# Evidentiary, Methodological and Ethical Limits of Compressed Family Assessment Models

A CoPA briefing note for legal and practitioner review on Child Impact Reports, limited-scope family reports, single expert processes, and other compressed assessment methodologies in parenting proceedings.

This document is an analytical resource, not legal advice. It is intended to assist legal and practitioner review of assessment methodology, evidentiary limits, professional competence, research currency, proportionality, and appropriate limitation of opinion in complex parenting matters.

It is particularly relevant where the evidence raises family violence, including post-separation family violence and coercive control, child coercive control, child contact refusal, coercive, obstructive or alienating behaviours, disrupted parent-child relationships, child voice reliability, attachment functioning, cultural, kinship or community factors, supervised contact, therapeutic intervention, or recommendations affecting parental responsibility, time, supervision, contact, or relationship repair.

**Co-Parenting Australia (CoPA) | Legal and practitioner briefing | June 2026**

PO Box 3873, Victoria Point West, QLD, 4165

Suggested Citation

Sillars, A. N., & Matthewson, M. (2026). Evidentiary, Methodological and Ethical Limits of Compressed Family Assessment Models: A CoPA Briefing Note for Legal and Practitioner Review. Co-Parenting Australia Ltd.

# Contents

## Glossary of terms

The following terms are used as analytical and assessment-methodology terms in this briefing note. They do not replace statutory language, clinical diagnosis, judicial findings, or case-specific forensic assessment.

**Compressed family assessment report —** Brief or restricted assessment involving limited interviews, observation, document review, or collateral enquiry.

**Limited-scope assessment —** Assessment confined by time, instructions, material, purpose, or method; its weight should match those limits.

**Child contact refusal —** A child's resistance to, avoidance of, or refusal of contact with a parent or family member; the term describes the presentation, not the cause.

**Child voice reliability —** Assessment of how the child's views were formed, elicited, tested, and weighted, including whether they were constrained, reinforced, suggested, or independently formed.

**Formation analysis —** Examination of how a child's stated views, fears, allegations, rejection, or preferences developed over time.

**Alienating behaviours —** Adult conduct that undermines, damages, restricts, or interferes with a child's relationship with a parent or family member without adequate protective justification.

**Coercive control —** A pattern of controlling, intimidating, isolating, threatening, or autonomy-restricting behaviour affecting safety, freedom, relationships, or emotional functioning.

**Post-separation family violence —** Family violence, coercive control, harassment, systems abuse, economic abuse, child manipulation, or contact obstruction after separation.

**Child coercive control —** Pressure, fear, loyalty demands, emotional burden, information control, reward, withdrawal, or adult influence used to shape a child's beliefs, speech, behaviour, or relationships.

**Systems abuse —** Use of legal, child protection, police, school, therapeutic, health, or other institutional pathways to intimidate, exhaust, discredit, restrict, or control.

**Litigation abuse —** Use of applications, allegations, delay, costs, procedural complexity, or repeated legal action as control, punishment, obstruction, or depletion.

**High-conflict formulation —** Framing the family problem primarily as mutual parental conflict; caution is required where evidence may indicate coercive, protective, reactive, or alienating conduct.

**Mutualising language —** Language that spreads responsibility across both parents before testing whether conduct is reciprocal, asymmetrical, protective, reactive, coercive, or obstructive.

**Contact, communication, and transition related anxiety—** Distress linked to movement between households or to phone, video, text, supervised, school-based, or other parent-child communication conditions.

**Communication restriction —** Filtering, monitoring, blocking, discouraging, supervising, or narrowing a child's ordinary private communication with a parent or family member.

**Attachment deactivation —** Defensive suppression or rejection of attachment needs, affection, longing, or care, often under pressure, fear, loyalty conflict, or relational unsafety.

**Relational displacement —** Substantial removal of a parent or family member from the child's ordinary relational world through disrupted contact, communication, meaning-making, kinship, or identity.

**Targeted parent —** A parent toward whom undermining, exclusionary, coercive, or obstructive conduct is directed, where some relationship may remain.

**Displaced parent —** A parent substantially removed from the child's relational world through restricted contact, damaged meaning-making, or loss of ordinary parental role.

**Adultification —** Requiring a child to carry adult emotional, legal, relational, caregiving, protective, or decision-making responsibility.

**Triangulation —** Involving a child in adult conflict or adult emotional needs so the child is placed between parents, households, professionals, or narratives.

**Suggestibility —** Vulnerability to adopting, altering, or strengthening beliefs, memories, or accounts through questioning, repetition, expectation, reinforcement, fear, or authority.

**Source misattribution —** Confusion about whether information came from direct experience, overheard conversation, adult explanation, counselling, documents, or reconstruction.

**Cognitive distortions —** Rigid or inaccurate thinking patterns affecting interpretation of events, relationships, risk, responsibility, threat, self-blame, or motives.

**Cognitive fusion —** Becoming so attached to a thought, label, fear, or narrative that it is experienced as fact rather than as a mental event requiring examination.

**Relational restriction —** Reduction, supervision, suspension, or practical narrowing of a child's relationship with a parent or family member.

**Relationship repair or reunification therapy —** Intervention intended to restore or repair a disrupted parent-child relationship; it requires a defined model, treatment targets, safeguards, competence, and review.

**Psychoeducation —** Structured education directed to identified mechanisms such as boundaries, loyalty pressure, communication, emotional regulation, coping, cognitive distortions, and relationship repair.

**Structured thematic analysis —** Transparent identification of patterns, themes, changes, inconsistencies, adult language, source shifts, and formation pathways across records and interviews.

**Collateral review —** Review of material beyond interviews, including communications, school, health, therapeutic, police or child protection records, orders, chronology, and repair attempts.

**Psychological measures and structured risk assessment instruments —** Standardised tools or structured instruments used to assist assessment of symptoms, functioning, parenting, safety, or risk. They support, but do not replace, formulation and differential assessment.

## Purpose and scope

This briefing note addresses the evidentiary, methodological, and procedural limits of compressed family assessment processes in parenting proceedings, including Child Impact Reports, limited-scope or short-form family reports, and any single expert or other assessment process where significant observations or recommendations are made after brief interviews, limited parent-child or family-system observation, and restricted review of material. [1] [2] [3]

Preliminary reports may assist case management by identifying issues, supporting interim risk screening, and informing directions for further enquiry, but their evidentiary value becomes problematic where a process of limited scope is relied upon as though it provides a comprehensive assessment of causation, risk, parenting capacity, child voice reliability, source reliability, attachment functioning, coercive control, obstructive or alienating behaviours, contact refusal, communication related distress, transition related anxiety, or long-term parenting arrangements. In complex matters, that distinction is particularly important because an early report can influence interim orders, professional assumptions, therapeutic referrals, school responses, later expert evidence, and the procedural direction of the case.

The Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia describes a Child Impact Report as a child-focused preliminary assessment report intended to support early decision-making, and states that, due to its limited nature, it does not provide an assessment suitable for final hearing or cross-examination. [1] That description is material to the weight such reports can safely bear, the limits that should be attached to their conclusions, and the manner in which their opinions, recommendations, and stated limitations should be tested.

The restricted scope of a Child Impact Report is also reflected in the adult interview structure described in the Court's public material, which states that the Court Child Expert conducts separate adult interviews, usually by Microsoft Teams, with each adult interview taking approximately 60 minutes. The same material states that other adults are generally not interviewed and that subpoenaed documents are not read unless the Court specifically orders otherwise. [2] Where a report prepared through that process is later relied upon to support recommendations affecting contact, communication, supervision, parental responsibility, therapeutic intervention, transition arrangements, or the child's relationship with a parent or family member, the Court and the parties should remain alert to the difference between preliminary issue identification and a methodologically sufficient foundation for substantive forensic conclusions.

A practical testing table is included at **Appendix A** to assist document review, expert clarification, cross-examination, and oral evidence where a compressed assessment report is relied upon in a complex parenting matter.

## Central position

Compressed assessment processes have significant methodological limits where the issues before the Court involve family violence, coercive control, child coercive control, obstructive or alienating behaviours, contact refusal, rigid child alignment, disputed allegations, communication restriction, source reliability, transition related distress, professional involvement, or substantial disruption to a child's relationship with a parent or family member. Brief interviews and limited observations may identify issues, but they do not provide a sufficient basis for comprehensive conclusions about the mechanism producing the child's position, the formation pathway of the child's expressed views, or the appropriate long-term arrangements.

Preliminary reports can acquire practical authority beyond their stated purpose when early formulations influence interim orders, professional assumptions, therapeutic referrals, school responses, later expert evidence, and the parties' litigation conduct. A report prepared to assist early case management may therefore shape the evidentiary pathway of the matter, despite being methodologically limited.

Compressed reports should be confined to preliminary screening, identification of issues, and referral for further assessment where complexity is present. They should not be treated as determinative where the evidence raises coercive control, obstructive or alienating behaviours, child rejection, entrenched alignment, unsupported or escalating allegations, significant psychological harm, source reliability concerns, school or therapeutic involvement, communication restriction, transition related anxiety, or major proposed changes to parental responsibility, time, supervision, communication, contact, or relationship repair.

## Methodological and evidentiary limits

A report based on brief interviews and short observations cannot safely determine complex family dynamics involving coercive control, obstructive or alienating behaviours, contact refusal, child alignment, unsupported or escalating allegations, source reliability, communication restriction, transition related distress, or relational displacement. These matters often require chronology, collateral records, review of communications, school material, therapeutic material, health material, police or child protection material where relevant, exposure-pathway analysis, and assessment of conduct, communication, and relational access over time.

A short assessment process can overvalue demeanour, verbal fluency, apparent composure, and coherent presentation under interview conditions. A parent who is calm, rehearsed, or strategically composed may appear more credible than a parent presenting with distress, urgency, defensiveness, grief, mistrust, or frustration arising from prolonged litigation, disrupted contact, unsupported allegations, or relational loss.

A targeted or displaced parent's trauma response may be mischaracterised as instability, hostility, poor insight, or inability to support the child. Proper assessment requires examination of contact obstruction, false positioning as unsafe, unsupported or escalating allegations, financial depletion, procedural delay, and the loss of ordinary parental role before adverse inferences are drawn from distress.

A preliminary formulation can lead practitioners to draw conclusions from a parent's presentation, rather than examining the relational processes, procedural pressures, cultural factors, communication conditions, and environmental conditions shaping how that parent presents. The assessment should examine which adult has practical control over the child's access to information, contact, private communication, phone or video communication, school reporting, professional input, family narrative, cultural connection, extended family relationships, and emotional permission to maintain significant relationships.

Cultural, kinship, language, religious, migration-related, and community factors should be identified where they may affect the child's relationships, caregiving arrangements, family roles, communication style, help-seeking, belonging, identity, or connection to extended family. These factors may also affect the child's connection to kinship networks, Country, community, or cultural practice.

A culturally responsive assessment should not assume that one family structure, caregiving arrangement, communication style, or expression of respect reflects ordinary functioning across all families. It should examine whether cultural factors are protective, stressful, misunderstood, or being used within the family system in a way that affects the child.

Cultural explanation should not be used to excuse coercive control, family violence, child maltreatment, intimidation, adult influence, information control, contact obstruction, or pressure placed on the child to reject a parent or family member. The assessment should identify how cultural, kinship, religious, linguistic, migration-related, or community factors relate to the child's formation pathway, family relationships, safety, and intervention needs.

A compressed process may inadequately test allegation chronology, despite timing often being probative in parenting matters involving contact refusal, intervention orders, school complaints, child protection notifications, therapeutic letters, therapeutic referrals, relocation proposals, enforcement applications, communication restrictions, changeover distress, contact-centre involvement, or changes to a child's stated position. The sequence in which allegations arise, intensify, reduce, change form, or become linked to litigation events can assist the Court to distinguish genuine risk escalation from strategic escalation, anxiety-driven escalation, adult narrative reinforcement, defensive reporting, system reinforcement, or allegations emerging in response to threatened loss of control.

Allegations that emerge or intensify near changeovers, phone or video contact, school disputes, proposed increases in time, enforcement attempts, report interviews, relocation proposals, supervised contact arrangements, contact-centre involvement, or therapeutic intervention require careful chronological mapping. The assessment should identify what was alleged, when it was first raised, who raised it, what evidence supported it at the time, whether the allegation changed after professional involvement, and whether the child's language, distress, avoidance, or relational position shifted after exposure to adult discussion, counselling, repeated questioning, legal material, monitored communication, lack of privacy, or post-contact debriefing. Without that chronology, a report may treat allegation volume, child distress, or contact refusal as evidence of risk rather than examining the conditions under which the account, anxiety, avoidance, or allegation was produced, repeated, escalated, or institutionally reinforced.

A limited report may fail to separate observation, allegation, inference, and opinion. A legally useful assessment should distinguish what was directly observed, what each party reported, what the child reported, what is

supported by independent material, and what is the assessor's professional inference. Compression across those categories can make a weak evidentiary foundation appear stronger than it is.

The absence of a clear limitations section is itself an issue for testing because a report writer who cannot identify the methodological limits of their own process may also be unable to identify the limits of the conclusions drawn from that process. In complex parenting matters, inadequate limitation statements can lead the Court and parties to overestimate the reliability of preliminary impressions, demeanour-based observations, child statements, unsupported allegations, and broad therapeutic recommendations.

