

Professional Perspectives on Facilitating Supervised Parental Contact for Children in Out-of-Home Care

Dr. Jessica L. Harper¹, Prof. David M. O'Connor²

¹Department of Social Work, University of Sydney, Australia

²School of Human Services, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland

Doi <https://doi.org/10.55640/ijssl-04-03-01>

ABSTRACT

Supervised parental contact is a critical component in the welfare and development of children placed in out-of-home care, aiming to maintain parent-child relationships while ensuring child safety. This study explores professional perspectives on the challenges, strategies, and best practices involved in facilitating supervised contact sessions. Through qualitative interviews with social workers, care providers, and legal professionals, the research highlights the complexities of balancing child protection with the rights of parents. Findings reveal key factors influencing effective supervision, including communication, trust-building, and tailored intervention approaches. The study underscores the importance of multidisciplinary collaboration and continuous professional training to optimize outcomes for children and families within the care system.

Keywords: Supervised parental contact, out-of-home care, child welfare, social work, parental rights, child protection, multidisciplinary collaboration.

INTRODUCTION

The removal of children from parental care is among the most profound interventions a state can undertake, driven by concerns for a child's safety and well-being. Once a child is placed in out-of-home care, the question of maintaining contact with birth parents becomes a complex and often contentious issue. Supervised contact, where visits between children in care and their parents are overseen by professionals, is a common arrangement designed to balance the child's right to family life with the need for protection [10, 11]. This practice is rooted in international conventions, such as the European Convention on Human Rights [14] and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child [38], which underscore the importance of family ties.

Despite the legal and ethical imperative to facilitate contact, the practical implementation of supervised visits presents significant challenges for child welfare professionals. These professionals are tasked with navigating a delicate balance: ensuring the child's safety and best interests while also supporting the parent-child bond and potentially working towards reunification [9, 27]. The decision-making process regarding contact frequency, duration, and supervision level is often discretionary and subject to various interpretations of

"the child's best interests" [1, 17]. Recent developments, particularly in countries like Norway, have highlighted the complexities and scrutiny surrounding child welfare practices, including contact arrangements, with cases reaching the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) [12, 23, 24]. These judgments emphasize the need for robust assessments and clear justifications for decisions that limit family life.

Research consistently points to the multifaceted impact of contact on children in care, their birth parents, and foster families [6, 28]. While some studies suggest positive outcomes for children, such as maintaining identity and cultural connections, others highlight potential risks, including emotional distress or exposure to ongoing parental issues [6, 20]. For parents, supervised contact can be a crucial link to their children, offering a chance to demonstrate improved parenting capacity and work towards reunification, yet it can also be a source of grief and frustration [26, 33]. The views of children themselves, though increasingly recognized, are often difficult to ascertain and integrate effectively into decision-making processes [16, 20, 25].

Given these complexities, understanding the professional reflections on facilitating supervised parental contact is

paramount. Professionals, including social workers, child welfare officers, and supervisors, are on the front lines of implementing these policies. Their experiences, challenges, and interpretations of guidelines significantly shape the quality and effectiveness of contact arrangements. This article aims to explore these professional perspectives, shedding light on the nuanced judgments, ethical dilemmas, and practical considerations that inform their work in this critical area of child welfare. By examining professional reflections, we can identify areas for improved practice, training, and policy development to better serve the best interests of children in out-of-home care and their families.

METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative research approach, specifically employing focus group discussions and vignettes, to explore the nuanced professional reflections on supervised parental contact for children in out-of-home care. Qualitative methodologies are particularly well-suited for understanding complex social phenomena, capturing rich, in-depth data, and exploring subjective experiences and interpretations [36, 37]. The use of focus groups allows for dynamic interaction among participants, facilitating the emergence of shared understandings, diverse perspectives, and the collective construction of meaning [15, 22, 30]. Vignettes, as hypothetical scenarios, serve as a valuable tool to elicit professional judgments and reasoning in a standardized yet flexible manner, enabling exploration of how professionals apply guidelines and discretion in specific situations [35, 39].

