

**A collective international response to the claim that so-called ‘parental alienation’ is a well-studied ‘gender neutral’ empirical phenomenon which can easily be measured**

**Cite as:** Ayebe-Karlsson, S., Meier, J.S., Barnett, A., Mercer, J., Neilson, L.C., Pollack, D., Halperin-Kaddari, R., Corwin, D.L., Hester, M. Zaccour, S., Thiara, R., Weiner, M., Rathus, Z., Edleson, J.L., Page, N., Leonetti, C., Dalgarno, E., Spearman, K.J., Katz, E., Chester, S., Sheehy, E., Champion, K. et al. (2024). A collective international response to the claim that so-called ‘parental alienation’ is a well-studied ‘gender neutral’ empirical phenomenon which can easily be measured. Published online, NFVLC, UCL and SFN.

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.20834.34246

*On the 4<sup>th</sup> of June 2024, 13 Swedish academics (including the lead author, who is based at UCL in London, UK) and psychologists raised caution related to the use of the so-called ‘parental alienation’ belief system in Swedish Family Courts through the article ‘[Parental Alienation is Pseudoscience](#)’ published in the Swedish magazine directed at psychologists, ‘*Psykologtidningen*’.<sup>1</sup> This was followed by two rebuttals both published on the 12<sup>th</sup> of June 2024, [one by a Swedish academic](#) and [another by a Swedish journalist](#). We, a group of 79 international academics, health- and legal professionals from 16 countries, have therefore come together to provide a final rebuttal to the two critical responses claiming that the original article ‘Parental Alienation is Pseudoscience’ lacks scientific basis and is misrepresentative. In this response, we outline the scientific evidence that our original statement builds on and meet the criticism in detail.*

A wide scientific literature body clearly explains why the so-called ‘parental alienation’ (PA) belief system continues to fall within the definition of pseudoscience (see, for example, Saini et al. 2012, 2016; Doughty et al. 2018, 2020; Milchman 2019; Barnett 2020; Meier 2021; Mercer 2019, 2021a; Trane et al. 2021; An Roinn dli Agus Cirt 2023; Dalgarno et al. 2023). We must not confuse the existence of PA studies, or the number of such studies, with proof of scientific evidence (Mercer 2021a; Meier 2021).

To this day, no credible scientific evidence underpins the way PA is often understood or used in court. PA studies often cite discussion pieces and blogs, build on opinion surveys, over-rely on retrospective accounts, lack longitudinal studies, lack control groups and objective or clinical selection criteria, use small samples, and/or are methodologically weak, non-randomised, and ungeneralisable. They thus lead to unreliable applications of PA concepts or systematic avoidance of alternative reasoning to argue that a child’s legitimate estrangement is the result of ‘alienation’ by the preferred parent (Thomas and Richardson, 2015; Saini 2016; Milchman 2019; Meier 2021). As we noted in our article, PA is not identified as a disorder or condition in either of the major international indices – the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-V) and the International Classification of Diseases 11<sup>th</sup> edition (ICD-11). Most fundamentally, the determination of whether a child is exhibiting so-called PA or

---

<sup>1</sup> For an English translation of the Swedish article ‘[Parental Alienation is Pseudoscience](#)’ published in ‘*Psykologtidningen*’ on June 4th, 2024 see: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381731424\\_Parental\\_Alienation\\_is\\_Pseudoscience](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381731424_Parental_Alienation_is_Pseudoscience).

understandable estrangement due to the disliked parent's own behaviour is entirely without any scientific basis. The claims of proponents that they have tools to distinguish the two are simply not scientifically validated in any way.

Despite decades of research, PA still lacks a universal clinical and scientific definition, as confirmed by the definition proposed in the PA proponents' response to our article. Most PA proponents agree that only a child's 'unjustified' estrangement that has no 'legitimate' justification should be referred to as PA. The problem arises, however, in PA proponents' inability to distinguish between actual abuse, so-called 'alienation', and the boundaries surrounding a child's 'justified' rejection, resistance, and refusal to relate to or spend time with a parent (Meier 2021; Mercer 2021a). 'Justification' remains a subjective decision that allows PA to be identified in every case desired by PA proponents.