A legally useful limitation section should state whether the report can or cannot support conclusions about causation, risk, parenting capacity, attachment functioning, coercive control, obstructive or alienating behaviours, child maltreatment, sexual abuse allegations, mental disorder, personality functioning, child suggestibility, memory reliability, source reliability, child voice formation, contact and communication related anxiety, or the appropriateness of reunification therapy or relationship repair. It should also identify whether the report writer reviewed communications, school records, therapeutic records, health records, police or child protection material where relevant, prior reports, litigation chronology, collateral accounts, and records relevant to contact, changeover, phone or video communication, and repair attempts. A report that does not state these limits may create the appearance of comprehensive assessment while relying on a method that cannot support comprehensive conclusions.

Proper limitation statements require methodological competence, psychological science underpinnings, case methodology, and an understanding of hypothesis testing, differential formulation, source reliability, sampling limits, interview contamination, developmental interpretation, memory reliability, risk assessment, and the distinction between screening, assessment, diagnosis, formulation, and intervention planning. A report writer must be able to identify how the assessment design affects the reliability of any opinion offered, including the limits created by brief interviews, artificial observations, limited collateral review, absence of transcripts, reliance on self-report, untested allegations, absence of appropriate psychological measures or structured risk assessment where indicated, absence of child voice formation analysis, absence of exposure-pathway analysis, and absence of longitudinal observation of the family system. Without that foundation, an assessor may not recognise the scope of the limitations or the conclusions that remain provisional, unsupported, or unsafe to draw without further assessment.

A compressed assessment report should clearly state its methodological limitations, yet brief family assessments often fail to identify the limits of the process with sufficient specificity. A generic statement that the report is limited, preliminary, or based on brief interviews is inadequate where the report may influence contact, supervision, parental responsibility, therapy, or a child's relationship with a parent or family member. The report should identify what was not done, what was not reviewed, what could not be tested, and which conclusions remain provisional.

Recommendations about supervision, no contact, reunification, therapeutic intervention, parental responsibility, communication restrictions, transition arrangements, or major changes to time can substantially restructure a child's relational world. They require a proportionate evidentiary foundation that matches the seriousness of the proposed intervention. A report based on limited interviews, brief observation, and restricted document review should not recommend relational restriction, therapeutic intervention, altered parental responsibility, restricted communication, or acceptance of a child's refusal unless it identifies the specific harm being addressed, the evidence supporting that harm, the alternatives considered, the safeguards available, and the reasons a less restrictive, better structured, or more restorative pathway would not adequately protect the child.

## Coercive control, systems abuse, and post-separation dynamics

Coercive control requires pattern-based assessment because its evidentiary significance is often cumulative, relational, and maintained through non-physical conduct. The Australian Government describes coercive control as patterns of abusive behaviour over time that create fear and deprive a person of freedom and independence, including after separation and within family relationships. [4] The Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia's Family Violence Plan recognises that the definition of family violence in the Family Law Act includes coercive control, including conduct that may not involve physical violence or threats. [5] Those principles are difficult to reconcile with assessment methods that rely predominantly on isolated interviews, observed demeanour, or brief parent-child interaction, because coercive control is established through patterns of conduct, not single-event impressions. A proper assessment should examine the sequence, function, and cumulative impact of fear, surveillance, isolation, communication restriction, gatekeeping, systems use, child-related pressure, third-party recruitment, and interference with ordinary relational access over time.

The Court's Family Violence Best Practice Principles recognise the need for early and appropriate risk management in parenting matters involving family violence, including attention to the impact of family violence on children, trauma, systems abuse, and safety planning. [6] In post-separation matters, systems abuse and litigation abuse require assessment of the legal, professional, school, police, child protection, and therapeutic pathways through which allegations, restrictions, referrals, and professional opinions have developed. Australian research recognises that legal and government systems may be exploited as part of coercive control, including through procedural tactics, counter-allegations, repeated reporting, or exploitation of justice processes after separation. [7] [8]

Supervised contact and contact centre referrals require careful evidentiary scrutiny because they can alter the child's ordinary experience of the parent, signal risk before risk has been properly established, and become a practical form of relational restriction if the purpose, evidentiary foundation, duration, and review pathway are not clearly defined. Although they can provide an important safeguard where there is reliable evidence of risk, they may also unnecessarily restrict a parent–child relationship and contribute to coercive or obstructive post-separation dynamics when imposed or maintained without sufficient evidentiary justification. Where the material establishes abuse, neglect, family violence, unsafe parenting, substance misuse, mental health instability, or child safety risk, supervised contact may provide an important protective structure. Where that foundation is absent, untested, overstated, or maintained through repeated allegation rather than corroborated risk, contact centre involvement may communicate to the child that the parent is dangerous, problematic, or unsafe before any proper finding has been made.

The assessment should examine whether supervised contact is being used to manage identified risk, or whether it is functioning as a litigation strategy, delay mechanism, reputational marker, or form of relational restriction. A contact centre can transform an ordinary parent-child relationship into a monitored, artificial, and anxious interaction. It can prevent the child from gathering ordinary relational information through school mornings, meals, transport, routines, conflict repair, shared tasks, and relaxed caregiving moments. In some cases, the setting may condition fear by repeatedly pairing the parent with surveillance, procedural tension, reporting expectations, adult anxiety, and the implied message that contact requires containment.

The same assessment caution applies beyond the contact centre setting, because a child's distress around contact, communication, or movement between households may reflect the conditions surrounding the interaction rather than the child's relationship with either parent. Contact, communication, and transition-related anxiety should therefore be assessed as a distinct evidentiary issue before it is used to support conclusions about parental risk, attachment quality, relationship viability, or the child's refusal. This includes the child's movement between parents, caregivers, households, supervised contact, contact-centre arrangements, school-based collection, and any phone, video, text, or other communication with a parent or family member.

Where adult conflict, surveillance, lack of developmentally appropriate privacy, parental anxiety, prompting, monitoring, facial expression, tone, silence, withdrawal, criticism, loyalty pressure, interrogation, post-contact debriefing, or repeated uncertainty is consistently paired with contact, communication, or changeover, the child may begin to associate the physiological stress of that process with the interaction itself. That stress may then be linked to the parent the child is moving toward, the parent the child is leaving, the parent the child is speaking with, both parents, the contact setting, the communication process, or the changeover arrangement.

Over time, that pairing may contribute to anticipatory anxiety, avoidance, resistance, refusal, guarded communication, or emotional shutdown that is later attributed to a parent rather than to the conditions surrounding contact or communication. A report should therefore avoid treating distress during changeover, reluctance to speak by phone or video, or avoidance of contact as direct evidence that either parent is unsafe. Before drawing that conclusion, the report should examine the transition conditions, the conditions of communication, adult behaviour before, during and after contact or communication, the child's access to privacy, exposure to emotional cues, reinforcement of avoidance, and whether safer, calmer, better structured arrangements could reduce the child's distress.

Contact centre reports should be interpreted cautiously because they may record behaviour within a highly artificial environment and may be prepared by staff whose role is observational, supervisory, or service based rather than forensic or clinical. A contact centre record may assist the Court by documenting attendance, incidents, observed interactions, safety concerns, or service compliance, but it should not be treated as a substitute for specialist assessment of ordinary parenting capacity, attachment behaviour, child voice reliability, or the child's functioning in routine life.

Additional caution is required because contact centre involvement does not, of itself, establish that the service provider or supervising staff hold specialist forensic, psychological, attachment, family violence, child

interviewing, or child development qualifications. Government-funded Children's Contact Services operate under guiding principles and program requirements, and national accreditation reform is underway; however, the existence of contact centre involvement should not be treated as equivalent to a regulated forensic assessment, clinical assessment, or expert opinion about parenting capacity, attachment functioning, causation, or the formation pathway of the child's expressed views.

A report recommending supervised contact or ongoing contact centre involvement should identify the specific risk being managed, the evidence supporting that risk, the duration and purpose of supervision, the conditions for review, the less restrictive alternatives considered, and the steps required to move toward ordinary safe contact where appropriate. Without those safeguards, contact centre use can deepen the divide, reinforce fear in the absence of established threat, reduce opportunities for corrective relational experience, and allow an untested risk narrative to become institutionally embedded.

Health, disability, medical and school support accounts require careful assessment where they are relied upon to support contact restriction, supervision, reduced time, or exclusion from parental decision-making. Genuine illness, disability, neurodevelopmental need, trauma, anxiety, somatic symptoms and complex medical presentations must be taken seriously. The forensic difficulty arises when a caregiver mediated account is accepted without proper collateral review, symptom chronology, specialist input, or consideration of alternative explanations.

In some matters, a targeted or displaced parent may be characterised as neglectful, unsafe, medically dismissive, or as denying the child's illness, when the evidence requires a more careful formulation. The child's presentation may be trauma-related, anxiety-driven, situational, reinforced by avoidance, shaped by family-system pressures, or amplified within a contested caregiving environment. The opposite error is also possible: genuine medical, disability, neurodevelopmental, psychiatric, or trauma-related needs may be minimised as strategic reporting. Either error can misdirect assessment, expose the child to avoidable harm, and distort the Court's understanding of parenting capacity.

Medical and healthcare systems can become part of the evidentiary pathway in post-separation disputes. Reports, diagnoses, treatment letters, medication histories, school-support plans, attendance records, emergency presentations and therapeutic opinions may be relied upon to support one account of risk or parenting capacity. A compressed assessment should not treat professional involvement as proof of causation. It should examine who supplied the history, what was independently observed, what records were reviewed, whether the child's functioning varies across households or settings, and whether each parent was given a fair opportunity to provide relevant information.

Where concerns arise about fabricated or induced illness, factitious disorder imposed on another, symptom amplification, disputed treatment needs, or school refusal, the assessor should identify the limits of the family assessment and recommend appropriate multidisciplinary review. These issues require expertise in child development, trauma and complex trauma, anxiety, somatic symptoms, neurodevelopment, paediatric safeguarding, family systems, attachment, child maltreatment, and diagnostic overlap. Recent Australian guidance on FIIC emphasises recognition, referral and multidisciplinary management, [10] and a 2026 systematic review of FDIA case reports and series found that these presentations involve physical, psychological and behavioural harm, with multidisciplinary intervention identified as critical. [11]

CPTSD and complex trauma require particular care because trauma-related dysregulation, avoidance, relational disturbance, negative self-concept, somatic complaints, dissociation, anxiety, shame, and functional impairment may overlap with other diagnostic categories or be incorrectly attributed to one parent without adequate formulation. [12] A brief family assessment should not convert partial medical, therapeutic, or school-support information into parenting conclusions the method cannot sustain.

A one-hour or otherwise compressed assessment may miss the way a parent or adult has controlled the child's information, restricted relational access, influenced the child's beliefs, recruited professionals or third parties, or created emotional conditions in which avoidance, guarded communication, or rejection becomes a way for the child to manage pressure, fear of consequence, loyalty demands, or household tension. These issues require pattern evidence, chronology, collateral material, communication records, and exposure-pathway analysis rather than interview impression or isolated observation.

Professional and third-party reinforcement can shape the evidentiary picture before the assessment occurs. Extended family, siblings, schools, therapists, lawyers, police, child protection workers, online communities, and family friends may receive, repeat, validate, or institutionalise one account. A compressed assessment may not identify whether the child's stated position has already been shaped through repeated exposure, adult

interpretation, professional reinforcement, household discussion, or social pressure before the assessor meets the child.

## High-conflict formulations and mutualising language

A report that uses high-conflict language should identify the model or framework being applied and explain why that formulation is supported by the evidence. High-conflict framing should be a conclusion reached after differential assessment, not the starting premise of the assessment. A model that emphasises mutual parental contribution, shared responsibility for conflict, or conflict management may be inadequate where the evidence raises coercive control, child coercive control, protective restriction, coercive restriction, legal systems abuse, adult influence, information control, pressure-shaped rejection, or obstructive relational conduct. In those matters, the report should explain how asymmetrical conduct was assessed before responsibility is spread across both parents.

Professional development material within the family law sector has, at times, promoted high-conflict formulations as an explanatory model for post-separation parenting disputes. The identity of a training provider need not be named in the body of a report challenge unless its material is being relied upon or directly contested. The relevant forensic issue is whether the assessor approached the case with an open differential formulation, or whether a taught model caused the assessment to begin from an assumed conclusion about mutual conflict, shared parental responsibility for the child's presentation, and conflict management as the primary intervention pathway.

A repeated concern in report review is the use of high-conflict language and mutual responsibility formulations without analysis of coercive control, professional reinforcement, litigation abuse, systems abuse, protective conduct, reactive distress, adult influence, information control, or obstructive relational conduct. This is not merely a wording issue. The formulation applied to the case shapes the evidentiary field. It affects which facts are gathered, which records are reviewed, how child statements are interpreted, how parent presentation is understood, whether third-party reinforcement is examined, and whether one parent's controlling or obstructive conduct is incorrectly reframed as a mutual communication problem.

Mutualising language can create an appearance of even-handedness while avoiding the central forensic question. Language about poor communication, parental conflict, adult dispute, or both parents exposing the child to conflict may be accurate where the evidence genuinely supports reciprocal parental contribution. It becomes factually distorting where the evidence shows asymmetrical conduct, protective action by one parent, reactive distress, coercive restriction, litigation abuse, systems abuse, adult influence, information control, or pressure placed on the child. The assessment must identify which pathway is supported by the material before recommending conflict management, therapeutic intervention, supervision, reduced contact, or relationship repair.

Where high-conflict reasoning is used by default, the model can determine what evidence is noticed, what evidence is minimised, and which parent is treated as responsible for the child's presentation. Contact restriction, communication control, information control, child influence, professional recruitment, misuse of protective language, litigation abuse, and pressure placed on the child may be reclassified as features of mutual conflict. A targeted or displaced parent's distress may then be treated as evidence of poor insight, hostility, emotional instability, or inability to support the child, rather than as a possible response to exclusion, unsupported allegations, relational loss, procedural pressure, or the loss of ordinary parental role.

