in-law is somewhat higher among those in longer relationships (1.53 vs. 1.14). Differences in conflict with fathers-in-law are small (1.39 vs. 1.17). This suggests that prolonged affinal interaction may increase the possibility for some tension.

Among men (Panel B), fatherhood is associated with somewhat lower conflict with own parents (own father 2.07 vs. 2.46; own mother 2.13 vs. 2.35) but higher conflict with inlaws, particularly mothers-in-law (1.82 vs. 1.46), while differences for fathers-in-law are

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

smaller (1.55 vs. 1.46). Partnership duration shows that men in longer unions experience clearly higher conflict with in-laws than those in shorter relationships (mothers-in-law 1.80 vs. 1.29; fathers-in-law 1.55 vs. 1.31), whereas differences in conflict with own parents are minimal.

Logistic regression models

Tables 6 and 7 below present logistic regression models predicting the likelihood of reporting emotional closeness and conflict with mothers- and fathers-in-law, separately for women and men. Childless respondents serve as the reference category for parenthood, and relationships shorter than five years serve as the reference for partnership duration. Odds ratios (ORs) with robust standard errors are reported. Compared to the earlier descriptive models, logistic models adjust for respondents' education, partner's education, age, and contact frequency. The complete model specifications, including all control variables, are presented in Appendix Tables J (women) and K (men). Stepwise specifications are also reported in Appendix Tables B–I.

Table 6. Women - Logistic regressions (ORs) for in-law closeness and conflict

Predictor	MIL closeness	MIL conflict	FIL closeness	FIL conflict
<i>Parenthood (ref=childless)</i>				
<i>Has children</i>	7.41* (6.70)	1.00 (.)	8.84* (7.63)	1.00 (.)
<i>Relationship length (ref = <5 years)</i>				
<i>≥ 5 years</i>	0.53 (0.43)	1.00 (.)	0.37 (0.29)	0.26 (0.35)
<i>N</i>	235	179	235	146
<i>Pseudo R²</i>	0.136	0.043	0.221	0.126

Exponentiated coefficients (Odds Ratios); robust SEs in parentheses. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

Among women (Table 6), parenthood shows a strong and consistent positive association with emotional closeness to both mothers- and fathers-in-law. Mothers have substantially higher odds of reporting closeness to their mothers-in-law (OR = 7.41, $p < .05$) and fathers-in-law (OR = 8.84, $p < .05$) compared to childless women. Predicted probabilities illustrate the magnitude of these differences. The probability of reporting emotional closeness to the mother-in-law increases from approximately 0.26 among childless women to 0.50 among mothers. For fathers-in-law, the corresponding probability rises from 0.24 to 0.39.

In contrast, partnership duration does not exhibit a systematic association with women's emotional closeness to in-laws, and its estimated effects remain statistically nonsignificant. Conflict outcomes show no meaningful or statistically significant associations with either parenthood or relationship duration. Overall, the results indicate that motherhood, rather than partnership duration, is the central factor associated with women's emotional closeness to in-laws.

Table 7. Men - Logistic regressions (ORs) for in-law closeness and conflict

Predictor	MIL closeness	MIL conflict	FIL closeness	FIL conflict
<i>Parenthood (ref=childless)</i>				
<i>Has children</i>	2.54 (1.63)	0.52 (0.34)	1.26 (0.85)	0.74 (0.50)
<i>Relationship length (ref = <5 years)</i>				
<i>≥ 5 years</i>	3.94* (2.18)	13.50* (13.88)	6.73* (5.20)	1.32 (1.04)
<i>N</i>	356	358	356	344
<i>Pseudo R²</i>	0.165	0.082	0.147	0.060

Exponentiated coefficients (Odds Ratios); robust SEs in parentheses. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

Among men (Table 7), the pattern differs quite markedly. Parenthood does not show statistically significant associations with closeness or conflict in any of the models. Instead, partnership duration emerges as the key predictor. Men in relationships lasting five years or longer have significantly higher odds of reporting closeness to mothers-in-law (OR = 3.94, $p < .05$) and fathers-in-law (OR = 6.73, $p < .05$) compared to men in shorter relationships. Predicted probabilities indicate that closeness to mothers-in-law increases from approximately 0.18 to 0.29 as partnership duration increases, and closeness to fathers-in-law rises from 0.21 to 0.31.

