

APPENDIX

Author(s): Frøydis Lønborg Haarberg

Title of publication: What do we know about children’s representation in child protection decisions? A scoping review

Year: 2024

Journal / Publisher: Children and Youth Services Review

Content

Search strategy.....	2
Table A.1. Search strings and filters for each database.	2
Quality assessment.....	4
Table A.2. Quality assessment of included studies.	4
Summary of included studies	6
Table A.3. Research on children’s representation in child protection decisions.	6

Search strategy

Table A.1. Search strings and filters for each database.

Database/ search engine	Search strings and filters
Web of Science	<p>TS=((spokesperson* OR guardian* OR advoca* OR GAL* OR CASA* OR Cafcass OR safeguarder* OR "tandem model*" OR "tandem system*" OR (represent* NEAR/5 child*) OR (attorney* NEAR/5 child*) OR (lawyer* NEAR/5 child*) OR (solicitor* NEAR/5 child*)) AND ("right to be heard" OR "best interest*" OR participat* OR voice* OR right* OR involv* OR engag* OR wish* OR view* OR opinion* OR perspective* OR statement* OR inclu* OR collaborat* OR cooperat* OR empower*) AND ("child protecti*" OR "child welfare" OR (child* NEAR/2 care) OR CPS OR "decision making*" OR "protective service*" OR hearing* OR adoption* OR "residential care" OR "foster care" OR "care order*" OR "out-of-home care" OR "out-of-home placement*" OR "looked-after child*" OR "care proceeding*" OR "law proceeding*" OR "family proceeding*" OR court* OR "legal decision*" OR "legal process*" OR adjudication* OR "family justice" OR "child justice" OR "family law" OR "child law") AND (child* OR adolescent* OR "young people" OR "young person*" OR youth* OR teen* OR minor OR minors)))</p> <p>Publication date: 1990-01-01 to 2022-08-31 (YYYY-MM-DD) Language: English Document type: Article</p>
ProQuest	<p>TI,AB,IF(spokesperson* OR guardian* OR advoca* OR GAL* OR CASA* OR Cafcass OR safeguarder* OR "tandem model*" OR "tandem system*" OR (represent* NEAR/5 child*) OR (attorney* NEAR/5 child*) OR (lawyer* NEAR/5 child*) OR (solicitor* NEAR/5 child*)) AND TI,AB,IF("right to be heard" OR "best interest*" OR participat* OR voice* OR right* OR involv* OR engag* OR wish* OR view* OR opinion* OR perspective* OR statement* OR inclu* OR collaborat* OR cooperat* OR empower*) AND TI,AB,IF("child protecti*" OR "child welfare" OR (child* NEAR/2 care) OR CPS OR "decision making*" OR "protective service*" OR hearing* OR adoption* OR "residential care" OR "foster care" OR "care order*" OR "out-of-home care" OR "out-of-home placement*" OR "looked-after child*" OR "care proceeding*" OR "law proceeding*" OR "family proceeding*" OR court* OR "legal decision*" OR "legal process*" OR adjudication* OR "family justice" OR "child justice" OR "family law" OR "child law") AND TI,AB,IF(child* OR adolescent* OR "young people" OR "young person*" OR youth* OR teen* OR minor OR minors)</p> <p>Publication date: From 1990-01-01 to 2022-08-31 (YYYY-MM-DD) Language: English Limit to: Peer reviewed</p>
PsycINFO	<p>1 Free text search: (spokesperson* OR guardian* OR advoca* OR GAL* OR CASA* OR Cafcass OR safeguarder* OR "tandem model*" OR "tandem system*" OR (represent* ADJ6 child*) OR (attorney* ADJ6 child*) OR (lawyer* ADJ6 child*) OR (solicitor* ADJ6 child*).ti,ab,id.</p> <p>2 Subject headings: guardianship/ OR advocacy/ OR attorneys/</p> <p>3 Free text search: ("right to be heard" OR "best interest*" OR participat* OR voice* OR right* OR involv* OR engag* OR wish* OR view* OR opinion* OR perspective* OR statement* OR inclu* OR collaborat* OR cooperat* OR empower*).ti,ab,id.</p> <p>4 Subject headings: participation/ OR client participation/ OR involvement/ OR empowerment/ OR inclusion/ OR cooperation/ OR collaboration/</p> <p>5 Free text search: ("child protecti*" OR "child welfare" OR (child* ADJ3 care) OR CPS OR "decision making*" OR "protective service*" OR hearing* OR adoption* OR "residential care" OR "foster care" OR "care order*" OR "out-of-home care" OR "out-of-home placement*" OR "looked- after child*" OR "care proceeding*" OR "law proceeding*" OR "family proceeding*" OR court* OR "legal decision*" OR "legal process*" OR adjudication* OR "family justice" OR "child justice" OR "family law" OR "child law").ti,ab,id.</p> <p>6 Subject headings: child welfare/ OR protective services/ OR decision making/ OR legal processes/ OR legal decisions/ OR "adoption (child)"/ OR residential care institutions/ OR foster care/ OR child care/ OR adjudication/</p>