High-conflict framing may be useful where the evidence genuinely supports mutual conflict, poor communication, reciprocal escalation, and shared parental contribution to the child's distress. The problem arises when high-conflict reasoning is used as a shortcut for complexity. In those circumstances, the assessment begins from an assumed formulation: that both parents are substantially contributing to the problem, that the child's presentation is primarily a product of parental conflict, and that the appropriate response is conflict management rather than identification of coercive, protective, reactive, obstructive, or pressure-shaped conduct.

A methodologically sound report should therefore state what evidence supports a high-conflict formulation, what evidence was considered against it, and how alternative explanations were tested. It should identify whether the facts support mutual parental conflict, protective restriction, reactive distress, coercive control, coercive restriction, litigation abuse, systems abuse, adult influence, information control, obstructive relational conduct, trauma-based avoidance, or a mixed presentation. Without that analysis, high-conflict language risks becoming a substitute for assessment and may direct the Court toward the wrong intervention pathway.

## Secondary guidance and disputed research

Secondary guidance, including bench book material, may assist legal orientation and risk identification, but it should be treated according to its evidentiary character and the purpose for which it is being relied upon. A bench book is not primary empirical research and does not replace case-specific forensic assessment. Where bench book material is used for contested propositions about alienating behaviours, contact refusal, abuse allegations, child resistance, or family-court outcomes, the underlying research base, methodological assumptions, and competing literature should be identified and tested.

Where the National Domestic and Family Violence Bench Book is relied upon for propositions about parental alienation, alienating behaviours, child resistance, or the relationship between alienation claims and abuse allegations, its discussion should remain open to forensic and methodological scrutiny. [13] Particular caution is required where secondary commentary, advocacy material, or contested secondary commentary claims are treated as determinative without adequate engagement with current peer-reviewed counter-literature, replication concerns, dataset limitations, coding issues, and competing findings.

An example of contested secondary commentary often relied upon in contentious parenting proceedings is Meier et al. (2019). Meier et al. may be relevant to legal debate about reported custody outcomes in cases involving abuse and alienation claims, but its disciplinary and methodological character should be made explicit when it is relied upon in assessment, training, report review, or litigation. [14] This paper is a legal outcomes study that examined electronically available published court opinions and coded variables such as allegations, defences, gender, parental status, and custody outcomes. The research focused on patterns within judicial decision-making and legal case outcomes rather than the direct assessment of psychological constructs, clinical phenomena, or forensic assessment practices. The principal investigator is a legal scholar, and the study is most appropriately understood as legal research rather than psychological, clinical, or forensic science.

Caution is therefore required when findings from legal outcomes research are relied upon to support conclusions regarding alienating behaviours, family dynamics, child psychological functioning, or the validity of forensic assessment practices. Analyses of published judicial opinions cannot, without further evidence, determine whether the underlying family assessments were methodologically sound, whether assessors possessed the requisite psychological or forensic expertise, whether child interviews were conducted in accordance with accepted practice standards, whether collateral information was adequately obtained and evaluated, or whether alternative explanations for a child's presentation were systematically considered. Nor can such research determine whether factors such as suggestibility, source misattribution, memory reliability, loyalty conflicts, fear, reinforcement processes, restricted relational exposure, or other influences on a child's expressed views were appropriately assessed. These are psychological, developmental, forensic, and assessment-methodology questions that require a different evidentiary foundation. Further caution is warranted where published descriptions of coding procedures, operational definitions, decision rules, and data-processing methods provide limited opportunity for independent scrutiny, replication, or evaluation of coding reliability and validity. Conclusions drawn from coded judicial opinions should therefore be interpreted considering these methodological constraints, alongside the broader peer-reviewed scientific literature and competing empirical findings.

Harman and Lorandos provide important counter-literature because they directly tested findings reported by Meier et al. in a peer-reviewed study using preregistered hypotheses, blind coders, transparent materials, and appellate cases in which parental alienation was alleged or found. [17] Their study reported no support for Meier et al.'s central conclusions about parental alienation claims operating as a successful legal strategy for abusive fathers, and identified substantial conceptual, methodological, analytical and statistical concerns with the Meier report. [17] Those concerns are relevant where Meier-derived claims are relied upon in training, bench book analysis, report reasoning, or policy argument without acknowledging the contested empirical foundation.

The broader counter-literature is also more specific than a general body of disagreement. Canadian court research and later custody-reversal analysis describe a fact-specific field in which alienation allegations must be distinguished from realistic estrangement, family violence, poor parenting, mixed presentations, and other parent-child contact problems, and in which a finding of alienation does not dictate a single legal or therapeutic response. [15] [16] Recent legal-practice scholarship similarly emphasises that children resisting contact require careful case analysis, proportionate intervention, and proper differentiation between alienation, protective restriction, abuse, coercive control, and cases where legal enforcement of contact may no longer serve the child's interests. [21]

Judicial outcome studies and related empirical work also dispute the use of a one-sided interpretation of the literature as though it resolves how alienation and abuse allegations operate in parenting litigation. Harman et al.'s trial-level Canadian study tested pre-registered hypotheses using independent coders and did not find support for research claims used to justify legislative restrictions on alienation evidence. [18] Sharples, Harman and Lorandos found that, in appellate cases where parental alienation was found, parents found to have alienated a child had a greater probability of substantiated abuse claims against them, while alienated parents had a greater likelihood of unsubstantiated abuse claims made against them. [19] Varavei and Harman further tested the claimed association between parental alienation allegations and mothers losing custody to abusive fathers in Canadian cases, and reported findings consistent with an illusory correlation rather than a general court pattern. [20] Kruk and Harman reviewed the empirical literature supporting the argument that alienating behaviours may constitute family violence and child maltreatment in appropriate cases, while also reinforcing that parental alienation does not describe cases where a child's rejection is justified by abuse, neglect, frightening parenting, or other legitimate safety concerns. [22]

Taken together, this literature does not require an assessor, report writer, lawyer, or court to assume that alienating behaviours are present in any particular case. It requires a disciplined evidentiary approach in which the research foundation being relied upon is disclosed, competing literature is acknowledged, and the assessment tests the available evidence for abuse, protective conduct, coercive restriction, alienating behaviours, child influence, litigation dynamics, practitioner competence, and the assessment method used in the matter before the Court.

## Child views and formation analysis

A child's expressed views require formation analysis because the child's current position does not, by itself, establish how that position developed, what it means, or what evidentiary weight it can safely bear. A report that records rejection, fear, anger, contempt, avoidance, loyalty, attachment, silence, compliance, or refusal of contact without examining the conditions in which those views were formed risks treating the child's current presentation as proof of causation. In complex parenting matters, the assessment should examine developmental capacity, relational history, exposure to adult allegations, repeated questioning, restricted contact, loyalty pressure, emotional reward, withdrawal of approval, fear of consequence, suggestibility, source misattribution, trauma, anxiety, cultural context, and the child's practical opportunity to experience each parent or family member in ordinary conditions. Children-resisting-contact literature supports careful differentiation between a child's stated position and the multiple pathways by which resistance, refusal, fear, or alignment may develop [21], while memory reliability literature supports caution where repeated questioning, adult interpretation, reinforcement, or source confusion may affect the child's account [49].

The obligation to hear the child is compatible with careful reliability assessment. A child's account may be sincere, important, and clinically informative without being independent of the relational, developmental, emotional, and informational conditions surrounding the child. Formation analysis should therefore distinguish direct experience from adult report, inference, overheard material, repeated narrative exposure, therapeutic interpretation, school-based discussion, legal language, and conclusions adopted after reinforcement. The issue is not whether the child should be heard; it is whether the report has explained how the child's views were elicited, how they were tested, what may have shaped them, and what conclusions can safely be drawn from them.

Child rejection, contact refusal, rigid relational positioning, fear, or marked alignment should prompt differential assessment rather than assumption. The assessment should consider whether the child's position is better explained by abuse, neglect, frightening parental conduct, family violence, coercive control, trauma, anxiety, grief, shame, developmental vulnerability, cultural or kinship context, ordinary relational rupture, protective restriction, adult influence, information control, loyalty pressure, attachment deactivation, obstructive relational conduct, or a mixed presentation. Specialist literature on child contact refusal, adult influence, family-system obstruction, and structured intervention supports assessment of adult influence, obstruction, reinforcement, and structured relational repair where those mechanisms are properly identified [21] [23] [24], but that inquiry must sit within a broader differential framework that also tests safety-based, trauma-based, developmental, cultural, and relational explanations.

A child's apparent detachment, contempt, dismissal, or indifference should not be treated as evidence that a meaningful relationship is absent unless the report has examined the conditions under which attachment behaviour can be expressed safely. Attachment theory and clinical attachment literature support assessment of secure-base functioning, separation and reunion behaviour, emotional availability, defensive inhibition, role reversal, and the child's capacity to seek comfort, express affection, tolerate ambivalence, or acknowledge

positive memory [44] [45]. In a compressed assessment, apparent indifference may reflect the absence of relationship, but it may also reflect inhibition, loyalty pressure, fear of consequence, grief, defensive adaptation, or attachment deactivation.

A child's compliance may also be mistaken for psychological safety where the child has learned which position reduces interrogation, criticism, guilt, withdrawal of approval, emotional collapse, adult distress, or household conflict. Outward composure can be an adaptive presentation rather than reliable evidence that the child's position is independently formed, emotionally free, or psychologically unconstrained. The assessment should examine whether the child can tolerate mixed feelings, revise a view, describe positive and negative experiences in proportionate terms, and speak about each parent or family member without anticipating emotional, relational, or practical consequences.

The child's broader relational losses should be assessed because disrupted parent-child contact may also weaken or sever relationships with siblings, grandparents, cousins, extended kin, cultural connection, family history, ordinary routines, shared memory, and identity continuity. A narrow focus on the child's immediate position toward each parent may miss the scale of relational disruption and the burden placed on the child when one side of the family system becomes inaccessible, unsafe to speak about, or psychologically incompatible with maintaining approval elsewhere. A report should therefore identify not only what the child currently says, but what relational opportunities have been available, restricted, filtered, reinforced, or lost.

## Age, developmental capacity, and the burden of choice

Where a child is asked about living arrangements, contact, safety, or preference between parents, the assessment should identify the child's age, developmental capacity, emotional vulnerability, dependency, and exposure to adult conflict, allegations, pressure, or loyalty demands. The younger the child, the greater the need to distinguish being heard from being asked to decide. A question about where the child wants to live may appear child-focused, but in a complex parenting matter it can place a developmentally inappropriate burden on a child who remains dependent on both parents and may not understand the legal, relational, and lifelong consequences of the answer.

The proper forensic question is not whether the child can state a preference, but what weight that preference can safely bear once age, maturity, vulnerability, suggestibility, dependency, triangulation, adultification, loyalty pressure, fear of consequence, and the child's opportunity for ordinary relational experience have been assessed. A child may be articulate, firm, and apparently confident while still being developmentally unable to separate personal experience from adult-supplied meaning, repeated allegations, household expectations, emotional reward, or the practical consequences of disappointing a parent. Although concepts such as Gillick competence arise most commonly in medical decision-making, they illustrate an important distinction between expressing a view and possessing sufficient developmental capacity to understand, weigh, and appreciate the consequences of that view. A child may be articulate, intelligent, and apparently confident while still lacking the maturity required to evaluate competing relational considerations, anticipate long-term consequences, or make decisions free from dependency, loyalty conflicts, emotional pressures, or adult influence.

Child-inclusive practice should not become a mechanism for transferring adult responsibility to the child. A child can be given a meaningful opportunity to express views without being asked to choose between parents, justify rejection, adjudicate adult allegations, or carry the moral burden of determining which parent loses time, status, or relational access. In complex cases, preference-based questioning may become particularly unsafe where the child has been adultified, triangulated into adult conflict, repeatedly questioned, exposed to allegations, rewarded for alignment, or made responsible for regulating the emotional state of a parent or household. [9]

Where a report relies on a child's stated preference, it should explain how the assessor tested whether the child had developmental and relational permission to hold mixed feelings, revise a position, describe positive and negative experiences in proportionate terms, and speak about each parent without anticipating emotional, practical, or relational consequences. It should also identify whether the child's preference was formed through direct and recent experience of ordinary caregiving, or through restricted contact, supervised contact, filtered communication, adult interpretation, repeated questioning, post-contact debriefing, or constrained access to the broader family system.

The longer-term burden placed on the child should also be assessed. A child who appears decisive during an interview may later carry guilt, grief, confusion, identity conflict, or moral injury if the child comes to understand that their stated preference contributed to the loss or restriction of a parent, sibling, grandparent, kinship relationship, cultural connection, family history, or ordinary routines. Reports should therefore avoid treating a

child's apparent firmness as sufficient evidence that the child can safely carry the consequences of a major relational decision. The child's views should be heard, but the responsibility for assessment, protection, proportionality, and final decision-making remains with adults and the Court. A child's ability to express a preference should not be conflated with developmental competence to carry responsibility for major relational outcomes, particularly where those outcomes may permanently affect family relationships, identity formation, cultural connections, or psychological wellbeing. [50]

## Child voice reliability and interviewing style

The statutory requirement to consider any views expressed by the child strengthens, rather than reduces, the need for careful interviewing, source analysis, and reliability assessment. Family Law Act 1975 (Cth) s 60CC(2)(b) makes the child's expressed views relevant to the best-interests inquiry, but it does not make those views determinative, self-authenticating, or independent of the conditions in which they were formed. Child-inclusive practice should therefore not be converted into child-determinative evidence. A child's expressed position may be sincere, important, and clinically informative, while still being shaped by restricted experience, repeated adult interpretation, loyalty pressure, consequence-based learning, suggestive questioning, or a caregiving environment that makes emotional flexibility costly.