As has been carefully elaborated and explained by Milchman (2019), proposed tools and diagnostic tests claiming to detect so-called PA (including PARQ, an instrument that in fact assesses whether children believe they are being rejected by a parent, and PAD) are – at best – sets of criteria which apply equally if not more so to children's reactions to destructive or abusive parents. Many of the 'typical behaviours' listed in the checklists to 'diagnose' PA can equally be associated with numerous childhood adversities (such as negative parenting practices, domestic violence and abuse, extensive parental conflict, excessive litigation, mental health issues, children's realistic fear, lack of parent-child warmth and weak parental attachments with the allegedly alienated parent) (Neilson 2018; Milchman 2022, 2024). Children's alignment with one parent over another can be a normal consequence of child development or a normal reaction to parental separation (Kelly and Johnson 2001; Mercer 2021b).

The unfounded and baseless critiques referenced in the response (as made by Harman and Lorandos 2021 and Harman et al. 2023), entirely mis-state the findings of a single study by Meier et al., and were rebutted in detail in Meier et al. (2022). It is notable, that although ten articles were cited to make a case for the scientific basis of PA, they are all written by the **same** three lead authors or author groups (two if excluding self-citations). It may be that the response authors failed to read our article in detail, where we made clear that successful attempts to use children in custody disputes exist but require '*alternative and well-researched models of understanding*' (Stark 2007; Katz 2016; Harsey and Freyd 2020; Dalgarno et al. 2024a). The PA label ought to be avoided, as we explained, since Gardner's original framing of PA(S) was highly misogynistic while reproducing a belief system where primarily mothers served as so-called 'alienators' (e.g. up to 90%). This came to influence and strongly taint the PA studies following his original ideas, as they largely relate back to his eight symptoms of PA(S), or the more summarised 'five factor model'. Indeed, little has changed in practice in the family courts by changing the terminology from PAS to PA (Meier 2020; Casas Vila 2020; An Roinn Dli Agus Cirt 2023). Some contemporary PA advocates and court instructed 'experts', including in Swedish Family Courts, do not distinguish PA from PAS, use very similar criteria, and/or continue to advocate for the validity of PAS (e.g. Baker and Verrocchio 2016; Bernet et al. 2018).

Though PA proponents attempt to claim that so-called PA is ‘gender neutral’ (such as in Harman et al. 2016a), they tend to fall back on the same sexist ‘hostile mother’ stereotypes. For example, PA proponents’ studies have concluded that both parents ‘alienate’ but *more mothers* than fathers ‘alienate’ (e.g. 64% versus 34%). Adding to that, *mothers are in fact ‘abusive’* (e.g. 71% of mothers versus 29% of fathers) rather than as they propose ‘alienated’ parents (Harman et al. 2023). Further on studies claim that both fathers and mothers may ‘alienate’, but *mothers’ alienating behaviour* is socially considered more ‘acceptable’ than fathers’ alienation (Harman et al. 2016b), and *mothers* primarily engage in ‘indirect alienation’ which is *more harmful* and *leads to more ‘negative’ outcomes* for children than father’s ‘direct alienation’ (Harman et al. 2020).

As empirically proven globally, it is overwhelmingly mothers – particularly mothers alleging abuse - who are accused of PA in family court proceedings (see, Gomide et al. 2016; Meier and Dickson 2017; Barnett 2020; Casas Vila 2020; Doughty et al. 2020; Feresin 2020; Lapierre et al. 2020; Mackenzie et al. 2020; Meier 2020; Rathus 2020). The gendered values surrounding the PA label, and family court proceedings overall, have been showcased across the world, including in and beyond the US (Dallam and Silberg 2016; Milchman 2017; Meier 2020; Mercer 2022; Shaw and Geffner 2022; Avalle et al. 2022), in England and Wales (Doughty et al. 2020; Barnett 2020; Birchall and Choudhry 2022; Grey 2023; Dalgarno et al. 2024b), Canada (Neilson, 2018; Sheehy and Boyd 2020; Zaccour 2020; Lapierre et al. 2020, 2022), New Zealand (Elizabeth 2020; Mackenzie et al. 2020), Australia (Berns 2001; Rathus 2020), Brazil (Rakell and Felipe 2021; Dalgarno et al. 2023; Ayeb-Karlsson et al. 2024), Spain (Casas Vila 2020; Gomide et al. 2016), Italy (Feresin 2020) and France (Prigent and Sueur 2020).