	<p>7 Free text search: (child* OR adolescent* OR "young people" OR "young person*" OR youth* OR teen* OR minor OR minors).ti,ab,id.</p> <p>8 (1 OR 2) AND (3 OR 4) AND (5 OR 6) AND 7</p> <p>Publication year: 1990-2022</p> <p>Languages: English</p> <p>Publication types: Peer-reviewed journal</p>
Idunn	<p>All content: ((talsperson* OR represent* OR verge*) AND barnevern*)</p> <p>Article type: Research article</p> <p>Publication date: January 1990 to August 2022</p>
Oria	<p>Any field contains: ((talsperson* OR represent* OR verge*) AND barnevern*)</p> <p>Language: Norwegian</p> <p>Publication date: Start date 01-01-1990, end date 31-08-2022 (DD-MM-YYYY)</p> <p>Show only: From peer-reviewed journals</p>
Google Scholar	<p>(talsperson* OR represent* OR verge*) AND barnevern*</p> <p>Year: 1990-2022</p>

Note. Searching for English articles, I use limitations to search in the article title, abstract, and keywords: "TS" (Web of Science), "TI,AB,IF" (ProQuest), and ".ti,ab,id." (PsycINFO). Searching for English articles, I use near operators with some terms to specify the maximum number of words between them: "NEAR/x" (Web of Science and ProQuest) and "ADJx" (PsycINFO), where the latter is higher because different chronological order of the terms counts. In databases that do not allow specific end dates (PsycINFO and Google Scholar), this is set to year 2022.

Quality assessment

Table A.2. Quality assessment of included studies.

