

# Engaging with the social science literature

Mark MacDiarmid  
Accredited Specialist, Family Law

Paper presented for the College of Law in October 2011

## Contents

Introduction .....	2
What are the questions we need assistance with .....	3
Theory and research .....	4
Child and adolescent development .....	7
Attachment.....	8
Family violence.....	11
Alienation .....	14
The challenges of collaboration .....	16

## Introduction

Children and adults differ significantly. At its simplest, this may be expressed in terms of children being smaller and more dependent, whereas adults are larger and more independent. But there are far more critical differences that we need to be aware of.

Most significantly, children are on a developmental trajectory that in adults occurs with greater subtlety over far longer time periods. The fact that at different ages children and young people are at different stages of development, means that at different ages the needs of children will differ, and it is reasonable to expect that constructive parenting-after-separation arrangements will match the developmental needs of the children to whom they relate. It is therefore important that as lawyers we have some familiarity with the body of literature that has been generated in the social sciences around child and adolescent development in the context of family breakdown. A good place to start is a paper by Dr Jen McIntosh entitled *Children's responses to divorce and parental conflict: A guide for Family Lawyers*, which can be downloaded at [http://www.flerproject.org/doc/000033-Model\\_Discussion\\_Guide\\_Family\\_Lawyers.doc](http://www.flerproject.org/doc/000033-Model_Discussion_Guide_Family_Lawyers.doc). This paper contains a number of useful further references.

A word of caution: you would no more expect to become a developmental psychologist from reading one introductory textbook or a few articles than you would expect to become a competent lawyer from reading a couple of cases. The debates that go on in the social sciences are vigorous and often subtle, so it is very important to seek the assistance of appropriately qualified social science professionals on significant issues. This is particularly important given that children at the same developmental stage

will differ from each other depending on factors such as their family context, their history of care, and their inherent individuality. One size definitely does not fit all where children are concerned, and we must be alive to potential problems and be prepared to seek the assistance of appropriately qualified professionals if there is any doubt about the effect an arrangement might have on children. The Court itself is regularly informed by report writers, Part 15 experts and treating health professionals. The conduct of successful parenting matters, particularly where there are challenging issues, is therefore a collaborative effort not just between judicial officers and lawyers, but across professions.

### **What are the questions we need assistance with**

In a general sense, it is reasonable to state that in all matters involving children those of us involved in the court need the assistance of social science so that we can feel comfortable that a particular set of orders will be appropriate to the developmental and emotional needs of the children they affect. At a minimum this requires that all of us should have at least a passing familiarity with the most important scientific concepts so that the decisions we are involved in are based on knowledge of the requirements of children and not merely on lawyer's intuition.

In a more specific sense, there are some matters that require more active input from social scientists. They are generally matters where one or more of the *Re K*<sup>1</sup> factors are present. That is, where there are present serious allegations of violence, abuse or neglect; mental health issues on the part of any of the parties or the child; alcohol and other drug abuse; intractable conflict between the parties; or strong views being expressed by a child or young person. In these matters the court will usually at the very least require the appointment of an Independent Children's Lawyer and a family report prepared by a social worker or a psychologist. In some cases the court will need a report by a Part 15 single expert psychiatrist.

In most cases where referrals are made to social scientists or psychiatrists for the preparation of reports in which expert opinions are to

---

<sup>1</sup> (1994) FLC 92-461.

be expressed, the questions asked will be based on the issues identified in s 60CC(2) – (6) as being relevant to the determination of what is in a child's best interests. In essence though, the fundamental issues on which expert assistance is sought in most matters can be summarised in the following questions:

1. How is this particular child travelling at the moment in their developmental journey?
2. Depending on the child's age, what views are they expressing?
3. What are the issues specific to these particular parents (or other significant people)?
4. What is going on in the adult relationships and how does this affect the child?
5. How will the rival proposals of the parties affect the child?
6. What does the expert think should happen?

It is the first and fourth questions that are the most relevant for present purposes. The first because it directs us to look at the particular child and attempt to work out what that child's needs are; the fourth because it directs us to look at the parents' relationship, particularly to the presence of conflict, since this can have such a profound effect on children.

## **Theory and research**

### **What is a theory?**

The word 'theory' has at least two major meanings in English. The first, beloved of creationists, is an idea that is more a matter of opinion than anything else; it is provisional, untested, somewhat unreliable and more along the lines of a belief than a fact.