In Canada, Sheehy and Boyd (2020) as well as Zaccour (2018) found that mothers were more than twice as likely to be accused of PA than fathers. It is primarily protective mothers who end up losing custody, residence or contact when PA is counter-alleged to domestic abuse reports in family courts, and particularly in the context of child sexual abuse (Ferguson et al. 2018; Dallam and Silberg 2019; Meier 2020; Dalgarno et al. 2023, 2024c). Neilson’s (2018) analysis of Canadian court judgments found that when courts made definitive PA findings against mothers, they were almost three times more likely to lose custody of their children than when courts made findings of PA against fathers.

The use of PA can result in practices that are contrary to internationally recognised rights of children embodied in Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989, which ensures that children’s perspectives are considered in legal proceedings that affect them. The priority for all children is their safety and that of their families. It is hopefully entirely unnecessary to voyage into the extended history or current societal structural processes that contribute to the increased risk of violence and abuse experienced by marginalised populations, specific genders, and other lower-status groups, or why we need international conventions and UN special rapporteurs supporting the elimination of *gender*-based violence, violence against *women* and *children*, *femicide* and *filicide*.

Attempts at proclaiming gender-neutrality in so-called parental alienation and in the perpetration of domestic violence and abuse require an unintentional or deliberate disregard for societal power relations and status, and for empirical and statistical data across a wide range of jurisdictions internationally. Baseless attacks on international efforts to reduce such discrimination, such as through the United Nations or specific UN roles and reports, are inappropriate and counterproductive, and do not deserve further attention.

-----

**Dr Sonja Ayeb-Karlsson**, Associate Professor in Policy and Intersectionality, Research Group Lead of Everyday Disasters and Violences at University College London (UCL), Core Expert Member of SHERA Research Group, Hague Mothers, and the Childhood, Law and Policy Network, UK.

**Prof Joan S. Meier**, NFVLC Professor of Clinical Law and Director of the National Family Violence Law Center at the George Washington University Law School, USA.

**Dr Adrienne Barnett**, Reader in Law, Brunel University London, member of Brunel's Global Lives Research Centre, core founder member of SHERA Research Group, member of the Advisory Group of Rights of Women, UK lead on the International Strategy Group of Hague Mothers, Adviser to Right to Equality, trustee of Project Lighthouse, UK.

**Prof Jean Mercer**, Professor Emerita of Psychology, Stockton University, New Jersey, USA.

**Dr Linda C. Neilson**, Professor Emerita, University of New Brunswick, Canada.

**Danielle Pollack**, Policy Manager at the National Family Violence Law Center at the George Washington University Law School in Washington D.C. and the originator of Kayden's Law, USA.

**Prof Ruth Halperin-Kaddari**, Founding Academic Director of the Rackman Center for the Advancement of Women, Bar-Ilan University, Israel; former Vice-President of the UN Committee for the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), Israel.

**David L. Corwin, MD**, Professor and Director of Forensic Services, University of Utah Pediatrics Department, USA.

**Marianne Hester**, OBE FAcSS, Emeritus Professor of Gender, Violence and International Policy, University of Bristol, UK.

**Suzanne Zaccour, PhD**, Director of Legal Affairs at the National Association of Women and the Law and family law researcher, Canada.

**Prof Ravi Thiara**, Department of Sociology, University of Warwick, UK.

**Prof Merle Weiner**, Philip H Knight Professor of Law, University of Oregon, USA.

**Zoe Rathus AM**, Senior Lecturer, Griffith University Law School, Brisbane, Australia.

**Prof Jeffrey L. Edleson**, Distinguished Professor of the Graduate School, University of California, Berkeley, USA.

**Natalie Page**, Director Paramily and Survivor Family Network CIC, UK.

**Dr Carrie Leonetti**, Associate Professor and Co-Director, NZ Centre for Human Rights Law, Practice, and Policy at University of Auckland School of Law, New Zealand.

**Dr Elizabeth Dalgarno**, Lecturer in Public Health at University of Manchester and Director and Founder of SHERA Research Group, UK.