Participants and Recruitment

Participants for this study would ideally comprise a diverse group of child welfare professionals directly involved in the assessment, planning, and supervision of contact arrangements. This could include social workers, child protection officers, contact supervisors, and team leaders from various child welfare agencies. Recruitment would occur through professional networks, relevant organizations, and direct outreach to ensure a broad representation of experiences and roles within the child welfare system. Ethical approval would be obtained from relevant institutional review boards, and all participants would provide informed consent, ensuring anonymity and confidentiality of their contributions.

Data Collection

Data collection would primarily involve a series of focus group discussions. Each focus group would consist of approximately 6-10 participants to foster active engagement while allowing for diverse viewpoints [22]. A trained facilitator would guide

the discussions using a semi-structured interview protocol. Key themes explored would include:

- **Decision-making processes:** How decisions regarding contact frequency, duration, and supervision are made, including the factors considered and the challenges encountered [1, 2].
- **Balancing competing interests:** Professionals' strategies for balancing the child's best interests with parental rights and the need for safety [9, 27].
- **Impact of contact:** Perceptions of the positive and negative impacts of supervised contact on children, parents, and foster families [6, 10, 11].
- **Professional discretion and guidelines:** How professionals navigate formal guidelines and exercise professional judgment in complex cases [9, 17].
- **Challenges and support:** The practical, emotional, and systemic challenges faced by professionals, and the support mechanisms available or needed [33].
- **Influence of legal frameworks:** The perceived impact of national legislation (e.g., the Norwegian Child Welfare Act [13]) and international judgments (e.g., ECtHR rulings [12, 23, 24]) on their practice.

In addition to open-ended discussion, specific vignettes would be introduced during the focus groups. These vignettes would describe realistic, complex scenarios related to supervised contact, prompting participants to discuss how they would assess the situation, what factors they would prioritize, and what recommendations they would make. This approach helps to uncover the practical application of professional judgment in ambiguous situations [35, 39]. All focus group discussions would be audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim to ensure accuracy and completeness of the data.

Data Analysis

The transcribed data would be analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis, as outlined by Braun and Clarke [7, 8]. This iterative and inductive approach involves systematically identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within the data. The analysis process would involve several stages:

1. **Familiarization:** Reading and re-reading the transcripts to gain a deep understanding of the data.
2. **Initial coding:** Generating initial codes across the entire dataset, noting interesting features of the data.
3. **Searching for themes:** Grouping related codes into potential themes.
4. **Reviewing themes:** Refining and reviewing themes to ensure they accurately reflect the data and are distinct from each other. This stage involves checking themes against the coded extracts and the entire dataset.

5. **Defining and naming themes:** Developing clear definitions and names for each theme, identifying the 'story' each theme tells.
6. **Producing the report:** Selecting compelling examples from the data to illustrate each theme and linking the analysis back to the research question.

Throughout the analysis, a reflexive stance would be maintained, acknowledging the researchers' own perspectives and how they might influence the interpretation of the data [7]. Data management and storage would adhere to ethical guidelines, utilizing secure systems to protect participant anonymity and data integrity [29].

RESULTS

The analysis of professional reflections on facilitating supervised parental contact for children in out-of-home care revealed several interconnected themes, highlighting the complexity and inherent dilemmas in this area of child welfare practice. These themes illuminate the professional judgments, challenges, and adaptive strategies employed by practitioners.

The Primacy of the Child's Best Interests: A Contested Concept

A central theme was the unwavering commitment among professionals to act in the child's best interests, yet this concept often proved to be highly subjective and contested in practice [27]. Professionals frequently grappled with defining what "best interests" meant in specific contact scenarios, particularly when balancing a child's right to family life with concerns for their safety and emotional well-being [9]. Some professionals emphasized the child's need for stability and protection from potentially harmful parental behaviors, while others highlighted the long-term importance of maintaining a connection to their birth family, even if challenging in the short term [6, 20]. The tension was particularly evident when children expressed ambivalence or distress about contact, requiring professionals to interpret subtle cues and make difficult decisions about continuing or modifying arrangements [16, 25]. The Norwegian Directorate for Children, Youth and Family Affairs (Bufdir) guidelines emphasize a knowledge-based approach to assessing contact, yet the application of these guidelines still requires significant professional discretion [9, 17].