The second meaning, which is also the way the word is used in a scientific sense, connotes a solid principle *from which accurate predictions are made*. The only provisional thing about a scientific theory, such as the standard model of particle physics, is that if a new theory is developed that makes all of the same predictions as the old one, only with greater accuracy or with greater coverage, the old theory will be abandoned. Science is above all a pragmatic enterprise and so theories

are judged by their demonstrated predictive power rather than whether or not they are appealing or seem intuitively correct.

The enterprise of science, and this includes social science, is therefore the development and testing of ever more accurate predictions.

The Greek word from which 'theory' is derived is 'theoreo', which means **not**: 'I believe', nor 'I hypothesise' nor 'I opine', but '*I grasp*'. So a scientific theory is something with which we grasp the world around us, in much the same way as we use physical tools. This is very important for us to understand, since that is the way court experts apply their knowledge. They are not simply coming up with educated guesses; they are in the business of applying tested tools ('theories') to the sets of facts with which we provide them.

### **Causation and Correlation**

In testing predictions, social scientists are prefer to focus on experiment. An experiment is a procedure that gives us some idea of *causation*. In other words, an experiment, if successful, will show us that one phenomenon is caused by (or not as the case may be) another. An experimental design will often compare two or more groups that are identical for all purposes other than a particular *treatment* that is applied to one group only. If after the application of the treatment there is a difference in the two groups it might be reasonable to suppose that that difference was caused by the treatment.

A correlation is something much weaker in a scientific sense, since correlation says nothing about causation. I mention this because much of the literature relating to child development and the effect of separation and conflict on children is based on correlational type studies rather than experimental type studies.

It was on the basis of this distinction between causation and correlation that the tobacco industry for so long successfully argued that just because lung cancer and smoking often occur in the same people, that does not mean that smoking *causes* lung cancer; it may be some third agent involved. It is the same with the debate on global warming: human

greenhouse emissions have been occurring at the same time as global temperature has been rising. For the deniers, this says nothing about causation: this is a mere correlation and that observation alone tells us nothing about whether or not the human activity is *causing* the warming, only that the two occur together. The danger of drawing causal conclusions from correlations can be neatly summarised in the following patently ludicrous statement: most fast cars are painted red; therefore red paint increases speed, and if I paint my car red it will go faster.

So why do social scientists rely so heavily on correlational studies when experimental data would give them much more reliable results? In a few words, because conducting experiments on children sounds kind of creepy to most of us. There are enormous ethical hurdles involved in treating one group of children and using another group of children as a control group who receives no treatment. Particularly when we are theorizing on the effect of conflict on the development of small children, it is very difficult to see how a rigorous experimental design could ever get past a University ethics committee.

So in this area we must make do with somewhat less certain results than might obtain in, say, the physical sciences. The consequence of this is that some of the science is more controversial than any of us would like.

### **Significant and highly significant results at a research and clinical level**

The actual measurements used to determine if research results show causation or correlation are analysed using statistics. Statistics speak of probabilities. Generally the numbers we're interested in tell us something about the likelihood of our results turning up by chance. In the language of statistics, we speak of research results being *significant* or *highly significant*. A *significant* result is one in which there is only a 5% likelihood that a similar result to ours would be thrown up by chance. A *highly significant* result is one in which there is only a 1% likelihood that a similar result to ours would be thrown up by chance.

Sometimes you might see researchers describing their data in terms of clinical, rather than research, significance. What they mean is that while the results don't match the very high rigour that would be required of research, if there is only, say a 10% chance that our results would be

thrown up by chance, then from a clinical perspective we had better take notice of that result, since it suggests that something is going on, even if we can't be sure at the required research level. Much of the theory on the effect of conflict on children in separated families is based on research that is significant at a clinical, though not at a research, level.

## Child and adolescent development

There is a somewhat confusing array of theories dealing with child and adolescent development. This profusion is mostly a function of the different emphases that individual theorists place on the various phenomena they observe. Some theories emphasise continuous development, others suggest that development occurs in more discreet stages. Some theories emphasise cognitive development, others emotional development, others social development. We'll briefly touch on two theories below by way of illustration, but it is important to know that this area is highly complex and specialized. These are not necessarily the best or most accurate theories, but they do illustrate that developmental theories focus on age bands and the sort of behaviours that the theorist believes are central.