Study	Sample size
Qualitative studies (n=29)	
<i>Interviews (individual and focus groups) (n=20)</i>	
Barnes (2007)	41 (20 children, 12 social workers, 9 representatives)
Barnes (2012)	41 (20 children, 12 social workers, 9 representatives)
Boylan & Ing (2005)	62 children (40 in study 1, 22 in study 2)
Brennan et al. (2021)	46 (26 social workers/social work managers, 20 solicitors)
Brocius et al. (2021)	73 (46 CASAs, 23 GALs, 4 Local Program Coordinators)
Burns et al. (2018)	38 (30 social workers/social work managers, 8 judges) ^a
Dillon (2021)	13 (6 children, 4 parents, 3 representatives) ^a
Duchscherre et al. (2017)	5 representatives ^a
*Enroos et al. (2017)	16 representatives (9 from Finland, 7 from Norway) ^a
Føleide (2021)	22 representatives
Føleide & Ulvik (2019)	22 representatives
Healy & Darlington (2009)	7 representatives ^a
Miller et al. (2018)	31 children
O'Mahony et al. (2016)	27 (15 solicitors, 8 judges, 4 barristers) ^a
Parkes et al. (2015)	67 (30 social workers/social work managers, 15 solicitors, 10 representatives, 8 judges, 4 barristers) ^b
Pert et al. (2017)	41 (25 children, 16 foster parents)
Ross (2013)	21 representatives
Ruegger (2001)	47 children
Thomson et al. (2017)	46 court key stakeholders/court-related workers (e.g., judicial officers, out-of-home providers) ^b
Walsh & Douglas (2011)	58 (32 community service providers, 26 representatives)
<i>Document analysis (n=4)</i>	
Magnussen & Skivenes (2015)	53 written decisions
Pösö & Enroos (2017)	36 written decisions
Selwyn (1996)	52 case documents
Vis & Fossum (2013)	Case documents (i.e., written decisions and representatives' reports) from 151 cases
<i>Other (n=5)</i>	
Boylan & Braye (2006)	39 children (6 individual interviews, 6 focus groups, 5 workshops), 16 review meetings observed ^{a, b}
Foster et al. (2021)	14 conferences (audio recordings and documents from 11 review conferences, 3 initial conferences), 50 professionals interviewed (15 conference staff, 35 practitioners) ^b
Knight & Oliver (2007)	10 children interviewed, representatives, social workers, parents interviewed, 2 child—representative interactions observed ^b
LeVezu (2018)	596 court hearings observed
Sanders & Mace (2006)	19 professionals interviewed (10 social workers, 9 child protection chairs), 89 case documents ^b
Quantitative studies (n=15)	
<i>Surveys (n=15)</i>	
Bala et al. (2013)	<79 representatives ^{a, b}

*Berrick et al. (2019)	1,794 decision-makers (1,636 from Norway, 65 from Finland, 54 from England, 39 from US)
Birnbaum et al. (2013)	Ca. 30 representatives ^{a, b}
Britner & Mossler (2002)	18 representatives (10 CASAs, 8 GALs) ^a
Cooley et al. (2019)	553 representatives
Goldman et al. (1993)	91 representatives
Litzelfelner (2008)	742 (343 child welfare workers, 287 parents/carers (105 biological, 160 foster/adoptive, 22 unidentified) 112 judges/attorneys (48 judges, 47 attorneys, 17 unidentified))
Miller et al. (2017)	100 children
Miller et al. (2019)	792 foster parents
Miller et al. (2020)	934 representatives
Orlebeke et al. (2015)	123 representatives ^a
Pugh & Jones (1999)	39 representatives
Strömpl & Luhamaa (2020)	107 professionals (representatives, child protection workers) ^{a, b}
Stötzel & Fegert (2006)	102 (52 children, 50 representatives)
Weisz & Thai (2003)	CASAs, GALs, and judges surveyed (about 21 court hearings for children who had a CASA and 22 who did not/were on a waiting list for a CASA) ^b
Mixed methods (n=7)	
Augsberger et al. (2016)	49 representatives surveyed, 20 representatives interviewed
Bourton & McCausland (2001)	28 children interviewed, 82 professionals surveyed (44 solicitors, 20 social workers, 18 representatives) ^b
Dalrymple (2002)	10 children interviewed, 29 children surveyed, 1 half-day workshop with representatives ^b
Dalrymple (2005)	Children, representatives, commissioners of representation services ^b
Hill et al. (2003)	557 professionals surveyed (338 panel members, 88 representatives, 56 sheriffs/sheriffs principal, 31 local authorities, 23 sheriff clerks, 21 panel chairs), 109 interviewed individually (25 children, 22 parents, 18 representatives, 18 reporters, 11 social workers, 6 sheriffs/sheriffs principal, 3 panel members/chairs, 3 sheriff clerks, 3 administrators) 13 focus groups (5 with panel members/chairs, 4 with representatives, 3 with workers, 1 with reporters), 115 case files (67 cases with representation, 48 cases without representation)
Hill et al. (2017)	229 professionals surveyed (122 panel members, 62 representatives, 45 social workers), 69 professionals interviewed (30 social workers, 20 panel members, 19 representatives) ^b
Leung (1996)	Rating sheets from 5 judges, case monthly activity records and case evaluation forms from 173 cases (66 cases with CASA, 107 with no CASA, 24 with no CASA but referred) ^a
<p><i>Note.</i> The studies are categorized based on data collection methods, not analysis methods. Surveys are defined as quantitative data collection methods, although they can have qualitative elements. Mixed methods refer to a combination of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. Group concept mapping (i.e., focus group-style brainstorming sessions), used by Miller et al. (2018), is defined as a qualitative data collection method. Unless marked, representatives refer to children's representatives. Abbreviations: GALs = guardians ad litem; CASAs = court-appointed special advocates. * Cross-country study. ^a Broader sample, meaning other sub-samples were included in the studies (e.g., social workers and direct legal representatives) but not used in the section relevant for this review/not relevant for this review of guardian-like representation and thus not reported. ^b Unclear sample/sub-group sample. For more details on ^a and ^b, see article-specific notes in Table A.3.</p>	