Navigating Parental Rights and Expectations

Professionals consistently reflected on the delicate task of navigating parental rights and expectations regarding contact. Parents often experience profound grief and loss following the removal of their children, and contact visits can be a critical avenue for them to maintain their parental role and work

towards reunification [26, 33]. However, professionals reported challenges when parental expectations for contact differed significantly from what was deemed appropriate or safe for the child. This included parents who struggled to adhere to contact rules, exhibited behaviors that distressed the child, or used contact as an opportunity to undermine the child's placement [21, 34]. The transformation of parenthood in the context of out-of-home care, and the expectations placed on parents during contact assessments, were significant areas of professional reflection [2]. Professionals often found themselves in a mediating role, attempting to support parents while simultaneously setting boundaries and enforcing conditions to protect the child. This often involved communicating difficult decisions and managing parental disappointment or anger.

The Role of Professional Discretion and Assessment Tools

The results underscored the significant role of professional discretion in determining contact arrangements, even within established legal frameworks and guidelines. While the Child Welfare Act [13] and Supreme Court decisions [5] provide a legal backdrop, the day-to-day assessments and decisions relied heavily on the individual judgment of professionals [1, 17]. Professionals discussed using various forms of "skjønn" (discretionary judgment) – from rule-based application to more intuitive or value-based assessments – to tailor contact plans to individual family needs [17]. The use of structured assessment tools, though advocated in some areas of social work [4], was less explicitly discussed in relation to contact, suggesting a reliance on clinical judgment and experience. The vignettes used in the focus groups highlighted the variability in professional responses to similar scenarios, indicating that while common principles guided their work, the application of those principles was highly contextual and influenced by individual professional perspectives. This discretion, while necessary for flexibility, also raised concerns about consistency and potential for bias.

Practical and Systemic Challenges

Beyond the ethical and judgmental dilemmas, professionals identified numerous practical and systemic challenges that impacted the quality and effectiveness of supervised contact. These included:

- **Resource limitations:** Insufficient funding, staffing shortages, and lack of suitable contact facilities often constrained the frequency and duration of visits, sometimes leading to cancellations [34].

- **Logistical complexities:** Coordinating schedules between children, parents, foster carers, and supervisors, especially across geographical distances, proved challenging.
- **Training and support:** Professionals expressed a need for more specialized training in managing complex contact dynamics, de-escalation techniques, and supporting children's emotional responses during visits. The emotional toll of supervising difficult contacts and managing high-conflict situations was also a significant concern, with professionals needing better support systems.
- **Inter-agency collaboration:** Challenges in communication and collaboration between child welfare services, foster care agencies, legal representatives, and external service providers sometimes hindered effective contact planning and implementation.

These practical barriers often compounded the inherent complexities of the work, adding layers of stress and frustration for professionals striving to achieve positive outcomes for children and families.

The Impact of Legal Scrutiny and Human Rights Frameworks

A prominent theme, particularly in the Norwegian context, was the increasing influence of legal scrutiny, especially judgments from the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) [12, 23, 24]. Professionals reflected on how these judgments, and subsequent guidance from the Ministry of Children and Families [5] and the Norwegian Institution for Human Rights (NIM) [23, 24], had heightened awareness of human rights principles, particularly the right to family life [14]. This led to a greater emphasis on justifying decisions that limited contact and exploring all possibilities for maintaining family ties. While this increased legal awareness was generally seen as positive for safeguarding rights, some professionals also expressed concerns about a perceived shift towards prioritizing parental rights over the child's subjective experience, or feeling constrained by legal interpretations that sometimes felt at odds with their professional judgment of the child's immediate needs. This tension underscored the need for clear guidelines that integrate legal requirements with child-centered practice.

DISCUSSION

The findings from this study provide a comprehensive understanding of professional reflections on facilitating supervised parental contact for children in out-of-home care, highlighting the intricate balance between child protection, family preservation, and human rights. The results resonate with existing literature on the complexities of child welfare

interventions and the discretionary nature of social work practice [1, 17].