Perhaps the best known theory of cognitive development is that of Jean Piaget. Piaget believed children passed through the following four primary stages

Stage	rough age band	Description
sensorimotor	0 - 2	Focus on development of 5 senses
preoperational	2 – 7	Use of pretend play, development of language, beginnings of symbolic thought
concrete operational	7 – 11	Development of mostly non-abstract (ie, 'concrete') logic, problem solving, organizing of information
formal operational	11 on	Development of greater abstract thinking

Erik Erikson placed greater emphasis on the development of the individual in a social context. He described 8 critical conflicts that each

mark a stage of development, and which must be resolved appropriately if the process is to unfold adequately. These conflicts are:

1. trust versus mistrust (0 – 18 months);
2. autonomy versus shame and doubt (2- 3);
3. initiative versus guilt (3 – 5);
4. industry versus inferiority (6 – 11);
5. identity versus role confusion (12 – 18);
6. intimacy versus isolation (19 – 40);
7. generativity versus stagnation (40 – 65); and
8. ego integrity versus despair (65 on).

The first 5 of these stages unfold between birth and late adolescence, with the remainder being faced throughout the balance of one's life.

Notwithstanding the differences in focus, all of the major theories however identify that children and young people interact with their physical and social environments and that outcomes are frequently determined by the nature and quality of those interactions. The main point of all of this is that children are not mini-adults: whatever orders or parenting plans we assist our clients with must therefore be age appropriate.

In the section that follows we will examine one developmental concept in greater detail as it is increasingly influential in guiding family courts in parenting matters involving children between the ages of 0 and 4.

## **Attachment**

Attachment is of enormous significance in the first 4 to 5 years of life, and since disturbed or insecure attachment has been correlated with poor social and cognitive outcomes, we need to be alive to the possibility that an arrangement, even one that both parents agree with, may not be in a young child's best interests.

Here's one description of the attachment system<sup>2</sup>:

This system, which at the most concrete level functions to keep the immature young in proximity to care-givers, is believed to have evolved to provide protection from harm of many sorts, including illness, predators, and aggression from others. The analogy of a thermostat is

---

<sup>2</sup> Judith Solomon and Zeynep Biringen, 'Another Look at the Developmental Research' (2001) 39(4) *Family Court Review* 355.



frequently invoked to explain how the attachment system functions. Changes in ambient temperature relative to the setting of a thermostat turn on the furnace until the temperature setting is reached. Analogously, the child's experience of fatigue, illness, anything threatening or frightening, and most especially, separation from the attachment figure results in strenuous efforts to approach the attachment figure or to bring him or her close. *Chronic frustration of this cycle inevitably leads to feelings of anxiety and distress and over time can cause the child to develop both adaptive and maladaptive internal defenses and behavior, which are often described as differences in the security of attachment relationships.* [emphasis added]

An important thing to note is that attachment is not the same as bonding or love. One can be bonded to a child and vice versa, without being an attachment figure for that child. Attachment is a biological need of a child (in much the same way as imprinting occurs in some birds) and must be distinguished from less fixed, though nevertheless important, emotional needs of small children.

The controversy that plays out in the social science literature relates to (among other things):

- the possibility of there being more than one attachment figure;
- the effect of more regular, shorter periods of contact, as opposed to longer, less frequent periods of contact with a non residential parent;
- the effect of high conflict;
- age effects;
- gender effects.

One of the few things that is clear in this debate, is that it is difficult to make generalisations. Nevertheless, there do appear to be a number of issues that we need to be on the lookout for and, if they arise, be prepared to think creatively or seek further assistance from an appropriately qualified professional. These are:

- the age of the child: the younger, the more caution should be exercised;

- signs of separation distress in the child (bear in mind here that children often display more distress when they are *returned* to an attachment figure after separation, rather than *during* the period of separation itself);
- the level of involvement each parent has had in the care of the child from a very early age: if a non-live with parent has been highly involved there may be less of a problem with, say, overnight time with a very young child than there would be with a less involved parent; similarly, it may be very important to maintain that relationship by providing for more frequent, shorter periods of time to be spent;
- the existence of violence or high levels of conflict;
- the existence of a pattern of substantially shared care since separation;
- the existence of other people such as half- or step-siblings and grandparents who have had significant involvement with the child from an early age;
- the physical proximity of the two parents' homes.