Longer relationship duration is also associated with substantially higher odds of conflict with mothers-in-law (OR = 13.50, $p < .05$), whereas no comparable association is observed for conflict with fathers-in-law. Taken together, these findings suggest that for men, partnership duration, rather than fatherhood, structures emotional integration into affinal family ties. All stepwise versions of the models are presented in Appendix Tables B-I. These additional specifications confirm that the substantive conclusions remain stable across model variations. Interaction models between parenthood and partnership duration were estimated but are not discussed further due to small cell sizes and the absence of meaningful effects. The full model specifications including all control variables are presented in Appendix Tables J (women) and K (men).

Discussion and Limitations

Main findings

Our findings offer only a partial support for the hypotheses. Consistent with H1, respondents report substantially greater closeness and somewhat higher conflict with their own parents than with in-laws. These differences were confirmed by paired-samples t-tests, which indicated that the mean differences between own parents and parents-in-law were

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

statistically significant across both closeness and conflict measures (all $p < .001$). Regarding the in-law relationships, the results provide somewhat support for H2 especially for women: parenthood is associated with greater emotional closeness to parents, particularly toward mothers- and fathers-in-law, but its association with conflict is weak or inconsistent. Among men parenthood is not significantly related to either closeness or conflict.

H3 also receives mixed support. Although longer relationship duration predicts a higher likelihood of emotional closeness for men especially with their fathers-in-law, and higher conflict with mothers-in-law, it does not operate uniformly across outcomes and does not reduce conflict as hypothesized. Nor does it meaningfully shape women's emotional closeness. Finally, in line with H4, the effects of parenthood and relationship duration differ by gender. Women's relationships with in-laws are primarily shaped by parenthood, whereas men's in-law relationships are driven more by partnership duration, highlighting distinct gender-specific pathways in the formation of affinal emotional ties.

Interpretation and theoretical reflections

These findings show that the emotional "benefits and penalties" of kinship are shaped by gendered pathways rather than functioning uniformly across parents and non-parents. Parenthood is strongly associated with women's emotional ties to in-laws, particularly mothers-in-law, whereas for men, parenthood has little measurable influence on emotional closeness or conflict.

This is consistent with the long-standing evidence that women continue to be the "kinkeepers" who maintain emotional ties and invest in extended kin relationships (Hornstra & Ivanova, 2023). It is also consistent with the evolutionary explanation of the matrilineal bias, which suggests that women's kin networks, especially those centered on maternal figures, are more structurally and functionally sound because alloparental support follows the maternal line (Perry & Daly, 2017). According to the Perry and Daly model, maternal kin

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

have both higher certainty of relationship and inclusive fitness reasons to support mothers and their offspring, which may account for why motherhood is associated with greater affinal closeness for women. By contrast, men's relationships with in-laws seem to be less dependent on parenthood and more on the cumulative stability and length of their romantic relationship, which is consistent with the idea that familiarity and shared history (not parenthood) are what shape men's affinal ties (Dubas, 2001).

From an evolutionary perspective, these results suggest that the shared reproductive interest created through having children does not automatically translate into stronger affinal bonds for both partners. Rather, gendered social norms and relational practices shape how biological kinship is enacted: women respond more immediately to the new relational ties introduced by parenthood, whereas men's affinal bonds strengthen only as relational stability accumulates. Following mating effort theory (Pettay et al. 2024), this finding suggests that the increased closeness to in-laws could be more of a partner-centered investment, which emerges over time, rather than a reaction to becoming parents with your partner.

The Finnish setting can also account for the relatively small effect sizes and the mixed results for Hypotheses 2 and 3. In a very individualistic and egalitarian welfare state, family relationships are likely to be characterized by high emotional closeness coupled with low interdependence. Institutional support systems reduce the need for intensive kin involvement, meaning that parenthood may produce incremental rather than transformational shifts in affinal relationships. This may be why parenthood increases women's closeness to in-laws but does not consistently elevate conflict or alter men's emotional ties.