A report that relies on the child's views should explain how the child was given a genuine opportunity to speak, how the interview method avoided rewarding a particular answer, how the assessor separated personal experience from information received from others, and how the child's views were tested against chronology, collateral material, cross-setting behaviour, developmental capacity, and the child's practical opportunity to revise their position without relational or practical consequences. Where a child's views are relied upon to support reduced time, supervision, no contact, therapeutic intervention, or a finding about risk, the report should identify the evidentiary pathway by which those views were elicited, tested, and weighted.

The child's voice is probative evidence because it provides direct information about the child's experiences, perceptions, wishes, and emotional functioning. It should not, however, automatically be treated as independent evidence of the underlying facts, or as proof that the child's beliefs were formed free from adult influence, restricted experience, repeated questioning, loyalty pressure, or consequence-based learning. The distinction between hearing the child and treating the child's views as automatically independent evidence is discussed in *The Child's Voice is Evidence: It is Not Automatically Independent Evidence*. [9] Contact-refusal literature also supports careful assessment of whether the child had a realistic opportunity for independent belief formation, including ordinary first-hand exposure to each parent or caregiver, access to the wider relational field, and the opportunity to compare caregiving realities through recent and routine experience rather than through managed, interrupted, supervised, or conditional contact. [21] The assessment should also examine whether contact has been primed or debriefed, whether communication has been filtered or monitored, and whether the child has been exposed to adult interpretation before, during, or after relational experiences.

A child's capacity to express ambivalence is an evidentiary issue because the ability to hold mixed feelings may indicate whether the child has relational permission to think flexibly. Where a child cannot speak positively or neutrally about a parent, cannot revise a view, or appears to anticipate relational or practical consequences for softening their position, the assessment should not treat a rigid stance as a simple preference. Formation analysis should examine reinforcement pathways, including relief, praise, restored warmth, reduced tension, guilt induction, withdrawal, escalation, post-contact questioning, and adult distress that the child may learn to regulate by maintaining the safer or more rewarded position.

Information control can narrow the child's opportunity to test their own beliefs against ordinary experience. Selective storytelling, repeated adult interpretations, adult-supplied labels, filtered communication, blocked calls, cancelled time, gatekeeping of extended family, and restriction of ordinary relational experiences can prevent the child from updating beliefs through direct observation. A child may speak sincerely while expressing the account that has been most reinforced, least costly, and most compatible with preserving attachment security or emotional safety in the caregiving environment.

Interviewing style is central to the reliability of any conclusion drawn from the child's expressed position. The report should disclose whether the interview used open, exploratory, developmentally appropriate questions, and whether the assessor separated direct experience from inferred meaning, information received from others, and conclusions adopted after repeated exposure to adult accounts. The report should identify whether questioning was repetitive, leading, morally framed, confirmatory, or structured in a way that rewarded a

particular answer, because the reliability of the child's position cannot be assessed without examining the method by which that position was elicited.

A competent child interview should test the child's account through concrete sequences, timing, source of knowledge, proportionality, cause and effect, and the child's capacity to tolerate partial knowledge, uncertainty, or mixed information. A child who can give global conclusions but cannot anchor those conclusions to personally experienced events, or whose account becomes more rigid and less complex across repeated interviews, requires careful reliability analysis rather than immediate acceptance of the expressed position as independently formed.

Prior interviews, counselling sessions, school conversations, police or child protection discussions, and repeated questioning by adults should be identified because they may affect the child's confidence, language, memory, and perceived expectations. The memory reliability literature in [49] supports caution where earlier processes may have introduced adult interpretations, increased confidence without increasing accuracy, blended inferred material into the child's personal knowledge, or made a particular account socially or relationally safer for the child to maintain.

The safeguards required for child interviews are methodological rather than merely procedural. Recording, transcription, and thematic coding should allow later review of the actual questions asked, the child's exact words, the sequence of prompting, the degree of interviewer influence, the presence or absence of alternative hypotheses, and the assessor's reasons for treating the child's views as reliable, provisional, constrained, or requiring further assessment.

## Research currency, shared parenting, and intervention competence

Research currency is material where a report makes recommendations about parenting time, contact, communication, parental responsibility, mental health treatment, psychoeducation, therapeutic support, supervised contact, no contact, transition arrangements, communication restrictions, or reliance on a child's refusal, avoidance, distress, or expressed preference as a basis for relational restriction. Those recommendations can materially alter a child's relationship with a parent or family member while also shaping the therapeutic pathway available to the family. Where a report recommends relational reduction, it should identify the research foundation considered, the child-specific evidence relied upon, and the reason the recommendation departs from relationship preservation, structured remediation, supported repair, protected communication, safer transition arrangements, or less restrictive protective arrangements. Where the concern involves child contact refusal, communication avoidance, adult influence, attachment disruption, or possible obstructive or alienating behaviours, the report should explain how intervention literature concerning assessment, coordinated legal and therapeutic management, and specialised family work was considered before reduced relationship opportunity was recommended. [23] [24]

The shared parenting and dual-residence literature does not create an automatic rule in favour of any particular arrangement, but it does make relational reduction an intervention requiring careful evidentiary justification. Meta-analytic reviews have reported better average adjustment for children in joint physical custody or shared care arrangements when compared with sole custody arrangements, while also recognising that effect sizes, study design, and sample characteristics affect the weight and application of those findings. [27] [28] Nielsen's reviews similarly report that children in shared parenting arrangements often show equal or better outcomes across emotional, behavioural, physical, academic, and parent-child relationship measures, including in studies that considered income, parental conflict, and parent-child relationship quality. [25] [26] [31] Braver and Votruba address the causal question more cautiously, concluding that the evidence supports likely average benefits of joint physical custody while still requiring attention to selection effects, research design, and the limits of applying group-level findings to an individual child. [32]

The broader dual-residence literature assists the Court by identifying a relevant research background, but it cannot replace case-specific assessment of the child, the parents, the practical arrangements, and any risk evidence. Systematic and narrative reviews describe a growing but heterogeneous field, with differences in terminology, jurisdiction, cultural setting, study design, family selection, and outcome measures that limit simplistic translation into any one parenting recommendation. [29] [30] Dutch and Swedish population-based studies add important data concerning shared residence, child wellbeing, parental resources, psychological complaints, and the stability or instability of shared arrangements. [33] [34] [35] Those findings should still be applied with attention to family functioning, parental conflict, logistics, resources, and the child's actual needs. Research addressing shared parental responsibility and longer-term distress after divorce further supports the proposition that exclusion, conflict, and reduced parental involvement may carry psychological and relational

consequences, while still requiring careful differentiation between ordinary post-separation strain and risk-based restriction. [36] [37] [38]

A report that moves from parental dispute, poor communication, litigation conflict, child distress, or contact difficulty to reduced time, supervision, no contact, communication restriction, or reliance on a child's refusal should state the evidentiary basis for that step rather than relying on an assumption that less relationship is the safer clinical course. Current shared parenting and dual-residence research does not support reducing a parent-child relationship merely because parents disagree, communicate poorly, present with litigation conflict, or require structured arrangements. [25] [26] [29] [30] [32] The report should identify whether the recommendation is based on child-specific risk, practical unsuitability, developmental need, family violence, coercive control, severe mental illness, substance misuse, unsafe parenting, entrenched obstruction, child psychological harm, transition-related anxiety, communication conditions, or some other assessed reason that makes ordinary relationship preservation unsafe or impracticable.

Parental conflict, including a matter described as high conflict, does not of itself justify reducing parent-child contact or communication. Where the identified difficulty is primarily located in adult communication, decision-making, litigation conduct, transition arrangements, or the parental relationship, rather than in child-specific safety concerns or unsafe parenting, the report should explain why relationship reduction is necessary and proportionate. It should also identify whether less restrictive arrangements were considered, including parallel parenting, structured communication protocols, defined decision-making boundaries, parenting coordination, third-party facilitation, protected communication arrangements, supported or supervised transition, or other conflict-management arrangements capable of protecting the child without unnecessarily reducing the child's relationship with either parent.

Age and developmental stage require separate analysis where arrangements involve infants, toddlers, preschool children, practical caregiving demands, transition frequency, attachment needs, parental availability, and the feasibility of safe and predictable movement between homes. The qualitative study of Swedish parents practising equal joint physical custody with children aged 0–4 is relevant because it illustrates the reasons some parents regard equal care as child-focused and workable. [39] It does not remove the need to assess the young child's developmental needs, caregiving history, parental capacity, transition stress, and practical safety in the particular family before recommending or rejecting any arrangement.

Intervention recommendations require the same evidentiary discipline as risk recommendations because generic counselling, generic co-parenting education, or child-led therapy may be inadequate where the assessment has not identified the mechanism producing the child's presentation. A recommendation should identify whether intervention is being directed to trauma symptoms, anxiety, depression, avoidance, communication avoidance, transition related anxiety, conditioned fear, cognitive distortions, cognitive fusion, loyalty-bound reasoning, cognitive dissonance, grief, shame, source misattribution, adult-shaped beliefs, school refusal, parent-child rupture, attachment deactivation, role reversal, or an adult-controlled family-system pattern. Evidence concerning intimate partner violence and mental health supports careful trauma-informed assessment where family violence, coercive control, psychological harm, or mental health symptoms are in issue. [40] Australian child maltreatment research separately supports attention to emotional abuse, neglect, exposure to domestic violence, and associated mental health outcomes across development. [41]

Evidence-based intervention planning should identify the modality, purpose, sequence, safeguards, practitioner competence, and criteria for review, because CBT-informed work, ACT-informed psychoeducation, family systems work, structured parenting intervention, trauma-informed treatment, specialist relationship repair, case management, contact and communication planning, transition support, and parent accountability work serve different clinical and forensic functions. CBT-informed work may be relevant where the assessed mechanism involves anxiety, avoidance, cognitive distortions, behavioural reinforcement, skill deficits, or maladaptive beliefs. [42] ACT-informed psychoeducation may be relevant where the assessed mechanism involves cognitive fusion, experiential avoidance, values conflict, rigid rule-governed behaviour, or difficulty acting consistently with relational values under emotional pressure. [43] A report should not recommend intervention in broad terms while leaving the Court, the parties, and treating practitioners to infer the mechanism, sequencing, safety conditions, communication conditions, transition supports, therapeutic target, and required expertise.

Templer et al.'s systematic review is relevant where child contact refusal, adult influence, and family-system obstruction have been properly identified, because it discusses specialised intervention and the importance of coordinated legal and therapeutic responses. [23] Haines, Matthewson and Turnbull similarly frame assessment and intervention in these cases as multidisciplinary work requiring legal and therapeutic understanding, rather than ordinary counselling applied to a specialised family dynamic. [24] Those sources do not mean that every

case of contact refusal, communication avoidance, guarded presentation, or relational distress involves adult influence, obstruction, or a need for relationship transfer. They support the narrower proposition that properly identified adult influence, family-system obstruction, coercive restriction, or reinforced avoidance requires intervention matched to the assessed mechanism rather than passive acceptance of the child's current position.

Traditional therapy can be ineffective or counterproductive where the wrong formulation is applied or the adult-driven conditions shaping the child's position remain unaddressed. In cases involving possible obstructive or alienating behaviours, coercive restriction, entrenched refusal, guarded communication, transition related distress, or attachment deactivation, the intervention should identify whether the child is being asked to carry the therapeutic burden while the adult conduct, communication conditions, transition conditions, or reinforcement patterns maintaining the presentation remain unchanged. [23] [24] Where risk is established, intervention must include protection, accountability, and safety planning. Where risk is not established, intervention should avoid embedding an untested risk narrative through indefinite restriction, unsupported supervision, monitored communication, lack of privacy, poorly structured transitions, or therapy that treats avoidance as the endpoint rather than as a behaviour requiring formulation.

Attachment-informed intervention should be identified as a distinct component where a report addresses parent-child rupture, rejection, avoidance, fear, guarded communication, rigid alignment, or attachment deactivation. Those presentations require assessment of secure-base functioning, parental sensitivity, emotional availability, repair after rupture, separation and reunion behaviour, transition stress, role reversal, the child's capacity to seek and receive comfort, and the conditions that permit or inhibit affection toward each parent. [44] [45] [46] Attachment theory should not be treated as sufficient justification for reduced time or restricted communication with one parent merely because the child appears more comfortable, dependent, or aligned with the other parent during a brief assessment. [24]

Psychoeducation should be specified rather than named in general terms, particularly where it is recommended as part of a parenting, child-focused, or family-system intervention. A report recommending psychoeducation should identify the content to be delivered, including healthy and unhealthy parent-child relationships, child development after separation, safe and unsafe communication, developmentally appropriate privacy in parent-child communication, adult-child role boundaries, triangulation, parentification, emotional caretaking, loyalty pressure, transition stress, cognitive distortions, cognitive fusion, dissonance, grief, coping skills, and the child's right to maintain safe and meaningful relationships where this can occur safely. Child contact-refusal and alienation intervention literature supports the need for specialised family work where adult influence or family-system obstruction is properly identified. [23] [24] CBT-informed and ACT-informed approaches may also inform psychoeducation where anxiety, avoidance, cognitive distortions, cognitive fusion, experiential avoidance, or rigid rule-governed behaviour are part of the assessed mechanism. [42] [43] Boundary education should explain what boundaries are, why they protect the child and the family system, when boundaries are required, and how they are communicated, maintained, reviewed, and distinguished from relational cut-off, avoidance, adult-led exclusion, or the permanent narrowing of the child's family relationships.