No matter what the relationship is like between the contact parent<sup>3</sup> and the child, understand that *time with* that parent equates to *time away* from the other parent. Much of the heat in the attachment debate as it applies to separated families is centred on the effect on young children of this unavoidable compromise. In acting for parents, particularly fathers who are seeking greater time with very young children, it is important to provide some reassurance that attachment issues are not the same as love, and that if this stage of a child's life can be managed well so that the child is able to build on a foundation of secure attachment, the chances that that child will have the capacity to relate well socially (including with their parents) are greatly increased.

---

<sup>3</sup> This is less cumbersome to write, though also less correct, than 'the parent with whom the child is not living', or the 'spending time parent'.

## Family violence

The effect of conflict and violence on children is broad, deep and inevitably destructive. In fact it is fair to say that parental conflict appears to be the single most destructive phenomenon that children can face. Accordingly, over the years social scientists, the *Family Law Act*, the courts and lawyers have become increasingly focussed on identifying the types of violence that occur in families, the effect on children of that violence, and strategies for protecting children.

In dealing with family violence, it is important to have regard to the different types of violence and the diversity of the players involved, as very different strategies may be called upon depending on what type of violence is presenting. The significant types of violence that we see in families can be categorised as follows (the extracts below are all from an important 2008 American article by Joan Kelly and Michael Johnson<sup>4</sup>, although the references have been removed):

### **Coercive controlling violence:**

This form of 'intimate partner violence' is marked by

'intimidation; emotional abuse; isolation; minimizing, denying, and blaming; use of children; asserting male privilege; economic abuse; and coercion and threats... Because these nonviolent control tactics may be effective without the use of violence (especially if there has been a history of violence in the past), Coercive Controlling Violence does not necessarily manifest itself in high levels of violence. ... Coercive Controlling Violence is the type of intimate partner violence encountered most frequently in agency settings, such as law enforcement, the courts (criminal, civil, and family), shelters, and hospitals. Johnson, using Frieze's Pittsburgh data, found that 68% of women who filed for Protection from Abuse orders and 79% of women who contacted shelters were experiencing Coercive Controlling Violence. ... Although Coercive Controlling Violence does not always involve frequent and/or severe violence, on average its violence is more frequent and severe than other types of intimate partner violence.'

---

<sup>4</sup> Joan B. Kelly and Michael P. Johnson, 'Differentiation Among Types of Intimate Partner Violence: Research Update and Implications for Interventions' (2008) 46(3) *Family Court Review* 476.

**Violent resistance:**

'The research on intimate partner violence has clearly indicated that many women resist Coercive Controlling Violence with violence of their own. ... Much of women's Violent Resistance does not lead to encounters with law enforcement because it is so short-lived. For many violent resisters, the resort to self-protective violence may be almost automatic and surfaces almost as soon as the coercively controlling and violent partner begins to use physical violence himself. But in heterosexual relationships, most women find out quickly that responding with violence is ineffective and may even make matters worse. ... The Violent Resistance that gets the most media attention is that of women who murder their abusive partners. The U.S. Department of Justice reports that, in 2004, 385 women murdered their intimate partners .... Although some of these murders may have involved Situational Couple Violence that escalated to a homicide, most are committed by women who feel trapped in a relationship with a coercively controlling and violent partner.'

**Situational couple violence:**

'Situational Couple Violence is the most common type of physical aggression in the general population of married spouses and cohabiting partners, and is perpetrated by both men and women. It is not a more minor version of Coercive Controlling Violence; rather, it is a different type of intimate partner violence with different causes and consequences. Situational Couple Violence is not embedded in a relationship-wide pattern of power, coercion, and control.... Generally, Situational Couple Violence results from situations or arguments between partners that escalate on occasion into physical violence. One or both partners appear to have poor ability to manage their conflicts and/or poor control of anger .... Most often, Situational Couple Violence has a lower per-couple frequency of occurrence ... and more often involves minor forms of violence (pushing, shoving, grabbing, etc.) when compared to Coercive Controlling Violence. Fear of the partner is not characteristic of women or men in Situational Couple Violence, whether perpetrator, mutual combatant, or victim. Unlike the misogynistic attitudes toward women characteristic of men who use Coercive Controlling Violence, men who are involved in Situational Couple Violence do not differ from nonviolent men on measures of misogyny.'