More broadly, the results shed light on changing family dynamics in contemporary Finland. The observation that parenthood does not have a uniform positive effect on emotional closeness and that it does not decrease conflict suggests that the emotional payoffs of parenthood are more complex and conditional than has been generally assumed. The lack of a strong effect of parenthood on men's emotional closeness specifically suggests that the

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

emotional closeness may increasingly come to be found in partners, peers, and social networks rather than in biological ties. These observations reflect the larger societal trends towards autonomy, the negotiation of family roles, and the acceptance of voluntary childlessness, which point to the ways in which emotional support is dispersed across a broader set of relationships in contemporary adulthood.

Limitations

However, there are a number of limitations that must be considered when evaluating these results. First, and most importantly, the number of childless respondents is very small, particularly in the partnered sample, meaning that statistical power is limited and may mask more diverse differences between parents and non-parents. Some conflict models among women show quasi-complete separation due to very few positive conflict cases, producing unstable estimates ($OR \approx 1$ with undefined SE); these results should be interpreted cautiously. Second, the fact that the sample is predominantly in midlife (average age approximately 42) means that most respondents have already established themselves in long-term relational and familial patterns. This means that the early post-parenthood or partnership formation transitions may not be well represented.

Third, the cross-sectional design prevents causal inference. Although earlier waves of Gentrans (2007; 2012) exist, they could not be used for longitudinal analysis because key variables (relationship duration) were not included in those waves. Fourth, all reports of closeness and conflict come from a single respondent, raising the possibility of perception bias, selective recall, or social desirability bias. Fifth, the analytic sample necessarily excludes single adults and single parents; therefore, the findings reflect relational processes within partnered households only. Finally, because the dataset does not link partners to one

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

another, it is possible that some respondents indirectly report on the same in-laws (e.g., two spouses describing the same mother-in-law), although this cannot be identified. This limitation is common in dyad-based survey designs and should be taken into account.

Strengths

Even with these limitations, the study contributes to the literature on intergenerational relations. It employs the extensive, nationally representative Gentrans 2018 dataset, which is one of the few population-level surveys that incorporates emotional closeness and conflict metrics for both biological parents and in-laws. This facilitates a distinctly comprehensive analysis of lineal versus affinal kinship relations.

The study uses dyad-specific logistic models, stratified by gender, including controls that reflect structural opportunities for interaction (e.g., contact frequency). This makes for a suitable framework to compare different types of relationships. The theoretical inclusion of evolutionary and sociological approaches to understand emotional intimacy and conflict, with a focus on the mix of shared reproductive interests, gendered kinship roles, and ideals of intergenerational autonomy in the Finnish context, is a strength of this study. The contributions made by the articles help to clarify the workings of contemporary kinship in a low-fertility, high-autonomy welfare state.

Directions for the future

The upcoming research should expand more upon this study in various ways. Longitudinal data comparing different years and changes would provide a more thorough examination of the evolution of emotional closeness and conflict preceding and succeeding

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

significant life transitions, including childbirths, the formation of partnerships, separations, or grandparenthood. On the other hand, comparative research across welfare regimes could elaborate how institutional contexts in societies influence the effects of parenthood and partnership dynamics on affinal relationships.

Furthermore, qualitative or mixed-method approaches could investigate what “closeness” and “conflict” mean in everyday interactions, especially in contexts shaped by voluntary childlessness, re-partnering, multi-local families, and varied household structures. These methods would clarify how people manage expectations and responsibilities within extended families. Instead of treating biological reproduction and emotional support as separate explanations, future research should examine how both work together to shape kinship and how changing support networks are redefining family relationships in modern societies.

References

- Chung, J. (2019). *PISA and Global Education Policy: Understanding Finland’s Success and Influence* (1st ed., Vol. 48). BRILL.
- Danielsbacka, M., Tanskanen, A. O., & Rotkirch, A. (2017). The “kinship penalty”: Parenthood and in-law conflict in contemporary Finland. *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, 3, 300–309. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40806-017-0114-8>
- Danielsbacka, M., Tanskanen, A. O., Rotkirch, A., & Ojala, M. (2015). Impact of genetic relatedness and emotional closeness on intergenerational relations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77(4), 889–907. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12206>