Practitioner training is material to assessment and recommendation quality because recommendations about parenting time, contact, communication, parental responsibility, therapeutic intervention, transition arrangements, and relational repair require knowledge that extends beyond ordinary interview impression. Reports should identify whether the assessor is current in shared parenting and dual-residence research, child development, attachment theory and attachment-based intervention, family violence, child coercive control, child contact refusal, family systems intervention, trauma-informed practice, source reliability, exposure-pathway analysis, communication avoidance, transition related anxiety, cognitive-behavioural and ACT-informed psychoeducation, and evidence-based responses to anxiety, depression, avoidance, cognitive distortions, cognitive fusion, dissonance, trauma, grief, and relational disruption. Where the recommendation affects the child's ongoing relationship with a parent or family member, the opinion should disclose the research foundation, the assessment method, the practitioner competence required, and the evidentiary basis for selecting restriction, repair, supervision, treatment, protected communication, supported transition, or staged restoration.

## Court-ordered reunification therapy and undefined intervention models

Court-ordered reunification therapy requires particular caution because the term is often used as though it describes a recognised and consistent treatment model, when in practice it may refer to a broad range of counselling, family therapy, parent coaching, supervised contact support, reportable therapy, or ad hoc

relationship repair work. A court order requiring reunification therapy may appear remedial, but without a defined model, identified treatment targets, practitioner competencies, safety parameters, and review mechanisms, the order can leave the practitioner to determine the intervention according to personal preference, ideology, general family therapy training, or an unsupported formulation of the case.

Undefined reunification therapy can deepen the relational divide where the intervention proceeds without a proper assessment of the mechanism producing the child's refusal, avoidance, guarded communication, distress, or rejection. A practitioner may inadvertently validate a child's rigid position without testing its formation pathway, require the targeted or displaced parent to repeatedly prove safety in the absence of established risk, frame the problem as poor parental communication, or place responsibility for repair on the parent who has been excluded from the child's relational world. In other cases, the intervention may pressure a child toward contact without first addressing fear, loyalty pressure, adult influence, attachment deactivation, trauma symptoms, communication conditions, transition related anxiety, or the emotional consequences the child anticipates for softening their position.

Court-ordered relationship repair should not proceed as therapeutic experimentation. The order should identify the purpose of the intervention, the assessment basis for that purpose, the practitioner's training, the model being applied, the safeguards for the child, the role of each parent, the management of allegations, the handling of the child's expressed views, the conditions for contact and communication, the communication rules between adults and practitioners, the reporting arrangements, and the criteria for review. Without these safeguards, reunification therapy can become another system process that reinforces avoidance, validates an untested narrative, increases the child's burden, restricts the child's capacity to communicate freely, or further pathologises the targeted or displaced parent.

Attachment-informed intervention should be distinguished from generic reunification work. Where a child's relationship with a parent has been disrupted, the intervention should assess the history of the attachment relationship, the child's current attachment adaptations, the conditions under which warmth or ambivalence becomes unsafe for the child, and the relational experiences needed to permit gradual repair. Effective intervention may require psychoeducation about healthy and unhealthy parent-child relationships, communication, developmentally appropriate privacy, boundaries, emotional regulation, repair after conflict, loyalty pressure, adultification, parent-child role reversal, contact and communication conditions, and the difference between protective boundaries and avoidance shaped by pressure, fear of consequence, or repeated pairing of contact with distress.

A report recommending reunification therapy or relationship repair should therefore state why that intervention is appropriate, what model is proposed, what evidence supports it, what risks it is intended to address, what risks it may create, what outcomes are expected, and what alternatives were considered. In complex matters, intervention should be matched to the assessed pathway: genuine abuse, protective restriction, coercive restriction, adult influence, attachment deactivation, conditioned fear, communication avoidance, transition related anxiety, trauma generalisation, child anxiety, neurodevelopmental factors, or mixed presentation. Because each pathway requires different intervention, a generic order for reunification therapy does not provide the Court, the child, or the parties with adequate procedural or clinical protection. **[23] [24]**

## Qualifications, formal training, and assessment model disclosure

The assessor's formal qualifications, professional registration, field of practice, family law assessment experience, specialist training, and limits of expertise should be identified with sufficient clarity for the Court and the parties to understand the foundation, scope, and weight of the opinion being advanced. The Court's public material states that family consultants must be psychologists or social workers with specialist knowledge in child and family issues after separation and divorce, and sufficient expertise to act as expert witnesses in parenting matters. [47] That threshold is important, but it should not be treated as establishing specialist competence in every psychological, developmental, family violence, coercive control, trauma, memory, interviewing, or intervention issue that may arise in a complex parenting dispute.

A practitioner's role title, general registration, or family law assessment experience does not, of itself, establish competence to assess child coercive control, post-separation coercive control, systems abuse, litigation abuse, obstructive or alienating behaviours, adult influence, attachment deactivation, suggestibility, memory contamination, source reliability, false or distorted belief formation, exposure pathways, communication avoidance, transition related anxiety, or the differential assessment of child contact refusal. Those matters require specific knowledge, disciplined formulation, and an assessment method capable of testing competing explanations rather than converting interview impression, child preference, parental presentation, litigation history, communication behaviour, or observed distress into a single explanatory account.

Complex parenting assessments require more than general familiarity with family separation where the material involves contact refusal, communication avoidance, allegations of harm, entrenched child alignment, relational displacement, intervention orders, therapeutic reports, school involvement, sexual abuse allegations, sudden or significant change in the child's position, contact-centre involvement, monitored communication, transition related distress, or a recommendation affecting contact, communication, supervision, parental responsibility, therapeutic intervention, transition arrangements, or the child's ongoing relationship with a parent or family member. In those matters, the Court is not only considering what the child or parent said during the assessment; it is being asked to rely upon the assessor's capacity to interpret formation conditions, evidentiary reliability, source reliability, risk, causation, relational functioning, and the likely effect of intervention, restriction, communication arrangements, or transition arrangements.

Where an assessor purports to give opinions on those issues, the report should disclose whether the assessor has the necessary knowledge base to address coercive control, family violence, child maltreatment, sexual abuse, attachment theory, personality functioning, anxiety, fears and phobias, family systems, complex trauma, obstructive or alienating behaviours, child development, assessment and diagnosis, trauma-informed practice, child safety risk, risk of harm to self or others, and child interviewing. The report should also disclose whether the assessor has sufficient understanding of cognitive distortions, false confessions, false memories, claimed repressed or recovered memory, suggestibility, source misattribution, learning processes, fear conditioning, compliance, dependency, information control, exposure pathways, non-verbal influence, social labelling, in-group and out-group positioning, and belief formation under relational pressure. False-confession research is relevant to caution about compliance and pressure-shaped accounts, [48] while memory reliability literature is relevant to false memory, source misattribution, suggestibility, and belief formation concerns. [49]

These areas of expertise should not be treated as interchangeable, because each can materially alter the interpretation of allegations, child statements, parent presentation, avoidance, fear, memory, compliance, resistance, guarded communication, transition distress, attachment deactivation, and the apparent causes of relational rupture. A practitioner trained primarily in general family assessment may be competent to identify presenting issues, describe observed interactions, or recommend further enquiry, while still lacking the specialist competence needed to determine whether a child's presentation is better explained by abuse, realistic estrangement, protective restriction, trauma, anxiety, adult influence, obstructive or alienating behaviours, coercive control, suggestibility, avoidance reinforcement, monitored communication, transition-related anxiety, contact conditions, or a mixed presentation. Where the report moves beyond issue identification into causal opinion or restrictive recommendation, that distinction becomes material to evidentiary weight.

The assessment model should be disclosed where the report addresses child rejection, contact refusal, communication avoidance, entrenched alignment, coercive control, obstructive or alienating behaviours, significant relational rupture, transition related distress, or a contested account of harm. A report that adopts high-conflict language, mutualising formulations, or language suggesting equal parental responsibility for the child's presentation should identify the evidentiary basis for that formulation and explain how asymmetrical coercive, obstructive, frightening, violent, controlling, protective, reactive, or pressure-shaped conduct was considered and either included or excluded. Without that analysis, high-conflict language can obscure unilateral or predominantly unilateral conduct and may misdirect the Court away from the mechanism affecting the child.

Where the assessor lacks specialist competence in a material domain, the report should say so expressly and should identify the further assessment, collateral review, multidisciplinary input, or specialist opinion required before stronger conclusions are drawn. It is preferable for a report to acknowledge the limits of its method and expertise than to present provisional observations as though they establish causation, risk, parenting capacity, child voice reliability, attachment functioning, or the appropriate therapeutic pathway. A compressed report or limited-scope assessment should not acquire evidentiary force beyond the competence of the assessor and the method actually used.

The concern is therefore not whether the assessor has undertaken professional development in family law generally, but whether the assessor has demonstrated competence in the specific dynamics raised by the evidence and has applied a method capable of testing those dynamics. A report that does not identify those competencies, does not disclose the formulation model being applied, or does not explain how competing hypotheses were assessed should be treated cautiously where its conclusions affect contact, communication, parental responsibility, supervision, transition arrangements, therapeutic intervention, or the child's relationship with a parent or family member.

## Questions properly raised by the qualifications and methodology issue

The question of qualifications and methodology goes to the weight that can properly be placed on the report, because the Court is being asked to rely on the assessor's expertise, information base, and assessment method when choosing between protection, remediation, relationship preservation, structured repair, supervised or supported transition, communication arrangements, and relational restriction. Protection must remain decisive where the material establishes risk, but the removal or substantial reduction of a child's relationship with a parent, sibling, grandparent, or other significant family member is a major intervention requiring a clear evidentiary foundation. It should not rest on impression, professional risk aversion, allegation repetition, parental distress, the existence of litigation, or an untested assumption that separation or restriction is the safer course.

A compressed report should not treat family division as the practical endpoint because a child refuses contact, avoids communication, becomes distressed during transition, a parent presents with distress, allegations have been made, or the parents communicate poorly. The report should identify whether the family problem remains capable of remediation through structured contact, supported or supervised transition, protected communication arrangements, parent coaching, psychoeducation, case management, family systems intervention, behavioural accountability, or specialist relationship repair. A parent may require accountability, monitoring, treatment engagement, skill development, or behavioural change before greater contact or communication is safe; that is different from assuming the relationship should be reduced or abandoned without testing whether repair is possible.

The same reasoning applies where the child presents with anxiety, avoidance, guarded communication, refusal, rigid thinking, cognitive distortions, cognitive fusion, dissonance, loyalty-bound reasoning, grief, shame, or attachment deactivation. These presentations may reflect risk, trauma, pressure, fear, reinforcement, loss, restricted relational experience, contact or communication conditions, or an adaptive attempt to maintain emotional safety within one household. A report should therefore identify whether the child's position is being maintained by genuine danger, unresolved trauma, anxiety, adult influence, avoidance reinforcement, loyalty pressure, attachment deactivation, contact or communication related distress, transition related anxiety, or fear of relational consequence.

Where that analysis is not undertaken, accepting the child's rejection, avoidance, guarded communication, or refusal as the endpoint may leave the child's underlying distress untreated and may convert a coping position into a long-term relational outcome. Where safe, the assessment should identify the maintaining conditions and recommend appropriately sequenced psychoeducation, therapeutic intervention, parent accountability work, structured communication arrangements, supported transition, or structured relational repair directed to those conditions, rather than allowing the child's current refusal, avoidance, distress, or expressed preference to become the substitute for formulation.

The following questions assist in testing whether a compressed report has a sufficient evidentiary and methodological foundation for recommendations affecting parenting time, contact, communication, parental responsibility, supervision, no contact, therapy, school involvement, transition arrangements, or reliance on a child's refusal, avoidance, distress, or expressed preference as a basis for restricting a parent-child or significant family relationship:

- What current shared parenting, dual-residence, parent-child relationship, and child-adjustment research informed the recommendations about time, contact, parental responsibility, relationship preservation, and relationship repair?
- What evidence established that reducing or severing the child's relationship with a parent or family member was necessary and proportionate, rather than using structured contact, therapeutic contact, supervised transition, parent coaching, communication controls, case management, or specialist family intervention?
- What specific risk made remedial work unsafe, and how was that risk weighed against the psychological and relational harm of removing ordinary access to a parent, sibling, grandparent, extended family member, culture, family history, and shared routines?
- What evidence supported the use or continuation of supervised contact or contact centre involvement, and did the report consider whether the arrangement was protective, proportionate, time-limited, reviewable, and capable of moving toward ordinary safe contact, or whether it risked reinforcing fear, reducing ordinary relational experience, and embedding an untested risk narrative?