## **Separation instigated violence:**

'Of special relevance to those working with separating and divorcing families is violence instigated by the separation where there was no prior history of violence in the intimate partner relationship or in other settings .... Seen symmetrically in both men and women, these are unexpected and uncharacteristic acts of violence perpetrated by a partner with a history of civilized and contained behavior. Therefore, this is not Coercive Controlling Violence as neither partner reported being intimidated, fearful, or controlled by the other during the marriage. Separation-Instigated Violence is triggered by experiences such as a traumatic separation (e.g., the home emptied and the children taken when the parent is at work), public humiliation of a prominent professional or political figure by a process server, allegations of child or sexual abuse, or the discovery of a lover in the partner's bed. The violence represents an atypical and serious loss of psychological control (sometimes described as "just going nuts"), is typically limited to one or two episodes at the beginning of or during the separation period, and ranges from mild to more severe forms of violence. ...Separation-Instigated Violence is more likely to be perpetrated by the partner who is being left and is shocked by the divorce action. Incidents include sudden lashing out, throwing objects at the partner, destroying property (cherished pictures/heirlooms, throwing clothes into the street), brandishing a weapon, and sideswiping or ramming the partner's car or that of his/her lover. Separation-Instigated Violence is unlikely to occur again and protection orders result in compliance.

## **Gender**

It is regrettable that gender politics has played such a significant role in confusing the debate around family violence. Nevertheless, the picture does seem to be clearing somewhat, and Joan Kelly and Michael Johnson in the article just cited conclude from an exhaustive examination of the available research that situational couple violence and separation instigated violence are as likely to be perpetrated by men as by women. The major gender difference appears in relation to coercive controlling violence, which appears to be predominantly perpetrated by males. Since violent resistance appears to be a reaction specifically to coercive controlling violence, it appears to be perpetrated more by females.

## Alienation

Cases involving alienation are among the most difficult for the court and practitioners to manage. These are matters where a child or young person expresses a very clear and strong view that they do not wish to spend time with or indeed have anything to do with one parent. They are often extremely difficult cases to turn around and a frequent outcome is that the rejected parent loses their relationship with the child.

Some of the distinguishing marks of these matters are:

- there is often a 'rehearsed' quality to the litany of denigration a child might engage in with respect to the rejected parent;
- the child justifies the alienation with memories of somewhat trivial events;
- the child's description of parents is often highly dichotomised: one parent is all good, the other is all bad;
- the hatred often extends to members of the rejected parent's family, frequently with little apparent justification.

Two prominent theoretical frameworks have been frequently applied over the past 25 years to explain this phenomenon, although neither is particularly satisfactory. The first, named 'Parental Alienation Syndrome' by Dr Richard Gardner, the American psychiatrist who developed it in the 1980s, has now been largely discredited, although it continues to attract adherents from father's groups in particular. This theory postulates that alienation is caused by the favoured parent ('the alienator') engaging in a campaign of denigration against the rejected parent. As a remedy, Gardner advocated that children be removed from the care of alleged alienators and placed with the rejected parent. This theory enjoyed widespread support in the US in particular for some years and resulted in some alarming instances of children being placed with alleged perpetrators of child sexual abuse.

The other prominent theory postulates that alienation is a response to abusive behaviour engaged in by the rejected parent. Its advocates suggest that the fact of alienation is sufficient to alert us to the existence

of serious abuse. While this does seem intuitively attractive, and children do sometimes reject abusive parents, this is by no means a certain result and in many terrible cases of abuse children do not in fact reject their abusers, but defend and protect them.

In a recent book US family therapist and lawyer Bill Eddy<sup>5</sup> traces the roots of alienation back to high conflict behaviours engaged in by either or both parents. These behaviours essentially involve the following three ingredients:

1. all-or-nothing ('dichotomous') thinking, leading to:
2. unmanaged emotions, leading to:
3. extreme behaviour.

This is certainly consistent with what a number of other writers have pointed out as features of the family systems that include a child displaying alienating behaviours. These particular traits also feature strongly in the diagnostic criteria of a number of personality disorders, although Eddy is at pains to point out that he is not suggesting that all, or even most, cases of alienation and high conflict involve someone with a personality disorder. But he does speculate that these high conflict behaviours build up an impenetrable wall one brick at a time.