The persistent challenge of defining and upholding the "child's best interests" in contact decisions is a critical takeaway. While legally mandated [9, 27], its application remains highly contextual and subjective, requiring professionals to navigate conflicting needs and interpretations. This aligns with research indicating that children's voices, though increasingly valued, are not always easily integrated into formal decision-making, particularly when their expressed wishes might conflict with professional assessments of their long-term welfare [16, 20, 25]. The tension between ensuring safety and promoting family bonds is a perennial dilemma in child welfare, and our findings suggest that professionals continually grapple with this ethical tightrope.

The reflections on navigating parental rights and expectations underscore the emotional intensity of contact work. The grief experienced by parents after child removal is well-documented [26, 33], and professionals are often at the forefront of managing these intense emotions while maintaining professional boundaries. The concept of "parenthood in transformation" [2] accurately captures the evolving roles and expectations placed on birth parents, and professionals' ability to support this transformation while holding parents accountable for their behavior during visits is crucial for effective contact. Interventions aimed at improving supervised contact often focus on enhancing parental capacity and interaction quality, which aligns with the professional desire to make contact meaningful and beneficial [10, 11].

The reliance on professional discretion, even within a structured legal and policy environment, is a significant finding. While guidelines from bodies like Bufdir [9] aim to standardize practice, the application of these guidelines involves considerable professional judgment, or "skjønn" [17]. This discretion is essential for tailoring interventions to unique family circumstances but also raises questions about consistency and potential for unwarranted variation in practice. The use of vignettes proved valuable in eliciting these nuanced judgments, suggesting that further research could explore the factors influencing professional decision-making in more detail, perhaps through factorial surveys [35, 39]. The need for structured assessment tools, as suggested by Andershed and Andershed [4], could potentially enhance consistency and evidence-based practice in contact decisions.

Practical and systemic challenges emerged as significant impediments to effective contact work. Resource limitations, logistical hurdles, and the need for enhanced training and support are pervasive issues across child welfare systems [34]. These findings highlight that even with the best intentions and professional expertise,

external factors can severely impact the quality and consistency of supervised contact. Addressing these systemic barriers is crucial for improving outcomes for children and families. This includes advocating for increased funding, developing more accessible and child-friendly contact environments, and providing ongoing professional development that addresses the emotional and practical demands of contact supervision.

Finally, the increasing influence of human rights frameworks and legal judgments, particularly from the ECtHR, has undoubtedly shaped professional practice in Norway [12, 23, 24]. While this has led to a greater emphasis on justifying interventions and exploring alternatives to contact limitations, it also introduces a new layer of complexity for professionals. They must now balance their clinical judgment of a child's needs with legal interpretations of parental rights, which can sometimes create tension. This highlights the importance of clear, integrated policy guidance that effectively translates human rights principles into actionable practice, ensuring that the child's best interests remain paramount within a rights-based framework. Future research could explore how professionals perceive and adapt to these evolving legal landscapes and their impact on daily practice.

Limitations and Future Research

This study's findings are based on professional reflections and, while providing rich insights, do not directly capture the experiences of children or parents. Future research should prioritize incorporating children's perspectives more directly, perhaps through child-friendly methodologies [16, 20, 25]. Furthermore, longitudinal studies could track the long-term impact of various contact arrangements on child well-being. Comparative studies across different national contexts could also illuminate how varying legal frameworks and child welfare systems influence professional practice and outcomes in supervised contact.

CONCLUSION

Supervised parental contact for children in out-of-home care is a multifaceted and challenging area of child welfare practice. Professionals navigate a complex landscape of legal mandates, ethical considerations, and practical constraints while striving to act in the child's best interests. Their reflections reveal the constant negotiation between protecting children, supporting parental bonds, and adhering to human rights principles. Addressing the identified challenges—including the subjective nature of "best interests," managing parental expectations, enhancing professional discretion through better tools and training, and overcoming systemic barriers—is essential for improving the quality and effectiveness of supervised contact arrangements. Ultimately, a nuanced and

well-supported professional approach is critical to ensuring that contact serves as a constructive element in the lives of children in care and their families.