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

- Dubas, J. S. (2001). How gender moderates the grandparent–grandchild relationship: A comparison of maternal and paternal grandparents. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22(4), 478–495. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251301022004005>
- Elder, G. H. (1994). Time, human agency, and social change: Perspectives on the life course. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 57(1), 4–15. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786971>
- England, P. (2001). [Rev. of *The Case for Marriage: Why Married People Are Happier, Healthier, and Better off Financially*]. *Contemporary Sociology (Washington)*, 30(6), 564–565. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3088984>
- Fingerman, K. L., & Hay, E. L. (2002). Searching under the streetlight? Age biases in the personal and family relationships literature. *Personal Relationships*, 9, 415–433. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6811.09404>
- Fingerman, K. L., [list all authors here if 20 or fewer] (2012). In-law relationships before and after marriage. *Research in Human Development*, 9(2), 106–125. <https://doi.org/>
- Gentrans. (n.d.). Generational transmissions in Finland (Gentrans). University of Helsinki. Retrieved June 1, 2025, from <https://www.vaestoliitto.fi/tutkimus/ikaantyminen-jasukupolvet/sukupolvien-ketju/>
- Goodman, C. C. (2007). Family dynamics in three-generation grandfamilies. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28(3), 355–379. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X06296672>
- Hämäläinen, H., & Tanskanen, A. O. (2021). ‘Sandwich generation’: Generational transfers towards adult children and elderly parents. *Journal of Family Studies*, 27(3), 336–355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13229400.2019.1586562>
- Hämäläinen, H., Danielsbacka, M., Hägglund, A. E., Rotkirch, A., & Tanskanen, A. O. (2021). Sukupolvien suhteet: Ikääntyminen ja vuorovaikutuksen muutos suurten ikäluokkien ja aikuisten lasten elämänculussa. Väestöntutkimuslaitos. <https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi-fe2022012710871>
- Hamilton, W. D. (1964). The genetical evolution of social behaviour I & II. *Journal of*

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

- Theoretical Biology, 7(1), 1–52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193\(64\)90038-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193(64)90038-4)
- Hank, K., & Buber, I. (2009). Grandparents caring for their grandchildren: Findings from the 2004 Survey of Health, Ageing, and Retirement in Europe. *Journal of Family Issues*, 30(1), 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X08322627>
- Hornstra, M., & Ivanova, K. (2023). Kinkeeping across families: The central role of mothers and stepmothers in the facilitation of adult intergenerational ties. *Sex Roles*, 88(7–8), 367–382. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-023-01352-2>
- Hughes, A. L. (1988). *Evolution and human kinship*. Oxford University Press.
- Itahashi, T., Okada, N., Ando, S., Yamasaki, S., Koshiyama, D., Morita, K., Yahata, N., Koike, S., Nishida, A., Kasai, K., & Hashimoto, R. (2020). Functional connectomes linking child-parent relationships with psychological problems in adolescence. *NeuroImage (Orlando, Fla.)*, 219, Article 117013. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117013>
- Jalovaara, M., Andersson, L., & Miettinen, A. (2022). Parity disparity: Educational differences in Nordic fertility across parities and number of reproductive partners. *Population Studies*, 76(1), 119–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00324728.2021.1887506>
- Lüscher, K., & Pillemer, K. (1998). Intergenerational ambivalence: A new approach to the study of parent–child relations in later life. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 60(2), 413–425. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353858>
- Mikkonen, K., Veikkola, H.-R., Sorkkila, M., & Aunola, K. (2023). Parenting styles of Finnish parents and their associations with parental burnout. *Current Psychology*, 42(25), 21412–21423. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03223-7>
- Mönkediek, B., & Bras, H. (2014). Strong and weak family ties revisited: reconsidering European family structures from a network perspective. *The History of the Family*, 19(2), 235–259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1081602X.2014.897246>