- What assessment was undertaken of health, disability, medical or school-support accounts, including whether the child's symptoms were genuine, trauma-related, anxiety-driven, situational, reinforced by avoidance, shaped by family-system dynamics, amplified through caregiver reporting, or indicative of specialist safeguarding concerns requiring multidisciplinary assessment?
- What assessment was undertaken of contact, communication, and transition related anxiety, including the child's movement between parents, caregivers, households, supervised contact, contact centre arrangements, school based collection, phone calls, video calls, text communication, or other parent-child communication, and whether distressing conditions were repeatedly paired with one parent, both parents, the contact setting, the communication process, or the transition itself?
- What assessment was undertaken of each parent's capacity for insight, accountability, behavioural change, treatment engagement, parenting support, safe communication, repair, and support for the child's relationship with the other parent and extended family?
- What evidence-based interventions were considered before recommending reduced time, no contact, or acceptance of the child's refusal, including psychoeducation, family systems intervention, specialist relationship repair, CBT-informed work, ACT-informed work, parenting coordination, case management, structured therapeutic support, and parent accountability work?
- Where the report recommends reunification therapy, does it identify the specific intervention model, the practitioner competencies required, the attachment and family-systems formulation, the psychoeducation content, the safeguards for the child, the criteria for progress, and the process for reviewing whether the intervention is repairing the relationship or deepening the divide?
- What attachment-informed assessment or intervention was considered, including secure-base functioning, parental sensitivity, emotional availability, repair after rupture, transition support, role reversal, attachment deactivation, and the child's capacity to experience both parents as psychologically available where safe?
- What specific psychoeducation was recommended for parents and children, including healthy and unhealthy parent-child relationships, safe communication, adult-child boundaries, triangulation, parentification, loyalty pressure, cognitive distortions, cognitive fusion, dissonance, coping skills, and boundaries as what, why, when, and how, rather than as a vague instruction to attend psychoeducation?
- What child processes were assessed, including anxiety, depressive symptoms, cognitive distortions, cognitive fusion, avoidance, dissonance, loyalty-bound reasoning, fear of consequence, suggestibility, source misattribution, adult-shaped beliefs, attachment deactivation, and the child's capacity to tolerate ambivalence?
- What steps were taken to distinguish safety-based restriction from conflict avoidance, adult convenience, professional risk aversion, unsupported allegation acceptance, or a high-conflict formulation that mutualises responsibility without evidentiary analysis?
- What collateral material was reviewed to test the child's account and the parents' accounts, including communications, school material, therapeutic material, police or child protection material, prior orders, allegation chronology, records of contact disruption, and records of repair attempts?
- What methodology was used to assess whether the child's expressed views were independently formed, developmentally plausible, reinforced, rehearsed, suggested, morally framed, fear-shaped, or shaped by the practical and emotional conditions in one household?
- What interviewing style or protocol was used with the child, and were questions open, exploratory, developmentally appropriate, and free from leading, confirmatory, or morally loaded framing?
- How did the assessor separate the child's direct experience from inferred meaning, information received from adults, repeated narrative exposure, therapeutic language, and conclusions formed through reinforcement?
- What prior interviews, counselling sessions, school conversations, police or child protection discussions, therapeutic interpretations, post-contact debriefing, and adult questioning were identified as possible sources of confusion, narrative consolidation, increased confidence without increased accuracy, or contamination of the child's personal knowledge?
- What consideration was given to the child's broader relational world, including siblings, grandparents, kinship ties, cultural connection, school stability, identity continuity, and the psychological effect of losing ordinary access to one side of the family system?

- What training or supervision does the assessor have in evidence-based interventions for mental health presentations, cognitive distortions, cognitive fusion, dissonance, family-system reinforcement, attachment deactivation, and child contact refusal?
- What monitoring or follow-up was recommended to determine whether orders, therapy, or family interventions were improving the child's functioning, reducing risk, and supporting safe relationship repair?
- What limits should be placed on the report because interviews were brief, material was incomplete, collateral sources were not reviewed, or the assessment did not include recorded interviews, transcription, or structured thematic analysis?
- What is the earliest documented version of the child's account, fear, allegation, preference, or refusal, and what evidence shows whether the child's wording, emotional intensity, certainty, explanation, or relational meaning changed after adult discussion, counselling, school involvement, legal events, police or child protection contact, or post-contact debriefing?
- Who first introduced the specific words, labels, fears, allegations, explanations, diagnoses, moral meanings, or safety descriptions that now appear in the child's account, and how did the assessor distinguish the child's direct experience from adult interpretation, overheard information, therapeutic language, school-based discussion, legal material, imagination, inference, or repeated narrative exposure?
- What exposure pathway was mapped before the child's account was treated as reliable, independently formed, or probative of risk, including exposure through parents, siblings, extended family, school staff, therapists, lawyers, police, child protection workers, online material, documents, repeated adult questioning, or household discussion?
- What evidence did the assessor identify about non-verbal influence, including adult facial expression, tone, silence, withdrawal, anger, anxiety, reassurance, approval, disappointment, emotional collapse, or post-contact reaction, and how may those cues have shaped the child's avoidance, confidence, account, or permission to speak positively or negatively about a parent or family member?
- What evidence did the assessor identify about social labelling or in-group and out-group positioning, including repeated descriptions of one parent, household, family group, or professional position as safe, unsafe, good, dangerous, abusive, protective, rejected, or unworthy, and how may those labels have affected the child's belonging, loyalty, role, identity, and permission to think flexibly?
- What independent evidence, contemporaneous records, behavioural timelines, observed interactions, cross-setting functioning, or collateral material supports or contradicts the child's account, and how did the assessor avoid treating repetition, confidence, consistency, emotional intensity, or apparent certainty as a substitute for corroboration or formation analysis?

These questions are intended to test whether the report has used proportionate reasoning and proper evidentiary discipline without minimising supported risk, diluting safeguarding obligations, or replacing protection with optimism. They require the report to identify the risk or harm relied upon, the evidentiary foundation for that risk or harm, the mechanism producing the child's presentation, the assessment steps used to test competing explanations, the remedial and protective options considered, the safeguards available, and the reasons any restorative, transitional, or less restrictive pathway is unsafe, insufficient, or unsuitable. Where a report recommends reduced contact, supervised contact, no contact, communication restriction, reliance on the child's refusal, or an undefined therapeutic pathway, it should explain why less restrictive, better supported, or more remedial options cannot safely meet the child's needs.

## Recording, transcription, and structured thematic analysis

Where interview material, observational material, or parent-child communication material is relied upon to support findings about risk, parenting capacity, child voice reliability, contact refusal, communication avoidance, transition related anxiety, coercive control, obstructive or alienating behaviours, attachment functioning, or the appropriate intervention pathway, the report should state whether relevant interviews or observations were audio recorded or audio-visually recorded, transcribed where appropriate, and retained in accordance with privacy, confidentiality, consent, professional, and Court requirements. A report based on selective notes from brief interviews or limited observations creates avoidable evidentiary risk because the

Court, the parties, and any later expert cannot properly examine the questions asked, the wording used, the sequence of questioning, the child's exact language, the extent of prompting, the presence of leading assumptions, the conditions under which the child spoke or behaved, or the distinction between what was said, what was observed, and what was inferred by the assessor.

Transcription provides a more accountable evidentiary record than summary notes alone because it allows later review of whether the interview process was even-handed, whether the child's account was explored carefully, whether alternative explanations were tested, and whether the assessor's conclusions are supported by the actual interview material. In matters involving coercive control, obstructive or alienating behaviours, contact refusal, communication restriction, guarded communication, rigid child alignment, disputed allegations, relational displacement, transition related distress, or a significant change in the child's position, the precise wording of questions and answers can materially affect the interpretation of the evidence.

These safeguards are particularly important where the report relies on the child's expressed views, reluctance, avoidance, refusal, or observed communication with a parent or family member. The record should show the child's exact words, the wording and order of the assessor's questions, the extent of prompting, any correction or clarification offered by the child, and the steps taken to separate personal experience from inference, adult-supplied information, therapeutic language, repeated narrative exposure, non-verbal influence, source confusion, and conclusions formed through reinforcement.

The assessment should also examine prior interviewing, questioning, counselling, school-based discussion, police contact, child protection contact, adult debriefing, monitored communication, lack of privacy during calls or video contact, and post-contact or post-transition discussion involving the child. Where a child has been repeatedly interviewed, questioned by adults, counselled, debriefed after contact, exposed to therapeutic interpretations, monitored during communication, or asked to explain their position across multiple settings, the report should examine whether those processes may have altered the child's account, increased confidence without increasing accuracy, introduced inferred material as memory, shaped the child's willingness to speak freely, or compromised the reliability of the child's personal knowledge.

A child's account should not be treated as more reliable merely because it has been repeated consistently after repeated questioning, therapeutic involvement, monitored communication, or household discussion. Consistency may reflect genuine memory, but it may also reflect narrative consolidation, rehearsal, adult language, source confusion, social reinforcement, or the child's learned understanding of which account is safest to maintain. The assessment should identify who asked the child questions, how often questioning occurred, what assumptions were embedded in the questions, whether the child was praised, reassured, relieved, corrected, criticised, monitored, or rewarded for particular answers, and whether alternative explanations were explored in a developmentally appropriate way.

Structured thematic analysis should be used in complex matters where the report relies on patterns across interviews, chronology, parent accounts, child accounts, collateral material, communication records, observational records, and professional records. The analysis should identify recurrent themes, inconsistencies, changes over time, adult language, moralised phrasing, fear-based claims, attachment deactivation, loyalty pressure, unsupported assertions, source shifts, allegation development, exposure pathways, non-verbal influence, social labelling, in-group and out-group positioning, and patterns across parent and child interviews. Qualitative analysis software may assist by creating an audit trail of coding, themes, quotations, source references, and analytical decisions. The software does not replace professional judgement, but it can make the reasoning process more transparent and less dependent on impressionistic note taking.

Recorded interviews, transcripts, and structured analysis improve professional accountability by allowing later review of whether competing explanations were considered, whether high-conflict framing was imposed prematurely, whether coercive, obstructive, protective, reactive, avoidant, or alienating dynamics were explored, whether interviewing or counselling contamination was assessed, whether contact and communication conditions were considered, and whether the child's expressed views were analysed through a formation pathway rather than accepted at face value. Where recording, transcription, or structured analysis has not occurred, the report should identify that limitation and avoid giving interview, observational, or communication material greater evidentiary weight than the method can safely support.

## Psychological measures, risk assessment instruments, and case methodology

Reports addressing psychological symptoms, parenting capacity, trauma, attachment functioning, child behaviour, family violence, coercive control, child safety, self-harm, substance misuse, personality functioning, communication avoidance, transition related anxiety, contact refusal, or therapeutic suitability should disclose

the role of standardised psychological measures, screening tools, and structured risk assessment instruments in the assessment design. That disclosure should make clear whether relevant tools were considered, administered, unavailable, declined, or contraindicated, and should explain how the assessor determined that the chosen method was sufficient for the questions before the Court. The use of a measure does not repair an inadequate assessment design, and the absence of a measure does not automatically invalidate a limited report. The forensic value of any tool depends on its relevance, competent administration, interpretation within its limits, and integration with the broader case methodology.

A report relying on psychological measures or structured risk assessment instruments should identify the instrument, version, purpose, informant, scoring method, interpretation limits, practitioner competence required, and relevance to the forensic question. It should also explain whether the instrument was used for screening, symptom description, clinical assessment, risk formulation, treatment planning, parenting assessment, or forensic opinion. A score, checklist, screening result, or scale elevation cannot substitute for analysis of causation, relational functioning, parenting capacity, child voice reliability, source reliability, coercive control, obstructive or alienating behaviours, attachment deactivation, communication avoidance, transition related anxiety, or the child's formation pathway.

Risk assessment requires precision because different forms of risk require different evidence, methods, and safeguards. Risk of family violence, coercive control, child maltreatment, sexual abuse, self-harm, psychological harm, unsafe parenting, substance-related harm, abduction, systems abuse, contact obstruction, communication restriction, and harm arising from inappropriate intervention cannot be collapsed into a general reference to safety, distress, or concern. Recommendations affecting contact, communication, supervision, parental responsibility, therapy, school involvement, transition arrangements, or the child's relationship with a parent or family member should identify the specific risk being assessed, the evidence supporting it, the method used to test it, and the protective or remedial response proposed.

Psychological measures and structured risk assessment instruments must be interpreted with attention to the conditions under which information was produced. Litigation pressure, fear, trauma, impression management, symptom minimisation, symptom amplification, caregiver-mediated reporting, repeated questioning, coaching, monitored communication, lack of privacy, avoidance reinforcement, restricted relational experience, adult influence, and exposure to repeated narratives may affect self-report, parent-report, child-report, and third-party report. Test results, screening tools, and risk instruments therefore need to be integrated with interviews, observations, chronology, collateral records, allegation sequence, communication records, inconsistency analysis, source reliability, exposure pathways, and competing hypotheses before they are relied upon to support findings or recommendations.

## Procedural safeguards recommended for complex matters

Compressed reports should identify their scope and limitations expressly so the Court can distinguish between observations that may assist interim case management and conclusions that require fuller assessment. The report should state what was assessed, what was not assessed, what material was reviewed, what material was unavailable, which interviews or collateral sources were not obtained, which hypotheses remain open, and what further inquiry is required before reliable conclusions can be drawn about risk, causation, parenting capacity, child voice reliability, source reliability, attachment functioning, contact refusal, communication avoidance, transition related anxiety, or the appropriate intervention pathway.

Where a matter involves disputed allegations, child contact refusal, entrenched alignment, relational displacement, coercive control, obstructive or alienating behaviours, intervention orders, communication restriction, transition related distress, school or therapeutic involvement, health or disability-related claims, or a significant change in the child's position, procedural fairness and assessment integrity require more than brief interviews and selective file review. The assessment should use a staged, specialist, multi-source method capable of testing competing explanations rather than confirming the most immediate presentation. That method should include, where proportionate and available, a chronology of allegations, contact changes, communication restrictions, transition arrangements, professional involvement and court events; review of relevant filed and subpoenaed material; collateral information from schools, therapists, health practitioners and agencies; consideration of appropriate psychological measures or structured risk assessment instruments where indicated; assessment of each parent's conduct, capacity and support for the child's relationships; cultural, kinship, language, community, and identity factors where relevant; exposure-pathway analysis; and formation analysis of the child's expressed views.