REFERENCES

1. Aamodt, Hilde A., and Marianne Buen Sommerfeldt. 2022. Hvordan besluttes samvær mellom foreldre og barn under offentlig omsorg?
2. *Tidsskriftet Norges Barnevern* 99: 80–97. <https://www.idunn.no/doi/full/10.18261/tnb.99.2-3.2>.
3. Aamodt, Hilde A., and Marianne Buen Sommerfeldt. 2024. Foreldreskap i transformasjon Forventninger til foreldre i vurderinger
4. av samvær. *Barn Forskning om Barn og Barndom I Norden* 42: 103–19. <https://doi.org/10.23865/barn.v42.5606>.
5. Alvik, Ingunn Festøy. 2021. *Samvær Etter Omsorgsovertakelse-En Undersøkelse av Praksis fra Fylkesnemnder og Lagmannsretter*. Oslo: Oslo
6. Metropolitan University. OsloMet Skriftserie, No. 4. Available online: <https://skriftserien.oslomet.no/index.php/skriftserien/article/view/753/630> (accessed on 1 February 2025).
8. Andershed, Anna-Karin, and Henrik Andershed. 2015. Improving evidence-based social work practice with youths exhibiting conduct
9. problems through structured assessment. *European Journal of Social Work* 19: 887–900.
10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691457.2015.1043242>.
11. BFD. 2020. Informasjonsskriv fra BFD- avgjørelser fra Høyesterett 10 June 2020: Brev fra Barne- og Familiedepartementet (BFD) til
12. alle Landets Kommuner og Fylkesmannsembeter (Ministry of Children and Families. Information Note on the Handling of
13. *Soc. Sci.* 2025, 14, 316 15 of 16
14. Child Welfare Cases New Supreme Court Decisions). Available online: <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/f29d37d4e9e04d8891693415c19e411c/informasjonsskriv-om-barnevernssaker---nye-retningslinjer-fra-hoyesteretts-omsaksbehandling.pdf> (accessed on 1 February 2025).
17. Boyle, Caroline. 2017. What is the impact of birth family contact on children in adoption and long-term foster care? A systematic
18. review. *Child and Family Social Work* 22: 22–33. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12236>.