Summary of included studies

Table A.3. Research on children’s representation in child protection decisions.

Authors (year)	Country (state)	Sample	Data collection method	Decision type	Research topic relevant for present review
Augsberger et al. (2016) ^{1 2}	US (New York state)	Child welfare attorneys	Surveys (N=49); Interviews (N=20)	Child dependency court proceedings	Perspectives on youth participation in court, including of children as receivers and providers of information and self-advocates
Bala et al. (2013) ³	Canada (Ontario)	Children’s lawyers (N= <79)	Surveys	Child welfare court proceedings	Perspectives on the role of children’s lawyers in two jurisdictions with different policies, including one with a best interest model
Barnes (2007) ⁴	UK	Young people (n=20); Social care workers (n=12); Children’s rights workers (n=9)	Interviews	Looked after children (decision-making, e.g., at review meetings/in complaint procedures)	Perspectives on advocacy services, how advocacy works for children, how an ethic of care perspective fits in with advocacy, and how advocacy impacts on young people’s care arrangements
Barnes (2012)	UK	Young people (n=20); Social workers (n=12); Children’s rights workers (n=9)	Interviews	Looked after children	Perspectives on advocacy (and social work) with young people, including the participants’ views/experiences with the work of children’s rights workers and their understanding of advocacy
Berrick et al. (2019) ⁵	England, Finland, Norway, US (California)	Judicial decision-makers (Norway: n=1,636; Finland: n=65; England: n=54; US: n=39) (N=1,794)	Surveys	Care order proceedings	Perspectives on whether and how children (and parents) are involved in care order proceedings in their systems, including if children have representation

¹ Note on sample: Survey data was not the primary source of data material but was used to contextualize the interviews (Augsberger et al., 2016, p. 582).

² Representation type: The study is included as it says that the attorneys represent children’s interests and wishes (e.g., p. 581). However, whether the focus is guardian representation (by attorneys) or direct legal representation is slightly unclear.

³ Broader/unclear sample: The study also includes domestic disputes (custody/access); this review focuses on child protection. Two provinces are studied, Ontario with a best interest representation model and Alberta with a direct legal representation model (Bala et al., 2013, p. 682); this review focuses on the former. 79 lawyers, including the child welfare and custody/access surveys, were from Ontario. The sample is likely smaller than that.

⁴ Note on sample: Young people’s views are the primary focus over professionals’ views (p. 146).

⁵ Broader research focus: The survey includes a question to judicial decision-makers on representation. It is problematic that guardians and legal representatives are asked about in combination, as the results are not only about guardian representation but also direct legal representation.