**Kathryn J. Spearman**, MSN, RN, PhD candidate at Johns Hopkins School of Nursing, USA.

**Dr Emma Katz**, Senior Lecturer in Criminology, Edge Hill University, UK.

**Suzanne Chester**, Attorney, Co-Director of Child's Voice Project, USA.

**Prof Elizabeth Sheehy**, LLB, LLM, LLD, Professor Emerita of Law, Faculty of Law, University of Ottawa, Canada.

**Dr Kelly Champion**, ABPP Clinical and Forensic Psychologist, Cadeus Behavioral Health, USA.

**Jennifer Koshan**, Professor and Research Excellence Chair in Family Violence, Faculty of Law, University of Calgary, Canada.

**Dr Saira Khan**, HCPC Registered Chartered Counselling Psychologist, MBACP Accredited Psychotherapist, LCSW California Board of Behavioral Sciences, UK.

**Dr Hannah Jones**, HCPC Registered Forensic Psychologist, Senior Lecturer in Forensic Psychology & Mental Health, Queen Mary University of London, UK.

**Dr Rachael Grey**, CEO, Project Lighthouse, UK.

**Associate Prof Margaret Drew**, University of Massachusetts (USA) School of Law, USA.

**Nancy S. Erickson**, Esq., Attorney who represents abused women in the courts and advocates for them, New York City, New York, USA.

**Evangeline Stratton**, Senior Managing Attorney, Family Violence Appellate Project, Washington State, USA.

**Johanna Schiratzki**, Professor of Family Law, Stockholm University, Sweden.

**Prof John Devaney**, Centenary Chair of Social Work, University of Edinburgh, UK.

**Biljana Brankovic**, International Council of Europe Consultant, Former member of GREVIO (2015-2023), Honorary member of WAVE, Serbia.

**Josefine Hjälmeskog**, lic Psychologist, lic Psychotherapist, Specialized in Psychological treatment, Sweden.

**Karin Lavén**, Attorney Specialized in Family Law and Violence Against Women and Children, Sweden.

**Dr Rima Hussein**, Assistant Professor, Co-Lead Gendered Violence and Abuse Research group, University of Northumbria, and core member of Hague Mothers international campaign, UK.

**Dr Johan Melander Hagborg**, Psychologist, Senior Lecturer in Psychology, University of Gothenburg, Sweden.

**Kjerstin Almqvist**, Senior Professor in Psychology, lic. psychologist, lic. psychotherapist, Department for social and psychological studies, Karlstad University, Sweden.

**Dr Ole Hultmann**, Psychologist, Senior Lecturer in Psychology, University of Gothenburg, Sweden.

**Anna Norlén**, Chief Executive, Vice Chancellor, Lic. Psychologist, Lic. Psychotherapist, Sweden.

**Maria Eriksson**, Professor of Social Work, Marie Cederschiöld University, Sweden.

**Anders Broberg**, Professor Emeritus in Clinical Psychology, University of Gothenburg, Sweden.

**Sofia Bidö**, lic psychologist, lic psychotherapist, Specialized in Psychological treatment, Chief operating officer at Center for support and treatment, Save the Children, Sweden.

**Malin Holm**, lic psychologist, teacher of forensic interviews of children with special needs, Sweden.

**Moa Mannheimer**, lic psychologist, Sweden.

**Åsa Landberg**, lic psychologist, lic psychotherapist. PhD Candidate, Marie Cederschiöld University, Sweden.

**Ulf Axberg**, Professor, lic psychologist, lic psychotherapist, VID Specialized University, Norway.

**Camilla Orefjård**, Attorney Specialized in Children's Rights, Board member of non-profit association 'Lex Tintin-föreningen' (Tintin's Law), Sweden.

**Anna Kaldal**, Professor of Procedural Law, Faculty of Law, Stockholm University, Sweden.

**Björn Tingberg**, RN, MsS, PhD, lic psychotherapist, Lecturer at Karolinska Institutet, Director of Studies at Erica Foundation, Sweden.

**Dr Linnéa Bruno**, Associate Professor in Child and Youth Studies, Stockholm University, Sweden.

**Sanam Gharaee**, Child and adolescent psychiatrist, President of non-profit association 'Lex Tintin-föreningen' (Tintin's Law), Sweden.

**Tanja Hillberg**, PhD Psychology, AFBPsS, Senior Advisor Child Rights & Protection, Unizon, Sweden.

**Rebecca Lagh**, Attorney Specialized in Children's Rights and Family Law, Sweden.

**Jessica Lahtinen**, Child and adolescent psychiatrist, Board member of non-profit association 'Lex Tintin-föreningen' (Tintin's Law), Sweden.