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

- Nazarinia Roy, R., Schumm, W. R., & Britt, S. L. (2013). *Transition to Parenthood* (2014th ed.). Springer New York. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7768-6>
- Perry, G., & Daly, M. (2017). A model explaining the matrilineal bias in alloparental investment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(35), 9290–9295. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1705910114>
- Pettay, J. E., Coall, D. A., Danielsbacka, M., & Tanskanen, A. O. (2024). The role of mating effort and co-residence history in step-grandparental investment. *Evolutionary Human Sciences*, 6, Article e27. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ehs.2024.17>
- Pietiläinen, M., & Nikander, T. (2021). *Vähemmän lapsia, enemmän isovanhempia*. Tieto & trendit. Tilastokeskus. <https://stat.fi/tietotrendit/artikkelit/2021/vahemman-lapsiaenemman-isovanhempia>
- Rosenthal, C. J. (1985). Kinkeeping in the Familial Division of Labor. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 47(4), 965–974. <https://doi.org/10.2307/352340>
- Statistics Finland. (2023). *Births 2023: Fertility continued to decline*. <https://stat.fi/en/publication/cln4jsw103qcn0avxz5icrry3>
- Tanskanen, A. O., & Danielsbacka, M. (2019). *Intergenerational family relations : an evolutionary social science approach*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315107806>
- Tanskanen, A. O., Danielsbacka, M., & Erola, J. (2017). Educational test scores among adolescents in three-generational households in 20 countries. *Finnish Yearbook of Population Research*, 51, 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.23979/fypr.59194>
- Valkama, P., & Oulasvirta, L. (2021). How Finland copes with an ageing population: Adjusting structures and equalising the financial capabilities of local governments. *Local Government Studies*, 47(3), 429–452. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2021.1877664>
- VanderVen, K. (2012). Intergenerational solidarity: Strengthening economic and social ties

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

(Book review). *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 10(2), 195–199.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2012.673373>

Waite, L. J., Gallagher, M., & Hill, S. (2003). [Rev. of *The case for marriage: why married people are happier, healthier, and better off financially*]. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 28(2), 245–248.

Appendix A: Spearman correlations between closeness and conflict

	Own mother closeness	Own father closeness	Mother- inlaw closeness	Father- inlaw closeness	Conflict own mother	Conflict own father	Conflict motherin- law	Conflict father- inlaw
Own mother closeness	1.00							
Own father closeness	0.59*** (p < .001)	1.00						
Mother- inlaw closeness	0.24*** (p < .001)	0.26*** (p < .001)	1.00					
Father- inlaw closeness	0.13** (p < .01)	0.22*** (p < .001)	0.64*** (p < .001)	1.00				
Conflict own mother	-0.28*** (p < .001)	-0.09** (p < .01)	0.00 (ns)	-0.04 (ns)	1.00			
Conflict own father	-0.09* (p < .05)	-0.24*** (p < .001)	-0.01 (ns)	-0.06 (ns)	0.38*** (p < .001)	1.00		
Conflict mother- inlaw	0.03 (ns)	0.00 (ns)	-0.08* (p < .05)	-0.03 (ns)	0.18*** (p < .001)	0.18*** (p < .001)	1.00	
Conflict father-inlaw	0.01 (ns)	0.05 (ns)	0.01 (ns)	0.00 (ns)	0.12** (p < .01)	0.18*** (p < .001)	0.58*** (p < .001)	1.00

Note. ρ = Spearman correlation coefficient. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001; ns = not significant.

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

Appendix B: Women - mil closeness, stepwise logistic models (odds ratios)

Predictor	M1: parent	M2: rel5	M3: parent + rel5	M4: + controls
Parenthood (ref: childless)	3.21* (2.14)	—	4.35** (2.67)	5.61** (4.22)
Relationship length $\geq 5y$	—	0.81 (0.42)	0.50 (0.31)	0.48 (0.37)
Age	—	—	—	0.97 (0.03)
Education variables	—	—	—	included
Partner education	—	—	—	included
Contact frequency (k29a–d)	—	—	—	included
N	239	239	239	238
Pseudo r^2	0.011	0.000	0.015	0.139

Appendix C: Women - mil conflict, stepwise logistic models (odds ratios)

Predictor	M1	M2	M3	M4
Parenthood	1.00 (.)	—	1.00 (.)	1.00 (.)
Relationship length $\geq 5y$	1.00 (.)	1.00 (.)	1.00 (.)	1.00 (.)
Age	—	—	—	1.01 (0.05)
Education (own & partner)	—	—	—	included
Contact frequency	—	—	—	included
N	225	223	215	181
Pseudo r^2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.044

Appendix D: women - fil closeness, stepwise logistic models (odds ratios)