Birnbaum et al. (2013) ⁶	Canada (Ontario)	Children's lawyers (N=ca. 30)	Surveys	Child welfare court proceedings	Perspectives of lawyers on children (whom they represent) meeting with judges
Bourton & McCausland (2001) ⁷	England	Children (n=28); Professionals (solicitors: n=44, SWs: n=20, children's guardians: n=18)	Interviews (children); Surveys (professionals) (N=82, about 21 cases)	Public law court proceedings (mainly care and contact proceedings)	Perspectives on the contribution of children's guardians and children's understanding of the guardian role and court process
Boylan & Braye (2006) ⁸	England	Children (n=39); Review meetings (n=16)	Focus groups (n=6); Interviews (n=6); Workshops (n=5); Observation of review meetings	Statutory reviews for looked-after children (i.e., professional network meetings in the local authority)	Perspectives on and evaluation of the contribution of advocacy to children's participation in decision-making
Boylan & Ing (2005) ⁹	England	Children (N=62) (Study 1: n=40; Study 2: n=22)	Interviews; Focus groups	Different decision-making for looked-after children (e.g., reviews, meetings, complaints, representations procedures)	Perspectives on a range of advocacy services, including professional advocacy, and the extent to which the involvement of an advocate facilitated their voices being heard in decision-making
Brennan et al. (2021)	Ireland	SWs and managers (n=26); Solicitors (n=20)	Interviews (solicitors); Focus groups (SWs and managers)	Voluntary care agreements	Perspectives on the strengths and weaknesses of voluntary care agreements as opposed to court decisions, including mechanisms for ascertaining children's views and resource allocation
Britner & Mossler (2002) ¹⁰	US (Virginia)	CASAs (n=10); GALs (n=8)	Surveys	Out-of-home placement decisions	Perspectives on the priority and use information to make placement decisions following instances of child abuse
Brocius et al. (2021) ¹¹	US (Alaska)	CASAs (n=46); GALs (n=23); Local Program Coordinators/LPCs (n=4)	Focus groups (CASAs, GALs); Interviews (LPCs)	Child welfare legal proceedings	Perspectives on the CASA program and essential tasks of CASAs, including CASAs supporting GALs

⁶ Broader/unclear sample: The study also includes domestic disputes (custody/access); this review focuses on child protection. Two provinces are studied, Ontario with a best interest representation model and Alberta with a direct legal representation model; this review focuses on the former. 79 lawyers, including the child welfare and custody/access surveys, were from Ontario. Figure 1 shows n=12, and Figure 2 shows n=30; the highest n is reported.

⁷ Unclear sample: Several subgroups of professionals are included but overall discussed as "professionals" in the analysis, using quotes indicating subgroup. Unclear if quotes are illustrative of the overall sample/due to lacking differences.

⁸ Broader/unclear sample: The study also includes interviews with policymakers and advocates, but whether they are used in the analysis is unclear. It says the number of focus groups and workshops but not the number of participants.

⁹ Decision-type: Note that some children could be in care following a voluntary agreement, not a court order (Boylan & Ing, 2005, p. 4).

¹⁰ Broader sample: The study also includes other professionals' use of information; they are irrelevant to this review. GALs are grouped with judges.

¹¹ Broader research focus: CASAs have broader roles than the representation of children in decision-making, so only parts of theme 1 in the analysis are analyzed.