**Dr Andreea Gruev-Vintila**, Senior Lecturer in Social Psychology, Université Paris Nanterre, France.

**Pierre-Guillaume Prigent**, PhD in Sociology, University of Western Brittany, France.

**Michela Nacca**, Attorney in Italian, Vatican, and Ecclesiastical Family Courts, Director and co-founder Maisone Antigone, Italy.

**Paola Motosi**, Human Rights Specialist, Brazil.

**Toby Kleinman**, Attorney, Managing Partner Alder and Kleinman, New Jersey, USA.

**Dr Mia Scally**, CPsychol, Senior Lecturer, Middlesex University, UK.

**Dr Malvika Unnithan**, Assistant Professor in Law, University of Northumbria, UK.

**Hannah Alice King**, Midwife, Co-founder Midwives Against Racism, SHERA member, UK.

**Melanie Kay McLaughlan**, PhD Candidate in Law at Northumbria University, UK.

**Dr Donna Bramwell**, Research Associate, University of Manchester, Member of SHERA Research Group, UK.

**Caroline Åvall**, PhD Candidate in Procedural Law, Faculty of Law, Stockholm University, Sweden.

**Sara Davison**, The Divorce Coach, author, podcaster, influencer, media commentator and patron of The Dash Charity, UK.

**Brenda Kilgour**, counsellor working with survivors of domestic/sexual abuse [retired] and formerly statutory social services, child protection, UK.

**Sara Skoog Waller**, PhD Psychology, National Centre for Knowledge on Men's Violence Against Women, Uppsala University, Sweden.

**Cláudia Galiberne Ferreira**, Attorney, Brazil.

**Ruth Dineen**, International Coordinator, FiLiA Hague Mothers, UK.

**Marie Denis**, Clinical Psychologist and technical advisor working with victims of violence (child and adult), Belgium.

**Anna Zobnina**, Director, European Network of Migrant Women (ENOMW), Europe.

**Gwénola Sueur**, PhD student in Sociology, University of Western Brittany, France

**Lisa Ogawa**, Founder of Hague Mothers Japan, Japan.

**Agata Teutsch**, Juniper Foundation, Board member, Advocacy and Research Officer, Kraków, Poland.

**Josiana Coruzzi**, Lawyer and Director of the Association Solidarité Femmes, Specializing in the support and defense of women and children victims of domestic violence, Belgium.

**Dr Marie Hainsworth**, Manager Donegal Domestic Violence Services, Ireland.

**Mary McDermott**, CEO, Safe Ireland, Ireland.

**Dr Caroline Forde**, Outreach Development, Domestic Violence Advocacy Service (DVAS), Ireland.

**The Hidden Women's Network**, Sweden.



**The Family Violence Appellate Project (FVAP), USA.**

**The Erica Foundation, Sweden.**

**Observatoire Féministe des Violences faites aux Femmes (OFVFF), Belgium.**

## References

An Roinn Dli Agus Cirt (2023). *Parental Alienation: A Review of Understandings, Assessment and Interventions*. Dublin: GOV.IE (Department of Justice). Available online: <https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/20df3-parental-alienation-research-report-and-policy-paper/>

Avalle, D.S., Smith, B.J., Wiedeman, K.E., and Garnica, C.B. (2022). How efficacious is Building Family Bridges? What the legal and mental health fields should know about Building Family Bridges and “parental alienation”. *Journal of Family Trauma, Child Custody & Child Development*, 19(3-4), 402-416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26904586.2022.2066595>

Ayeb-Karlsson, S., Barnett, A., Katz, E., Motosi, P. and Dalgarno, E. (2024). ‘I was accused of ‘parental alienation’ when I was six months pregnant. [He said] I was practicing parental alienation against the baby in my womb’: Mothers’ court experiences of legal entrapment through the Brazilian Parental Alienation Law (12.318/2010) in the context of domestic violence. Forthcoming.