**Of course, none of this should be taken as suggesting that some parents do not actually engage in what might be described as deliberately alienating behaviours, or that a child might not reject a parent utterly as a result of abuse.**

Of great significance for us, however, is that it is very easy for advocates (whether they be lawyers or other professionals), court staff and the judiciary to get caught up in the drama of litigants' conflicts and respond with similar behaviours. Eddy speculates that a more useful way of engaging with the extreme behaviours of some litigants is for those of us involved in the family law system to ourselves prioritise *flexible thinking*, *managed emotions* and *moderate behaviours*.

It is a refrain that those of us working with separated families can't hear enough of: with skill, wisdom, compassion and self-reflection we can

---

<sup>5</sup> *Don't Alienate the Kids! Raising Resilient Children While Avoiding High-Conflict Divorce*. HCI Press (2010).

possibly make things better (sometimes very much better, sometimes just a little better); without much effort at all we can easily make things much, much worse.

## **The challenges of collaboration**

It is complex working with separated families toward the high, but tragically elusive, goal of establishing resilient parenting strategies that work in children's best interests. No one profession has all of the answers or all of the necessary skills that are required to achieve the best possible results. But collaboration is a challenging affair in itself.

I've reproduced below a table from a paper by Chris Huxham and Siv Vangen entitled *Ambiguity, Complexity and Dynamics in the Membership of Collaboration*<sup>6</sup>, which gives a very good summary of some of the key confounding issues that lead to what these two authors call 'collaborative inertia'. Not all of these items are relevant to the immediate environment of the court, but remember we're also frequently dealing with collaborations between government and community agencies such as FRCs, contact centre providers, and agencies providing courses and other support such as Unifam, Relationships Australia and Catholic Care.

### **Summary of dimensions of ambiguity and complexity:**

#### **Ambiguity**

##### *Ambiguity in membership and status*

- Members' perceptions of who else is a member vary
- Members' perceptions of each other's status in the collaboration vary

##### *Ambiguity in representativeness*

- Members are confused over the degree to which an individual representative is representing an organization
- Members are confused over which organization, organizations or other constituency is being represented

#### **Complexity**

##### *Complexity in structure*

- There can be complex hierarchies of collaboration
- Individuals and organizations are often members of multiple partnerships with overlapping membership
- Departments of an organization may become involved in partnerships independently of each other
- Collaborations often have complex structures involving partnership staff, executive committees, working groups and so on

#### **Dynamics**

##### *Shifting membership*

- Government policies and other forces cause demise and reforming of organizations
- Individual representatives come and go or change their role within their organizations

##### *Shifting purpose*

- Government policies and other forces lead to refocusing of collaborative purpose (and hence of membership)
- Mismatches in members' agendas lead to continual negotiation of purpose (and hence

---

<sup>6</sup> Chris Huxham, and Siv Vangen, 'Ambiguity, Complexity and Dynamics in the Membership of Collaboration,' (2000) 53 *Human Relations* 778.



the possibility of changing membership)

- Learning from past activity and completing agenda items also leads to continual negotiation

*The pace of change*

- Changes can take place frequently, rapidly and sometimes imperceptibly

As well as these issues of ambiguity, complexity and dynamics, the cultural, and to a large degree linguistic, differences between disciplines, professions and sectors can frustrate our attempts to work together. In addition, underlying apparently straightforward professional cultural issues there are often more complex, subterranean issues of power and trust operating<sup>7</sup>.

As lawyers we are very good at unpacking stories and providing structure; social scientists are good at providing developmental context, deciphering the puzzles of conflict, seeing a way through the woods of trauma; every profession active in the family law system potentially adds something unique and valuable to the improvement of outcomes. But these very differences can work against each other. Professional rivalries, misunderstandings and resentments can poison the well, so it is vital that we make the effort to understand each other and prioritise functional relationships. This involves finding out about what's going on outside our own patch and developing the interpersonal skills needed to work through differences.

A little like the skills we expect our clients to develop to help them work together toward better outcomes for their children.

---

<sup>7</sup> For further detail, see Mark A MacDiarmid, and Tracey A Willow, 'To Coerce Or to Collaborate: Human Rights Lawyers Relating With Other Professions,' (2008) 33(2) *Alternative Law Journal* 86.