Predictor	M1	M2	M3	M4
Parenthood	2.70 (1.80)	—	3.92** (2.41)	6.82*** (5.03)
Relationship length $\geq 5y$	—	0.68 (0.35)	0.43 (0.26)	0.33 (0.25)
Age	—	—	—	0.96 (0.03)
Education (own & partner)	—	—	—	included
Contact frequency	—	—	—	included

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

N	238	238	238	237
Pseudo r²	0.008	0.002	0.014	0.223

Appendix E: Women - fil conflict, stepwise logistic models (odds ratios)

Predictor	M1	M2	M3	M4
Parenthood	1.00 (.)	—	1.00 (.)	1.00 (.)
Relationship length ≥5y	0.53 (0.58)	0.35 (0.39)	0.26 (0.35)	—
Age	—	—	—	1.03 (0.10)
Controls	—	—	—	included
N	223	236	223	146
Pseudo r²	0.000	0.004	0.009	0.126

Appendix F: Men - mil closeness, stepwise logistic models (odds ratios)

Predictor	M1	M2	M3	M4
Parenthood	4.76*** (2.43)	—	3.73** (2.04)	2.54 (1.64)
Relationship length ≥5y	—	2.73** (1.12)	1.73 (0.78)	3.90 (2.17)
Age	—	—	—	0.98 (0.03)
Controls	—	—	—	included
N	361	361	361	359
Pseudo r²	0.024	0.013	0.027	0.169

Appendix G: Men - mil conflict, stepwise logistic models (odds ratios)

Predictor	M1	M2	M3	M4
Parenthood	0.93 (0.59)	—	0.84 (0.54)	0.74 (0.50)
Relationship length ≥5y	—	1.15 (0.73)	1.24 (0.79)	1.31 (1.03)
Age	—	—	—	1.01 (0.04)
Controls	—	—	—	included
N	359	359	359	345
Pseudo r²	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.059

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

Appendix H: Men - fil closeness, stepwise logistic models (odds ratios)

Predictor	M1	M2	M3	M4
Parenthood	3.39** (1.88)	—	1.91 (1.14)	1.24 (0.85)
Relationship length $\geq 5y$	—	5.96*** (3.69)	4.74** (3.05)	6.79** (5.26)
Age	—	—	—	1.00 (0.03)
Controls	—	—	—	included
N	362	362	362	360
Pseudo r^2	0.013	0.027	0.029	0.153

Appendix I: Men - fil conflict, stepwise logistic models (odds ratios)

Predictor	M1	M2	M3	M4
Parenthood	0.93 (0.59)	—	0.84 (0.54)	0.74 (0.50)
Relationship length $\geq 5y$	—	1.15 (0.73)	1.24 (0.79)	1.31 (1.03)
Age	—	—	—	1.01 (0.04)
Controls	—	—	—	included
N	359	359	359	345
Pseudo r^2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.059

Appendix J: Full logistic models - Women (all coefficients)

Predictor	MIL Closeness	MIL Conflict	FIL Closeness	FIL Conflict
Parenthood (ref: Childless) Has children	7.411* (6.702)	1.000 (.)	8.835* (7.625)	1.000 (.)
Relationship ≥ 5 years	0.534 (0.427)	1.000 (.)	0.372 (0.288)	0.264 (0.346)
Age (years)	0.971 (0.029)	1.005 (0.048)	0.964 (0.031)	1.027 (0.102)
Respondent education (ref: Basic education)				
Upper secondary	0.311 (0.354)	1.000 (.)	0.523 (0.529)	1.000 (.)
Vocational qualification	0.923 (0.907)	0.383 (0.371)	1.122 (0.930)	2.164 (2.332)
Post-secondary vocational	0.649 (0.654)	0.081 (0.104)	1.187 (1.202)	0.614 (0.943)
University of applied sciences	0.449 (0.419)	0.268 (0.246)	0.957 (0.759)	2.119 (1.820)