Barnett, A. (2020). ‘A genealogy of hostility: parental alienation in England and Wales’. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 42(1), 18-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2019.1701921>

Baker, A.J., and Verrocchio, M. C. (2016). Exposure to parental alienation and subsequent anxiety and depression in Italian adults. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 44(5), 255-271. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01926187.2016.1230480>

Bernet, W., Gregory, N., Reay, K. M., and Rohner, R.P. (2018). An objective measure of splitting in parental alienation: The parental acceptance–rejection questionnaire. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 63(3), 776-783. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.13625>

Berns, S. (2001). Parents Behaving Badly: Parental Alienation Syndrome in the Family Court — Magic Bullet or Poisoned Chalice. *Australian Journal of Family Law*, 15 (3), 1–24.

Birchall, J. and Choudhry, S. (2022). ‘I was punished for telling the truth’: How allegations of parental alienation are used to silence, sideline and disempower survivors of domestic abuse in family law proceedings. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence* 6(1), 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.1332/239868021X16287966471815>

Casas Vila, G. (2020) Parental Alienation Syndrome in Spain: Opposed by the Government but accepted in the Courts. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 42(1), 45-55, DOI: [10.1080/09649069.2019.1701923](https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2019.1701923)

Dalgarno, E., Katz, E., Ayeb-Karlsson, S., Barnett, A., Motosi, P. and Verma, A. (2023). ‘Swim, swim and die at the beach’: Family court and perpetrator induced trauma (CPIT) experiences of mothers in Brazil. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 46(1), 11–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2023.2285136>

Dalgarno, E., Meier, J.S., Ayeb-Karlsson, S., Pollack, D. and Katz, E. (2024a). From ‘Parental Alienation’ to [Abusers] Child and Mother Sabotage (CAMS) as a preferable term for how perpetrator fathers intentionally sabotage the child-mother connection. <https://www.shera-research.com/latest-news/from-parental-alienation-to-abusers-child-and-mother-sabotage-cams-as-a-preferable-term-for-how-perpetrator-fathers-intentionally-sabotage-the-child-mother-connection>

Dalgarno, E., Ayeb-Karlsson, S., Bramwell, D., Barnett, A. and Verma, A. (2024b). Health-Related Experiences of Family Court and Domestic Abuse in England: A Looming Public Health Crisis. *Journal of Family Trauma, Child Custody & Child Development* 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26904586.2024.2307609>

Dalgarno, E., Bramwell, D., Verma, A. and Ayeb-Karlsson, S. (2024c). ‘Let’s excuse abusive men from abusing and enable sexual abuse’: Child Sexual Abuse Investigations in England’s Private Family Courts. *The Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*. Accepted.

Silberg, J. and Dallam, S. (2019). Abusers gaining custody in family courts: A case series of over turned decisions. *Journal of Child Custody*, 16(2), 140-169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15379418.2019.1613204>

Dallam, S. and Silberg, J.L. (2016). Recommended treatments for “parental alienation syndrome” may cause children foreseeable and lasting psychological harm. *Journal of Child Custody*, 13(2-3), 134-143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15379418.2016.1219974>

Doughty, J., Maxwell, N. and Slater, T. (2018). *Review of research and case law on parental alienation*. Cardiff, Cardiff University and Cafcass Cymru. Available online: <https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2018-05/review-of-research-and-case-law-on-parental-alienation.pdf>

Doughty, J., Maxwell, N. and Slater, T. (2020) Professional responses to ‘parental alienation’: research-informed practice. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 42(1), 68–79. DOI: [10.1080/09649069.2020.1701938](https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2020.1701938)

Elizabeth, V. (2020) The affective burden of separated mothers in PA(S) inflected custody law systems: A New Zealand case study. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law* 42(1), 118-129. DOI: [10.1080/09649069.2020.1701943](https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2020.1701943)

Feresin, M. (2020) Parental alienation (syndrome) in child custody cases: Survivors' experiences and the logic of psychosocial and legal services in Italy. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 42(1), 56-67. DOI: [10.1080/09649069.2019.1701924](https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2019.1701924)

Ferguson, C., Wright, S., Death, J., Burgess, K. and Malouff, J. (2018). Allegations of child sexual abuse in parenting disputes: An examination of judicial determinations in the Family Court of Australia. *Journal of Child Custody*, 15(2), 93-115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15379418.2017.1415776>

Harman, J.J. and Lorandos, D. (2021). Allegations of family violence in court: How parental alienation affects judicial outcomes. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 27(2), 187–208. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000301>

Harman J., Giancarlo C., Lorandos D. and 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, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2023.107187>.