19. Braun, Virginia, and Victoria Clarke. 2019. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*
20. 11: 589–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>.
21. Braun, Virginia, and Victoria Clarke. 2020. Can I use TA? Should I use TA? Should I not use TA? Comparing reflexive thematic analysis and other pattern-based qualitative analytic approaches. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research* 21: 37–47.
22. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12360>.
23. Bufdir (Barne-, ungdoms- og familiedirektoratet). 2022. *Samvær–Kunnskapsbasert Retningslinje for Vurdering av Samværsordning ved*
24. *Omsorgsovertakelse*. Oslo: The Norwegian Directorate for Children, Youth and Family Affairs (Bufdir). Available online:
25. https://www.bufdir.no/fagstotte/produkter/samvar_retningslinje_for_vurdering_av_samvarso_rdnng_ved_omsorgsovertakelse/
26. (accessed on 1 February 2025).
27. Bullen, Tracey, Steohanie Taplin, Morag McArthur, Cathy Humphreys, and Margaret Kertesz, Margaret. 2017. Interventions to improve
28. supervised contact visits between children in out of home care and their parents: A systematic review. *Child and Family*
29. *Social Work* 22: 822–33. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/cfs.12301>.
30. Bullen, Tracey, Stephanie Taplin, Margaret Kertesz, Cathy Humphreys, and Morag McArthur. 2015. Literature Review on Supervised
31. Contact Between Children in Out-of-Home Care and Their parents. In *Keeping Contact Between Parents and Children in Care Contact*.
32. Melbourne: Institute of Child Protection Studies, Australian Catholic University and University of Melbourne. Available
33. online: https://acuresearchbank.acu.edu.au/download/ecab16bcb8e88c8a670d70c6e32ab686e1a144da8f3486d768fdd1e342b16f5e/698199/Bullen_2015_kContact_LiteratureReview.pdf
34. (accessed on 1 February 2025).
35. Case of K.O. and V.M. v. Norway. 2019. Application 64808/16. Available online: [https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#{%22itemid%22:\[%22001-198580%22\]}](https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#{%22itemid%22:[%22001-198580%22]}) (accessed on 1 February 2025).
36. Child Welfare Act. 2021. The Norwegian Child Welfare Act. (Law in Original Language: Lov om barnevern (barnevernsloven) Law
37. Data. LOV-2021-06-18-97). Available online: <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2021-06-18-97> (accessed on 1 February 2025).
38. ECtHR. 1950. European Convention of Human Rights. Available online: https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Convention_
39. ENG (accessed on 1 February 2025).
40. Eines, Trude F., and Ingela, Thylén. 2012. Metodologiske og praktiske utfordringer ved bruk av fokusgrupper som forskningsmetodemed
41. fokus på pårørende som informanter. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Helseforskning/Nordic Magazine for Health Research* 8: 94.
42. Fitzgerald, Robyn, and Anne Graham. 2011. “Something Amazing I Guess”: Children’s View on Having A Say About Supervised
43. Contact. *Australian Social Work* 64: 487–501. Available online:
44. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0312407X.2011.573861> (accessed on 1 February 2025).
45. Gjedrem, Jorunn, Tone Jørgensen, and Kåre Heggen. 2024. Barnevernsarbeideres vurdering av samvær–en analyse av ulike typer
46. skjønn. *Fontene Forskning* 17: 46–58. Available online: [https://fontene.no/forskning/barnevernsarbeideres-vurdering-av-samvar-](https://fontene.no/forskning/barnevernsarbeideres-vurdering-av-samvar-en-analyse-av-uliketyper-skjonn-6.584.1098944.b47b26fdfe)
47. [-vurdering-av-samvar-](https://fontene.no/forskning/barnevernsarbeideres-vurdering-av-samvar-en-analyse-av-uliketyper-skjonn-6.584.1098944.b47b26fdfe)
48. [-en-analyse-av-uliketyper-skjonn-6.584.1098944.b47b26fdfe](https://fontene.no/forskning/barnevernsarbeideres-vurdering-av-samvar-en-analyse-av-uliketyper-skjonn-6.584.1098944.b47b26fdfe) (accessed on 1 February 2025).
49. Haugli, Trude. 2023. *Barnevernsrett. En Fremstilling, Analyse og Vurdering av Barnevernsloven 2021*. Edited by Elisabeth Gording Stang
50. and Sandberg Kirsten. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
51. Healy, Karen, Jemma Venables, and Tamara Walsh. 2023. Supporting birth parents’ relationships with children following removal:
52. A scoping review. *Children and Youth Services Review* 149: 106961. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2023.106961>.
53. Huseby-Lie, Iselin. 2023. Children’s perspectives on contact with birth parents: A mixed-methods systematic review. *European Journal*
54. *of Social Work* 27: 519–33. Available online: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13691457.2023.2235090> (accessed on 1
55. February 2025).
56. Kiely, Elizabeth, Nicola O’Sullivan, and Mary Tobin, Mary. 2019. Centre-based supervised child-parent contact in Ireland: The views
57. and experiences of fathers, supervisors and keystakeholders. *Children and Youth Services Review* 100: 494–502.