The report should also identify whether its recommendations are interim, provisional, protective, remedial, investigative, or intended to guide final orders. That distinction is important because a limited report may

properly identify risk indicators, information gaps, the need for urgent safeguards, or the need for specialist assessment, but it should not present compressed observations as final findings on abuse, coercive control, alienating behaviours, attachment, mental health, parenting capacity, or the child's expressed views as independently formed unless the method used can support those conclusions. Where recommendations affect contact, communication, parental responsibility, supervision, therapy, schooling, medical decision-making, transition arrangements, or the child's relationship with a parent or family member, the report should explain why the recommended pathway is necessary, proportionate, reviewable, and safer than the available alternatives.

Procedural safeguards should include clear identification of the assessment model, the hypotheses tested, the evidence relied upon, the limits of the data, the basis for accepting or rejecting competing explanations, and the specific expertise required for any further assessment or intervention. Where the report recommends reduced contact, supervised contact, no contact, communication restriction, reunification therapy, parent therapy, child therapy, psychoeducation, case management, transition arrangements, or further expert input, it should identify the purpose of the recommendation, the risk or mechanism it is intended to address, the practitioner competencies required, the proposed sequencing, the safeguards for the child, and the criteria for review.

The Court should treat compressed reports cautiously where their conclusions carry consequences beyond the method used to produce them. A brief report may assist by identifying immediate concerns, narrowing issues, recommending interim safeguards, or directing the matter toward proper assessment, but it should not become the evidentiary substitute for that assessment. Where the report's limitations are not clearly stated, or where strong recommendations are made without sufficient collateral review, hypothesis testing, specialist competence, recording, transcription, exposure-pathway analysis, or structured analysis, the proper safeguard is to confine the weight of the report to what its method can reliably support.

## Conclusion

In complex parenting matters, compressed reports are safest when treated as preliminary tools for screening, issue identification, interim risk management, and referral for further assessment, rather than as comprehensive evidence capable of resolving causation, risk, child voice reliability, source reliability, attachment functioning, coercive control, obstructive or alienating behaviours, contact refusal, communication related distress, transition related anxiety, or long-term parenting arrangements. Where those issues are live, the assessment requires transparent methodology, specialist competence, relevant collateral review, careful chronology, explicit limitation statements, recorded interviews where appropriate, transcription where interview material is relied upon, structured analysis of recurring themes and formation pathways, and differential assessment capable of distinguishing mutual parental conflict from coercive, obstructive, protective, reactive, traumatised, avoidant, or alienating conduct. Without those safeguards, a limited interview process may be converted into a forensic conclusion that the method cannot properly support.

The reliability of a report in a complex matter depends on the method used to reach the opinion, not on professional presentation, report format, confident language, or broad references to the child's best interests. A report capable of assisting the Court should identify the evidence reviewed, the hypotheses tested, the specialist knowledge applied, the interview method used, the role of any standardised psychological measures, screening tools, or structured risk assessment instruments, the limits of the available data, the conclusions that remain provisional, and the conclusions that cannot safely be drawn. A generic limitation statement provides inadequate protection against over-reliance where the report has not tested causation, risk, parenting capacity, attachment functioning, coercive control, child influence, memory reliability, source reliability, exposure pathways, contact or communication conditions, or the suitability of any proposed intervention. The same caution applies where a score, checklist, scale elevation, or screening result is relied upon without integration into a broader case methodology that includes chronology, collateral review, competing hypotheses, and child-specific formulation.

A report that recommends reduced time, supervision, no contact, communication restriction, or reliance on a child's refusal, avoidance, distress, or expressed preference as a basis for relational restriction should demonstrate current knowledge of shared parenting and dual-residence research, child development,

attachment theory, family systems, trauma-informed practice, risk assessment, child interviewing, and evidence-based intervention. It should explain whether psychoeducation about healthy and unhealthy parent-child relationships, safe communication, boundaries, emotional regulation, repair after conflict, loyalty pressure, adultification, role reversal, contact and communication conditions, and safe relational repair was considered before the child's relationship with a parent or family member was reduced, suspended, or left to an undefined therapeutic process.

The promotion of the child's voice requires forensic discipline because child-inclusive practice can become child-determinative practice when expressed views are accepted without reliability testing. The assessment should show how the child's views were elicited, whether the questions were open and developmentally appropriate, whether prior interviewing, counselling, adult discussion, school-based discussion, post-contact debriefing, or therapeutic interpretation may have shaped the account, whether the child had relational permission to hold mixed feelings, and whether the child's statements were grounded in first-hand experience rather than repeated interpretation, reinforcement, priming, fear conditioning, adult-supplied meaning, source confusion, or constrained opportunity to experience the wider family system.

Court-ordered reunification therapy or relationship repair requires careful definition because broad therapeutic orders may expose the child and family to intervention without an identified model, purpose, safeguards, practitioner competencies, reporting arrangements, review process, or assessment of the risks created by the intervention itself. Relationship repair requires more than directing an undefined intervention into a poorly assessed family system. In complex matters, intervention should follow careful assessment, identify the mechanism of relational disruption, preserve child safety, protect against further relational harm, and provide a realistic opportunity for behavioural change, healing, and repair where safe and clinically appropriate.

The central question is whether the assessment has identified the mechanism of harm, the evidentiary foundation for that mechanism, the child's formation pathway, the available protective and remedial options, the pathway that best protects the child while minimising unnecessary relational harm, and the limits of the assessment method. Supervised contact, contact centre involvement, communication restrictions, and transition arrangements should be protective, proportionate, time-limited, reviewable, and supported by child-specific evidence rather than functioning as untested markers of danger. Family division should not become the default result of professional uncertainty, compressed assessment, high-conflict framing, unsupported allegation acceptance, undefined therapeutic orders, inadequate limitation statements, untested reliance on a child's current position, or failure to assess the conditions under which the child's refusal, avoidance, distress, or expressed preference was formed and maintained.

**Safeguarding Children, Supporting Families, Strengthening Practice**


Co-Parenting Australia Ltd is registered with the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission.
ABN 57 613 304 028 | Support CoPA

## Appendix A

The following table translates the concerns addressed in this briefing note into practical testing points for document review, expert clarification, cross-examination, and oral evidence. It is designed to assist legal representatives and practitioners to test whether a report's conclusions are proportionate to the method used, the material reviewed, the limitations stated, and the specialist knowledge required. It does not dilute safeguarding obligations or invite delay where risk is established; it identifies where further evidence, clarification, limitation, or comprehensive assessment may be required before a compressed report is given determinative weight.

### Table 1. Issues for testing in compressed family assessment reports

| Issue for testing | Document or oral evidence to seek |
|---|---|
| **Assessor qualifications and specialist competence** | Formal qualifications, professional registration, field of practice, family law assessment experience, and specialist training relevant to the issues in dispute. Where the matter involves child contact refusal, coercive control, alienating behaviours, attachment disruption, systems abuse, litigation abuse, suggestibility, or memory reliability, the evidence should identify training and demonstrated competence in those specific domains rather than relying on general family law experience. |
| **Scope of expertise** | Clarification of which opinions fall within the assessor's expertise and which require further specialist assessment. The report should distinguish observations, screening impressions, provisional formulations, risk indicators, causal opinions, and intervention recommendations. |
| **Minimum knowledge base for complex parenting matters** | Evidence that the assessor understood the relevant domains raised by the case, including family violence, coercive control, child maltreatment, sexual abuse, attachment theory, personality functioning, anxiety, fears and phobias, family systems, complex trauma, alienating behaviours, child development, trauma-informed practice, child interviewing, risk assessment, and child safety. |
| **Memory, suggestibility, and belief formation** | Evidence that the assessor understood cognitive distortions, false confessions, false memories, claimed repressed or recovered memory, suggestibility, source misattribution, learning and conditioning processes, compliance, dependency, information control, adult influence, and belief formation under relational pressure. The report should explain how those issues were considered when interpreting allegations, fear, avoidance, memory, child alignment, attachment deactivation, and relationship rupture. |
| **Assessment model** | Identification of the model or framework used to interpret the family dynamics. Where the report uses high-conflict language, mutualising formulations, or shared-responsibility language, it should explain how asymmetrical coercive, obstructive, protective, reactive, or alienating conduct was considered. |
| **Differential assessment** | The steps taken to distinguish mutual parental conflict from protective restriction, coercive restriction, litigation abuse, systems abuse, alienating behaviours, justified estrangement, reactive distress, trauma responses, and mixed presentations. |
| **Hypothesis testing** | Evidence that competing explanations were actively tested rather than assumed. The report should identify which hypotheses were considered, what evidence supported or weakened each hypothesis, which hypotheses remain open, and what further inquiry is required. |
| **Child voice reliability** | The method used to assess whether the child's expressed views were independently formed, developmentally plausible, reinforced, rehearsed, suggested, morally framed, fear-shaped, or shaped by the practical and emotional conditions in one household. |
| **Child interviewing method** | Disclosure of the interview style or protocol used with the child, including whether questions were open, exploratory, developmentally appropriate, and free from leading, confirmatory, repetitive, or morally loaded framing. |
| **Source reliability** | Evidence that the assessor separated the child's direct experience from inferred meaning, adult-supplied information, repeated narrative exposure, therapeutic language, and conclusions formed through reinforcement. |
| **Prior questioning and narrative contamination** | Identification of prior interviews, counselling sessions, school conversations, police or child protection discussions, adult questioning, debriefing after contact, or therapeutic interpretations that may have contributed to suggestion, repetition, source confusion, narrative consolidation, or increased confidence without increased accuracy. |

| Issue for testing | Document or oral evidence to seek |
|---|---|
| **Account development and earliest version** | Evidence identifying the earliest documented version of the child's account, fear, allegation, preference, or refusal, and any later changes in wording, emotional intensity, certainty, explanation, source, or relational meaning. The report should identify whether the account changed after adult discussion, counselling, school involvement, legal events, police or child protection contact, professional interpretation, or post-contact debriefing. |
| **Exposure pathway and source introduction** | Evidence identifying who first introduced the words, labels, fears, allegations, explanations, diagnostic language, moral meanings, or safety descriptions that now appear in the child's account. The report should map exposure through parents, siblings, extended family, school staff, therapists, lawyers, police, child protection workers, online material, documents, repeated adult questioning, and household discussion where relevant. |
| **Non-verbal influence and emotional signalling** | Evidence that the assessor considered adult facial expression, tone, silence, withdrawal, anger, anxiety, reassurance, approval, disappointment, emotional collapse, post-contact reaction, or other non-verbal cues that may have shaped the child's behaviour, avoidance, confidence, account, or permission to speak positively or negatively about a parent or family member. |
| **Social labelling and group positioning** | Evidence that the assessor considered repeated descriptions of one parent, household, family group, or professional position as safe, unsafe, good, dangerous, abusive, protective, rejected, unworthy, or aligned with the child's loyalty position. The report should identify whether social labelling, in-group and out-group positioning, status assignment, or repeated moral framing affected the child's belonging, role, identity, flexibility of thought, or access to both sides of the family system. |
| **Corroboration, repetition, and evidentiary weight** | Evidence identifying what independent records, contemporaneous material, behavioural timelines, observed interactions, cross-setting functioning, or collateral information supports or contradicts the child's account. The report should explain how the assessor avoided treating repetition, confidence, consistency, emotional intensity, or apparent certainty as a substitute for corroboration, source analysis, or formation analysis. |
| **Collateral review** | The filed and subpoenaed material reviewed, the material not reviewed, records excluded by scope, and collateral sources not contacted. Relevant material may include communications, school records, therapeutic records, health records, police or child protection material, prior orders, allegation chronology, records of contact disruption, and records of repair attempts. |
| **Chronology** | A chronology of allegations, changes in contact, professional involvement, school involvement, therapeutic intervention, court events, and changes in the child's expressed position. The chronology should assist the Court to examine timing, escalation, reinforcement, intervention effects, and whether the child's position changed after identifiable events or adult processes. |
| **Methodological limitations** | A clear statement of what was not reviewed, what was not tested, which hypotheses remain open, and which conclusions cannot safely be drawn from the process used. This should include limits created by brief interviews, limited observations, restricted document review, no transcripts, limited collateral evidence, absence of appropriate psychological measures or structured risk assessment where indicated, and no formal child voice formation analysis. |
| **Psychological measures and structured risk assessment** | Evidence of the role played by standardised psychological measures, screening tools, or structured risk assessment instruments in the assessment design, including the instrument, version, purpose, informant, scoring method, interpretation limits, practitioner competence required, and integration with interviews, observations, chronology, collateral records, allegation sequence, and competing hypotheses. A score, checklist, scale elevation, or screening result should not be treated as a substitute for case formulation, risk analysis, or assessment of causation. |
| **Opinion limits** | Clarification of the weight that can safely be given to conclusions and recommendations having regard to the assessment scope, time available, interview method, observation limits, collateral review, and specialist competence. |
| **Research currency** | Current research relied upon in relation to shared parenting, dual residence, child adjustment, child voice, family violence, coercive control, contact refusal, intervention, relationship repair, and the effect of relational restriction. |