Burns et al. (2018) ¹²	Ireland	SWs and managers (n=30); Judges (n=8)	Interviews; Focus groups	Child care court proceedings	Perspectives (of SWs/managers first and foremost) on care order proceedings, including their views on GALs
Cooley et al. (2019)	US (Florida)	GALs (N=553)	Surveys	Child protection court proceedings	Perspectives on pathways to and motivations for becoming GALs, including the motivation of advocacy for children
Dalrymple (2002) ¹³	England	Children; Advocates	Interviews (children, n=10); Group meeting/focus group (children, n=4); Evaluations/feedback forms (children, n=29); Workshop (advocates)	FGCs (e.g., decisions made within a family network setting about the care of children)	Perspectives on the efficacy of independent advocacy for children in FGCs
Dalrymple (2005) ¹⁴	England	Children and young people; Advocates; Commissioners of advocacy services	Study 1; Study 2 (Dalrymple (2002)); Study 3; Study 4; Study 5	Children in receipt of welfare services (e.g., statutory reviews, FGCs, complaint procedures, child protection conferences)	Perspectives on how child and youth advocacy is constructed and given meaning by the actors
Dillon (2021) ¹⁵	UK	Children (n=6); Parents (n=4); Participation workers (advocates) (n=3)	Interviews (children, parents); Focus group (participation workers)	Child protection social work intervention (children living at home with their parents)	Perspectives on the gathering of children's wishes and feelings in child protection planning, including through participation workers
Duchscher et al. (2017) ¹⁶	US (Arizona)	GALs (N=5)	Interviews	Child dependency proceedings	Perspectives on and execution of the role of GALs
Enroos et al. (2017) ¹⁷	Finland, Norway	Children's spokespersons (N=16) (Finland: n=9; Norway: n=7)	Interviews	Care order court/court-like proceedings	Perspectives on the role and function of representing children and how spokespersons typically proceed

¹² Broader sample: The study also includes other professionals, but the relevant section for this review is based on data from SWs and judges.

¹³ Unclear sample: The study includes a half-day workshop with representatives (Dalrymple, 2002, p. 293), but whether this is used in the analysis is unclear. I assume that only evaluation/feedback forms for children with independent advocates are used. However, the larger research project also included evaluations from children without advocates or with family advocates (Dalrymple, 2002, p. 293).

¹⁴ Unclear sample: The study draws on material from five studies, which appear to be mainly qualitative accounts. Since one of the studies includes evaluation/feedback forms, the study is counted as mixed method.

¹⁵ Broader sample: The study also includes SWs.

¹⁶ Broader sample: The study also includes children's attorneys/direct legal representation. This review only focuses on those serving as a GAL (n=4) and one equally a GAL/attorney (Duchscher et al., 2017, p. 36).

¹⁷ Broader sample: The study also analyzes policies/legislation.

Foster et al. (2021) ¹⁸	England	Initial and review conferences (n=14) (3 of the former and 11 of the latter); Practitioners (n=35); Conference staff (n=15)	Audio recordings of conferences; Document analysis of conference reports; Interviews with staff (conference chairs, managers, minute takers); Focus groups (n=6) with practitioners	CPCs (child neglect cases)	Perspectives on and evaluation of the extent to which child protection conferences are considered child-focused events by practitioners, including use of advocacy
Føleide (2021)	Norway	Children's spokespersons (N=22)	Interviews	Care order court-like proceedings	Perspectives on speaking with children about their views and wishes
Føleide & Ulvik (2019)	Norway	Children's spokespersons (N=22)	Interviews	Care order court-like proceedings	Perspectives on contradictions and dilemmas in their practice and their interpretation of their mandate
Goldman et al. (1993)	US (Florida)	GALs (N=91)	Surveys	Child dependency proceedings (adjudicated abuse and neglect cases)	Perspectives on the reporting practices of GALs to judges/GALs' provision of information to judges through reports
Healy & Darlington (2009) ^{19 20}	Australia (Queensland)	Child and family advocates (n=7)	Interviews	Family group meetings and courts	Perspectives on involving children (and parents) in child protection practice, including advocacy services for children
Hill et al. (2003)	Scotland	Panel members; Panel chairs; Safeguarders; Sheriffs/sheriffs principal; Sheriff clerks; Local authorities; Children; Parents; Reporters; SWs; Administrators; Case files	Surveys (safeguarders: n=88; local authorities: n=31; panel chairs: n=21; panel members: n=338; sheriffs/sheriffs principal: n=56; sheriff clerks: n=23); Interviews (safeguarders: n=18; sheriffs/sheriffs principal: n=6; panel chairs/members: n=3; administrators: n=3; sheriff clerks: n=3; reporters: n=18; SWs: n=11; children: n=25; parents: n=22); Focus groups (safeguarders: n=4; panel chairs/members: n=5; reporters: n=1; SWs: n=3); Case records	Child welfare proceedings/court-like children's hearings	Perspectives on the role of representatives and their training, monitoring, support, and independence

¹⁸ Unclear sample: The abstract says that 15 interviews with conference staff were conducted; however, Foster et al. (2021, p. 462) say that the data included "semi-structured interviews with conference chairs and their managers (n = 11) and minute takers (n = 15)".