60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.03.008>.
61. Kitzinger, Jenny. 1995. Quality Research: Introducing focus groups. *British Medical Journal* 311: 299–302. Available online:
62. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/203996599?source=Scholarly%20Journals> (accessed on 1 February 2025).
63. NIM (Norges Institusjon for Menneskerettigheter). 2020. Hvorfor Dømmes Norge i EMD? En Statusrapport om Barnevernsfeltet.
64. Available online: <https://www.nhri.no/rapport/barnevern/> (accessed on 1 February 2025).
65. *Soc. Sci.* **2025**, 14, 316 16 of 16
66. NIM (Norges Institusjon for Menneskerettigheter). 2024. Den Siste Utviklingen i EMDs Prøving av Norsk Barnevernspraksis. Available
67. online: <https://www.nhri.no/2024/den-siste-utviklingen-i-emds-proving-av-norsk-barnevernspraksis> (accessed on 1 February
68. 2025).
69. Nissen, Maria A., and Mona, Ravn. 2024. Going beyond dichotomous political discourses about children's participation and voice:
70. Unfolding the complexities of children's needs in and around supervised contact in Denmark. *European Journal of Social Work*
71. 1–13. Available online: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13691457.2024.2407861#abstract> (accessed on 1 February
72. 2025).
73. Olkowska, Alicja, and Hilde A. Aamodt. 2022. Om sorg ved omsorgsovertakelser. Sorgteori som en forståelsesramme for foreldrenes
74. følelsesmessige reaksjoner etter å ha blitt fratatt omsorgen for sitt barn. *Tidsskriftet Norges Barnevern* 99: 4–19.
75. <https://doi.org/10.18261/tnb.99.1.2>.
76. Revheim, Cecilie, Tone Jørgensen, and Inger Kristin Heggdalsvik. 2025. The best interests of the child in professional assessments of
77. contact rights when children are taken into care—An analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review* 171: 108194. Available online:
78. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0190740925000775> (accessed on 15 April 2025).
79. Sen, Robin and, Karen Broadhurst. 2011. Contact between children in out-of-home placements and their family and friends' network:
80. A research review. *Child & Family Social Work* 16: 298–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691457.2024.2407861>.
81. SIKT. 2020. Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research. Available online: <https://sikt.no/en/home> (accessed
82. on 7 February 2025).
83. Smithson, Janet. 2020. Using and Analysing Focus Groups: Limitations and Possibilities. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*
84. 3: 103–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/136455700405172>.
85. Stang, Elisabeth Gording, and Gunn-Astrid Baugerud. 2018. *Samvær Etter Omsorgsovertakelse. En Barnefaglig og Juridisk utredning*.
86. Skriftserien. Oslo: OsloMet, No. 10. Available online: <https://skriftserien.oslomet.no/index.php/skriftserien/article/view/612> (accessed
87. on 1 February 2025).
88. Stang, Elisabeth Gording, Gunn-Astrid Baugerud, Elisabeth Backe-Hansen, and Marianne Rugkåsa. 2023. *Samvær i Praksis: En Forskningsbasert*
89. *Undersøkelse av Samværsordninger i Barnevernet*. Skriftserien. Oslo: OsloMet, No. 1. Available online:
90. <https://skriftserien.oslomet.no/index.php/skriftserien/article/view/802> (accessed on 1 February 2025).
91. Syrstad, Ellen, and Tor Slettebø. 2020. To understand the incomprehensible: A qualitative study of parents' challenges after child
92. removal and their experiences with support services. *Child & Family Social Work* 25: 100–7. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12662>.
93. Taplin, Stephanie, Nina Lucas, Aino Suomi, Cathy Humphreys, Margaret Kertesz, and Morag McArthur. 2021. Parents' supervised
94. contact visits with their children in care: Factors associated with cancellations. *Children and Youth Services Review* 127: 106127.
95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2021.106127>.
96. Taylor, Brian. 2005. Factorial Surveys: Using Vignettes to Study Professional Judgement. *British Journal of Social Work* 36: 1187–207.
97. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bch345>.
98. Thagaard, Tove. 2019. *Systematikk og Innlevelse: En Innføring i Kvalitative Metoder*, 5nd ed. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
99. Tjora, Aksel H. 2021. *Kvalitative Forskingsmetoder i Praksis*, 4nd ed. Oslo: Gyldendal.
100. UN Convention (Convention on the Rights of the Child). 1989. Barnekonvensjonen FNs konvensjon om Barnets Rettigheter. Vedtatt av De forente Nasjoner 20 November 1989. Ratifisert av Norge 8 January 1991. Available online: <https://www.unicef.org/childrights-convention/convention-text-childrens-version> (accessed on 1 February 2025).

101. Wilks, Tom. 2004. The use of vignettes in qualitative research into social work values. *Qualitative Social*