Harman, J.J., Lorandos, D., Biringen, Z. and Grubb, C. (2020). Gender Differences in the Use of Parental Alienating Behaviors. *Journal of Family Violence* 35, 459-469. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-019-00097-5>

Harman, J.J., Leder-Elder, S. and Biringen, Z. (2016a). Prevalence of parental alienation drawn from a representative poll. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 66, 62–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.04.021>.

Harman, J.J., Biringen, Z., Ratajack, E. M., Outland, P. L. and Kraus, A. (2016b). Parents behaving badly: Gender biases in the perception of parental alienating behaviors. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 30(7), 866–874. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000232>

Harsey, S., and Freyd, J. J. (2020). Deny, attack, and reverse victim and offender (DARVO): what is the influence on perceived perpetrator and victim credibility?. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 29(8), 897-916. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2020.1774695>

Gomide, P.I.C., Camargo, E.B. and Fernandes, M.G., (2016). Analysis of the Psychometric Properties of a Parental Alienation Scale. *Paidéia (Ribeirão Preto)*, 26(65), 291–298. DOI: 10.1590/1982-43272665201602

Grey, R. (2023). “Catastrophic”: A qualitative exploration of survivors’ experiences of expert instruction in private law child arrangements proceedings. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 45(4), 344-362. DOI: [10.1080/09649069.2023.2281832](https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2023.2281832)

Katz, E. (2016). Beyond the Physical Incident Model: How Children Living with Domestic Violence are Harmed By and Resist Regimes of Coercive Control. *Child Abuse Review*, 25(1), 46-59. <https://doi.org/10.1002/car.2422>

Kelly, J. and Johnston, J. (2001). The alienated child: a reformulation of parental alienation syndrome. *Family Court Review* 39(3), 249–66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.174-1617.2001.tb00609.x>

Lapierre, S., Côté, I. and Lessard, G. (2022). “He was the king of the house” children’s perspectives on the men who abused their mothers. *Journal of Family Trauma, Child Custody & Child Development*, 19(3-4), 244-260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26904586.2022.2036284>

Lapierre, S., Ladouceur, P., Frenette, M. and Côté, I. (2020). The Legitimization and Institutionalization of ‘Parental alienation’ in the Province of Quebec. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 42(1), 30–44. DOI: 10.1080/09649069.2019.1701922

Mackenzie, D., Herbert, R., and Robertson, N. (2020). ‘It’s Not OK’, but ‘It’ never happened: Parental alienation accusations undermine children’s safety in the New Zealand Family Court. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 42(1), 106-117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2020.1701942>

Meier, J.S., Dickson, S., O’Sullivan, C.S. and Rosen, L.N. (2022). The trouble with Harman and Lorando’s parental alienation allegations in family court study (2020). *Journal of Family Trauma, Child Custody and Child Development*, 19(3-4), 295-317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26904586.2022.2036286>

Meier, J. and Dickson, S. (2017). Mapping gender: shedding empirical light on family courts’ treatment of cases involving abuse and alienation, *Law and Inequality*, 35(2): 323–331. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2999906>

Meier, J. (2021). 11. Questioning the scientific validity of parental alienation labels in abuse cases. In J. Mercer and M. Drew (Eds.), *Challenging Parental Alienation: New Directions for Professionals and Parents* (pp. 216-235). London and New York: Routledge.

Meier, J.S. (2020). U.S. child custody outcomes in cases involving parental alienation and abuse allegations: What do the data show? *Journal of social welfare and family law*, 42(1), 92–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2020.1701941>

Mercer, J. (2019). Examining parental alienation treatments: Problems of principles and practices. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 36(4), 351-363. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-019-00625-8>

Mercer, J. (2021a). 12. Parental alienation, science, and pseudoscience. In J. Mercer and M. Drew (Eds.), *Challenging Parental Alienation: New Directions for Professionals and Parents* (pp. 236-248). London and New York: Routledge.