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

Master's degree	0.711 (0.663)	0.179 (0.172)	1.490 (1.224)	1.000 (.)
Doctoral degree	0.304 (0.327)	0.135 (0.187)	0.285 (0.304)	1.000 (.)
Partner education (ref: Basic education) Upper secondary				
	8.329 (9.093)	0.324 (0.433)	0.904 (0.881)	1.000 (.)
Vocational qualification	0.657 (0.562)	0.423 (0.448)	0.469 (0.419)	1.000 (.)
Post-secondary vocational	3.763 (2.951)	1.000 (.)	1.207 (1.012)	7.008* (5.649)
University of applied sciences	1.479 (1.014)	0.949 (0.858)	0.513 (0.373)	3.676 (4.574)
Master's degree	1.982 (1.345)	0.636 (0.537)	0.836 (0.600)	1.000 (.)
Doctoral degree	1.000 (.)	1.000 (.)	1.000 (.)	1.000 (.)
Contact frequency (standardized)				
Contact with mother-in-law	0.960 (0.201)	0.994 (0.338)	0.853 (0.210)	0.974 (0.313)
Contact with father-in-law	0.787 (0.162)	1.124 (0.315)	0.748 (0.185)	1.565 (0.983)
Contact with own mother	2.075*** (0.399)	0.788 (0.278)	0.777 (0.193)	0.666 (0.674)
Contact with own father	1.070 (0.188)	0.953 (0.321)	4.016*** (1.082)	1.026 (0.935)
N	235	179	235	146
Pseudo R²	.136	.043	.221	.126

Note. OR = odds ratio. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Reference categories: childless; relationship < 5 years; basic education. p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

Appendix K: Full logistic models - Men (all coefficients)

Predictor	MIL Closeness	MIL Conflict	FIL Closeness	FIL Conflict
Parenthood (ref: Childless)	2.544 (1.630)	0.522 (0.337)	1.256 (0.852)	0.742 (0.499)
Relationship ≥ 5 years	3.935* (2.178)	13.501* (13.878)	6.735* (5.203)	1.322 (1.037)
Age (years)	0.977 (0.026)	0.983 (0.033)	1.002 (0.028)	1.014 (0.041)
Respondent education (ref: Basic education)				
Upper secondary	0.760 (0.684)	0.348 (0.559)	0.466 (0.446)	3.122 (3.340)
Vocational qualification	0.440 (0.314)	0.249 (0.344)	1.187 (0.844)	1.335 (1.163)
Post-secondary vocational	0.613 (0.427)	0.114 (0.158)	1.568 (1.092)	0.251 (0.276)
University of applied sciences	0.671 (0.396)	0.166 (0.223)	1.190 (0.721)	0.346 (0.301)
Master's degree	1.137 (0.651)	0.265 (0.354)	2.183 (1.257)	0.599 (0.497)
Doctoral degree	1.000 (.)	0.108 (0.172)	1.000 (.)	1.000 (.)

KINSHIP BENEFITS AND PENALTIES

Partner education (ref: Basic education) Upper

secondary	0.934 (1.040)	2.119 (1.935)	2.554 (3.158)	0.309 (0.451)
Vocational qualification	1.090 (1.131)	1.580 (1.217)	2.118 (2.467)	0.515 (0.671)
Post-secondary vocational	0.958 (1.011)	1.322 (1.111)	1.243 (1.466)	0.482 (0.677)
University of applied sciences	0.794 (0.817)	2.416 (1.844)	1.819 (2.109)	0.584 (0.772)
Master's degree	0.670 (0.695)	1.576 (1.248)	1.233 (1.441)	0.566 (0.753)
Doctoral degree	0.688 (0.866)	4.519 (4.466)	4.353 (5.876)	1.000 (.)

Contact frequency (standardized)

Contact with mother-in-law		1.862**		
	1.006 (0.161)	(0.375)	1.112 (0.200)	1.365 (0.279)
Contact with father-in-law	0.748 (0.129)	0.716 (0.135)	0.670* (0.120)	1.044 (0.261)
Contact with own mother	3.457*** (0.696)	1.084 (0.235)	1.570* (0.287)	1.045 (0.272)
Contact with own father	0.793 (0.141)	0.936 (0.191)	1.792***	0.872 (0.217)
			(0.300)	
N	356	358	356	344
Pseudo R ²	.165	.082	.147	.060

Note. OR = odds ratio. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Reference categories: childless; relationship < 5 years; basic education. p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.