| Issue for testing | Document or oral evidence to seek |
|---|---|
| **Parenting time reasoning** | The child-specific evidence used to support any recommendation reducing, expanding, supervising, suspending, or restoring time. The report should identify the risk, developmental consideration, caregiving history, practical arrangement, safety issue, or repair pathway relied upon. |
| **Supervised contact and contact centres** | Evidence supporting the need for supervised contact or contact centre involvement, the specific risk being managed, the proportionality of the restriction, the proposed duration, the review criteria, and the less restrictive alternatives considered. The report should also address whether supervision may reinforce fear, reduce ordinary caregiving experience, restrict corrective information, or function as a relational restriction without an established risk foundation. |
| **Health, disability, medical, neurodevelopmental, and school-support accounts** | Evidence that the assessor considered genuine illness, disability, neurodevelopmental need, trauma symptoms, anxiety, somatic complaints, school refusal, treatment needs, caregiver-mediated reporting, symptom reinforcement, disputed clinical interpretation, and specialist safeguarding concerns such as fabricated or induced illness or factitious disorder imposed on another where indicated. The report should identify who supplied the history, what was independently observed, what records were reviewed, whether functioning varied across households or settings, whether each parent was given a fair opportunity to contribute information, and whether multidisciplinary assessment is required before parenting conclusions are drawn. |
| **Contact, communication, and transition related anxiety** | Evidence that the assessor considered the child's distress before, during, or after movement between parents, caregivers, households, supervised contact, contact-centre arrangements, school-based collection, phone calls, video calls, text communication, or other parent-child communication. The report should identify whether distress was linked to adult conflict, surveillance, lack of developmentally appropriate privacy, prompting, monitoring, parental anxiety, interrogation, emotional withdrawal, loyalty pressure, post-contact debriefing, avoidance reinforcement, the receiving parent, the departing parent, the parent being contacted, both parents, the contact setting, the communication process, or the transition itself, and whether safer or better structured arrangements were considered before drawing conclusions about risk or contact. |
| **Parent capacity and accountability** | Evidence that each parent's insight, accountability, behavioural change, treatment engagement, parenting support, safe communication, capacity for repair, and support for the child's relationship with the other parent and wider family were assessed. |
| **Cultural, kinship, and community factors** | Evidence that the assessor considered relevant cultural, kinship, religious, linguistic, migration-related, community, and identity factors, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander kinship and connection to Country where relevant. The report should identify whether these factors affect caregiving, communication, family roles, help-seeking, child voice, shame, authority, community pressure, relational belonging, or the child's access to extended family and cultural identity. It should also explain how the assessor distinguished culturally shaped family functioning from coercive control, family violence, child maltreatment, adult influence, information control, contact obstruction, or pressure placed on the child to reject a parent or family member. |
| **Intervention competence** | Training and experience in evidence-based interventions and psychoeducation relevant to trauma symptoms, anxiety, depression, cognitive distortions, cognitive fusion, dissonance, avoidance, attachment deactivation, child contact refusal, and family-system reinforcement. |
| **Intervention pathway** | The evidence-based interventions considered before recommending reduced time, no contact, supervised contact, or acceptance of the child's refusal. This may include psychoeducation, family systems intervention, specialist relationship repair, CBT-informed work, ACT-informed work, parenting coordination, case management, structured therapeutic support, and parent accountability work. |
| **Reunification therapy or relationship repair** | Identification of the intervention model, practitioner competencies, attachment and family-systems formulation, psychoeducation content, safeguards for the child, reporting arrangements, criteria for progress, review process, and indicators that the intervention is repairing the relationship rather than deepening the divide. |
| **Attachment-informed assessment** | Evidence that the report considered secure-base functioning, parental sensitivity, emotional availability, repair after rupture, transition support, role reversal, attachment deactivation, and the child's capacity to experience both parents as psychologically available where safe. |

| Issue for testing | Document or oral evidence to seek |
|---|---|
| **Psychoeducation** | Identification of the actual psychoeducation content recommended, including healthy and unhealthy parent-child relationships, safe communication, adult-child boundaries, triangulation, parentification, loyalty pressure, cognitive distortions, cognitive fusion, dissonance, coping skills, and boundaries as what, why, when, and how. |
| **Recording, transcription, and structured analysis** | Evidence of whether interviews were recorded, transcribed, retained, and analysed using a structured method. Where recording, transcription, or structured thematic analysis did not occur, the report should identify the limitation and avoid giving interview material greater evidentiary weight than the method can support. |
| **Broader relational world** | Consideration of the child's relationship with siblings, grandparents, kinship networks, cultural connection, school stability, identity continuity, family history, and the psychological effect of losing ordinary access to one side of the family system. |
| **Monitoring and review** | The monitoring or follow-up recommended to determine whether orders, therapy, supervision, or family interventions are reducing risk, improving the child's functioning, supporting safe repair, and preventing further relational harm. |

The table is intended to assist proportionate testing of the report, not to require every issue to be explored in every case. The relevant questions will depend on the issues raised by the evidence, the scope of the assessment, the seriousness of the recommendations, and the consequences for the child's relationships, safety, functioning, and long-term development.

**Safeguarding Children, Supporting Families, Strengthening Practice**

Co-Parenting Australia Ltd is registered with the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission.
ABN 57 613 304 028 | Support CoPA

## References

[1] Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia, Reports prepared by Court Children's Service. https://www.fcfcoa.gov.au/fl/pubs/court-childrens-service

[2] Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia, Child Impact Report - FAQs. https://www.fcfcoa.gov.au/fl/pubs/child-impact-report-faq

[3] Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia, Expert witnesses in family law. https://www.fcfcoa.gov.au/fl/pubs/expert-witnesses

[4] Australian Government Attorney-General's Department, Coercive control. https://www.ag.gov.au/families-and-marriage/family-violence/coercive-control

[5] Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia, Family Violence Plan 2023-2026. https://www.fcfcoa.gov.au/fl/fv/fv-plan-2023

[6] Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia, Family Violence Best Practice Principles. https://www.fcfcoa.gov.au/pubs/fl/fvbpp

[7] Australian Institute of Family Studies, Coercive Control Literature Review. https://aifs.gov.au/all-research/research-reports/coercive-control-literature-review

[8] National Domestic and Family Violence Bench Book, Legal systems abuse. https://dfvbenchbook.aija.org.au/article/1080119

[9] Sillars, A. (2026), The Child's Voice is Evidence: It is Not Automatically Independent Evidence. Psychoeducation resource reviewed by M. Matthewson, PhD, Clinical Psychologist. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.36832.65283

[10] Tully, J., Hopkins, O., Smith, A., & Williams, K. (2021), Fabricated or induced illness in children: A guide for Australian health-care practitioners. Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health, 57(12), 1847-1852. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpc.15663

[11] Wang, D., Zhao, M., Yin, J., & La, Y. (2026), Characteristics, interventions, and outcomes of factitious disorder imposed on another (FDIA): A systematic review of 455 perpetrators and 469 victims. Frontiers in Public Health, 13, 1723415. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1723415

[12] Karatzias, T., Murphy, P., Cloitre, M., Bisson, J., Roberts, N., Shevlin, M., Hyland, P., Maercker, A., Ben-Ezra, M., Coventry, P., Mason-Roberts, S., Bradley, A., & Hutton, P. (2019), Psychological interventions for ICD-11 complex PTSD symptoms: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Psychological Medicine, 49(11), 1761-1775. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291719000436

[13] National Domestic and Family Violence Bench Book, Parental alienation. https://dfvbenchbook.aija.org.au/article/1080525

[14] Meier, J. S., Dickson, S., O'Sullivan, C., Rosen, L., & Hayes, J. (2019), Child custody outcomes in cases involving parental alienation and abuse allegations. GWU Law School Public Law Research Paper No. 2019-56. SSRN. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3448062

[15] Bala, N., Hunt, S., & McCarney, C. (2010), Parental alienation: Canadian court cases 1989-2008. Family Court Review, 48(1), 164-179. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2009.01296.x

[16] Birnbaum, R., & Bala, N. (2024), A retrospective study of outcomes of custody reversal in parental alienation cases. University of New Brunswick Law Journal, 75, 62-88. https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/unblj/article/view/34796

[17] Harman, J. J., & Lorandos, D. (2021), Allegations of family violence in court: How parental alienation affects judicial outcomes. Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 27(2), 184-208. https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000301

[18] Harman, J., Giancarlo, C., Lorandos, D., & Ludmer, B. (2023), Gender and child custody outcomes across 16 years of judicial decisions regarding abuse and parental alienation. Children and Youth Services Review, 155, 107187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2023.107187

[19] Sharples, A. E., Harman, J. J., & Lorandos, D. (2023), Findings of abuse in families affected by parental alienation. Journal of Family Violence. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-023-00575-x

[20] Varavei, H., & Harman, J. J. (2024), The illusory correlation between parental alienation and other forms of family violence. International Journal of Social Welfare. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12692

[21] Bala, N., Birnbaum, R., & Farshait, J. (2024), Children resisting contact & parental alienation: Strategies for lawyers in high conflict parenting cases. Research Paper Series 2024-004. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4839167

[22] Kruk, E., & Harman, J. J. (2025), Countering arguments against parental alienation as a form of family violence and child abuse. The American Journal of Family Therapy, 53(2), 117-146. https://doi.org/10.1080/01926187.2024.2396279

[23] Templer, K., Matthewson, M., Haines, J., & Cox, G. (2017), Recommendations for best practice responses to parental alienation: Findings from a systematic review. Journal of Family Therapy, 39(1), 103-122. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6427.12137

[24] Haines, J., Matthewson, M., & Turnbull, M. (2020), Understanding and Managing Parental Alienation: A Guide to Assessment and Intervention. Routledge.

[25] Nielsen, L. (2018), Joint versus sole physical custody: Children's outcomes independent of parent-child relationships, income, and conflict in 60 studies. Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 59(4), 247-281. https://doi.org/10.1080/10502556.2018.1454204

[26] Nielsen, L. (2018), Joint versus sole physical custody: Outcomes for children independent of family income or parental conflict. Journal of Child Custody, 15(1), 35-54. https://doi.org/10.1080/15379418.2017.1422414

[27] Baude, A., Pearson, J., & Drapeau, S. (2016), Child adjustment in joint physical custody versus sole custody: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 57(5), 338-360. https://doi.org/10.1080/10502556.2016.1185203

[28] Bauserman, R. (2002), Child adjustment in joint-custody versus sole-custody arrangements: A meta-analytic review. Psychological Bulletin, 128(1), 91-102. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.91

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

[30] Berman, R., & Daneback, K. (2022), Children in dual-residence arrangements: A literature review. Journal of Family Studies, 28(4), 1448-1465. https://doi.org/10.1080/13229400.2020.1838317

[31] Nielsen, L. (2014), Shared physical custody: Summary of 40 studies on outcomes for children. Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 55(8), 613-635. https://doi.org/10.1080/10502556.2014.965578

[32] Braver, S. L., & Votruba, A. M. (2018), Does joint physical custody cause children's better outcomes? Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 59(5), 452-468. https://doi.org/10.1080/10502556.2018.1454203

[33] Poortman, A.-R., & van Gaalen, R. (2017), Shared residence after separation: A review and new findings from the Netherlands. Family Court Review, 55(4), 531-544. https://doi.org/10.1111/fcre.12302

[34] Spruijt, E., & Duindam, V. (2009), Joint physical custody in the Netherlands and the well-being of children. Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 51(1), 65-82. https://doi.org/10.1080/10502550903423362

[35] Fransson, E., Turunen, J., Hjern, A., Östberg, V., & Bergström, M. (2016), Psychological complaints among children in joint physical custody and other family types: Considering parental factors. Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 44(2), 177-183. https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494815614463

[36] Kruk, E. (2005), Shared parental responsibility: A harm reduction-based approach to divorce law reform. Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 43(3-4), 119-140. https://doi.org/10.1300/J087v43n03_07

[37] Kruk, E. (2012), Arguments for an equal parental responsibility presumption in contested child custody. The American Journal of Family Therapy, 40(1), 33-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/01926187.2011.575344

[38] Laumann-Billings, L., & Emery, R. E. (2000), Distress among young adults from divorced families. Journal of Family Psychology, 14(4), 671-687. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.14.4.671

[39] Fransson, E., Sarkadi, A., Hjern, A., & Bergström, M. (2016), Why should they live more with one of us when they are children to us both?: Parents' motives for practising equal joint physical custody for children aged 0-4. Children and Youth Services Review, 66, 154-160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.05.011

[40] Oram, S., Fisher, H. L., Minnis, H., et al. (2022), The Lancet Psychiatry Commission on intimate partner violence and mental health. The Lancet Psychiatry, 9(6), 487-524. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(22)00008-6

[41] Australian Child Maltreatment Study Team (2023), The Australian Child Maltreatment Study: National survey findings on child maltreatment and mental disorders. Medical Journal of Australia, 218(S6). https://doi.org/10.5694/mja2.51870

[42] Beck, J. S. (2020), Cognitive Behavior Therapy: Basics and Beyond (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.

[43] Hayes, S. C., Strosahl, K. D., & Wilson, K. G. (2012), Acceptance and Commitment Therapy: The Process and Practice of Mindful Change (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

[44] Bowlby, J. (1988), A Secure Base: Parent-Child Attachment and Healthy Human Development. Basic Books.

[45] Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. R. (Eds.). (2016), Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.

[46] Powell, B., Cooper, G., Hoffman, K., & Marvin, B. (2014), The Circle of Security Intervention: Enhancing Attachment in Early Parent-Child Relationships. Guilford Press.

[47] Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia, Family consultants. https://www.fcfcoa.gov.au/fl/pubs/family-consultants

[48] Kassin, S. M., Drizin, S. A., Grisso, T., Gudjonsson, G. H., Leo, R. A., & Redlich, A. D. (2010), Police-induced confessions: Risk factors and recommendations. Law and Human Behavior, 34(1), 3-38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-009-9188-6

[49] Otgaar, H., Howe, M. L., & Patihis, L. (2022), What science tells us about false and repressed memories. Memory, 30(1), 16-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2020.1870699

[50] United Nations. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child.* United Nations Treaty Series, 1577, 3.

Co-Parenting Australia Ltd is registered with the
Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission.
ABN 57 613 304 028 | Support CoPA