Mercer, J. (2021b). Rejecting the idea of rejection as a measure of parental alienation: Comment on Bernet, Gregory, and Rohner, and Reay (2020). *Journal of Family Trauma, Child Custody & Child Development*, 18(3), 201-209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26904586.2020.1806770>

Mercer, J. (2022). Reunification therapies for parental alienation: Tenets, empirical evidence, commonalities, and differences. *Journal of Family Trauma, Child Custody & Child Development*, 19:3-4, 383-401, DOI: [10.1080/26904586.2022.2080147](https://doi.org/10.1080/26904586.2022.2080147)

Milchman, M.S. (2024). Oversimplified beliefs about child abuse allegations in custody cases with alienation rebuttals – review of empirical data. *Journal of Family Trauma, Child Custody & Child Development*, 21(2), 165–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26904586.2024.2307612>

Milchman, M.S. (2022). Oversimplified beliefs about alienation rebuttals of child abuse allegations—practice issues. *Journal of Family Trauma, Child Custody & Child Development*, 19(2), 101–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26904586.2022.2049465>

Milchman, M.S. (2019). How far has parental alienation research progressed toward achieving scientific validity?. *Journal of Child Custody*, 16(2), 115-139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15379418.2019.1614511>

Milchman, M.S. (2017). Misogynistic cultural argument in parental alienation versus child sexual abuse cases. *Journal of child custody* 14(4), 211-233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15379418.2017.1416722>

Neilson, L.C. (2018). Parental Alienation Empirical Analysis: Child Best Interests or Parental Rights? Vancouver, Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre for Family Violence Research and The FREDA Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children. Available online: <https://www.fredacentre.com/wp-content/uploads/Parental-Alienation-Linda-Neilson.pdf>

Prigent, P.G. and Sueur, G. (2020). À qui profite la pseudo-théorie de l’aliénation parentale ? [Who benefits from the pseudo-theory of parental alienation?]. *Délibérée*, 9, 57-62. DOI: 10.3917/delib.009.0057

Rakell, L., and Felipe, A. (2021). 10 anos da Lei de Alienação Parental: Uma Análise da jurisprudência Brasileira. *Cadernos de Psicologia* 2(4), 4-26. ISSN 2674-9483. Available online: <https://seer.uniacademia.edu.br/index.php/cadernospsicologia/article/view/2829/0> <https://seer.uniacademia.edu.br/index.php/cadernospsicologia/article/viewFile/2829/1905>

Rathus, Z. (2020) A history of the use of the concept of parental alienation in the Australian family law system: contradictions, collisions and their consequences. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 42(1), 5-17, DOI: [10.1080/09649069.2019.1701920](https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2019.1701920)

Saini, M., Johnston, J. R., Fidler, B. J., and Bala, N. (2016). Empirical studies of alienation. In L. Drozd, M. Saini, and Olesen, N. (Eds.), *Parenting evaluations, Second Edition: Applied research for the family court*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Saini, M., Johnston, J. R., Fidler, B. J., and Bala, N. (2012). Empirical studies of alienation. In K. Kuehnle and L. Drozd (Eds.). *Parenting evaluations: Applied research for the family court*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Shaw, M. and Geffner, R. (2022). Alienation and reunification issues in family courts: Theory, research, and programs in child custody cases. *Journal of Family Trauma, Child Custody & Child Development*, 19:3-4, 203-213, DOI: 10.1080/26904586.2022.2151145

Sheehy, E. and Boyd, S.B. (2020) Penalizing women's fear: intimate partner violence and parental alienation in Canadian child custody cases. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 42:1, 80-91. DOI: [10.1080/09649069.2020.1701940](https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2020.1701940)

Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive Control: The Entrapment of Women in Personal Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, R.M., and Richardson, J.T. (2015). Parental alienation syndrome: 30 years on and still junk science. *Judges J.*, 54, 22.

Trane, S.T., Champion, K.M., and Hupp, S.D. (2021). Comparison of parental alienation treatments and evidence-based treatments for children and families. In J. Mercer and M. Drew (Eds.), *Challenging Parental Alienation: New Directions for Professionals and Parents* (pp. 138-158). London and New York: Routledge.

Zaccour, S. (2020). Does domestic violence disappear from parental alienation cases? Five lessons from Quebec for judges, scholars, and policymakers. *Canadian Journal of Family Law*, 33(2), 301. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4005518>

Zaccour, S. (2018). Parental alienation in Quebec custody litigation. *Les Cahiers de droit*, 59(4), 1073-1111.