¹⁹ Broader sample: The study also includes other professionals; they are irrelevant to this review. I mainly focus my thematic analysis on the parts explicitly on advocates' perspectives and not when different professionals are addressed generally, as there are many different groups. However, accounts from representatives are almost exclusively grouped with accounts from statutory child protection services.

²⁰ Decision type: The study mentions advocacy in family group meetings and courts, but since the former appears to be the article's focus, the study is categorized as focusing on non-judicial decisions.

			(safeguarder cases: n=67; non-safeguarder cases: n=48)		
Hill et al. (2017) ^{21 22}	Scotland	Panel members; Safeguarders; SWs	Surveys (panel members: n=122; safeguarders: n=62; SWs workers: n=45) Interviews or focus groups (SWs: n=30; panel members: n=20; safeguarders: n=19)	Public law court-like proceedings on the long-term care of children	Perspectives on what constitutes relevant and helpful expertise in public law cases, including/with a special focus on the expertise of safeguarders
Knight & Oliver (2007) ²³	England	Children with disabilities (n=10); Advocates; SWs; Parents	Interviews; Observations (of two advocate—child interactions)	Looked after children in residential/foster care with disabilities (e.g., review and child protection meetings, transition to adult services)	Perspectives on the role of, benefits of, and barriers to advocacy for looked-after disabled children
Leung (1996) ²⁴	US	Cases with CASA (n=66) versus two control groups (n=131) (cases with no CASA, n=107; cases with no CASA but referred, n=24); Judges (n=5)	Case evaluation forms; Case monthly activity records; Judges' rating sheets	Child protection court processes	Perspectives on and evaluation of the time involvement of CASAs and their contribution
LeVezu (2018)	US (Washington)	Court hearings (N=596)	Court observation	Child dependency court proceedings	Evaluation of what is happening in court on a day-to-day basis regarding representation of children
Litzelfelner (2008) ²⁵	US (17 states)	Child welfare workers (n=343); Parents/carers (n=287; 105 biological, 160 foster/adoptive, 22 unidentified); Judges/attorneys (n=112; 48 judges, 47 attorneys,	Surveys	Judicial proceedings on child abuse or neglect	Perspectives on and variation in consumer satisfaction with CASA volunteers

²¹ Decision type: The Scottish hearings system makes compulsory supervision orders about separating the child from the family, including children whose welfare/safety is concerned and children who offend (Hill et al., 2017, p. 43).

²² Unclear sample: The interview and focus group samples are presented combined (Hill et al., 2017, p. 45), although a distinction is made in the analysis. Unclear how many were individually interviewed and participating in focus groups.

²³ Unclear sample: The sample size is unclear, linked to the study being part of a larger project.

²⁴ Broader research focus/sample: The study focuses on a CASA program's effectiveness (regarding placement outcomes) in child protection court processes. A focus on the effectiveness of CASAs without going into how representation is organized is irrelevant, given the broader role of the CASAs. There are also "CASA case review forms" used to measure outcomes (Leung, 1996, p. 275), but since this review does not analyze the full article, this data is not included.

²⁵ Broader research focus: The findings reflect that CASAs have broader roles than only representation of children in decision-making, which also includes support of different kinds to children and families (particularly evident in the thematic analysis to the open-ended question #3 (Litzelfelner, 2008, p. 181ff)).

		17 unidentified)			
Magnussen & Skivenes (2015)	Norway	Written Tribunal rulings (N=53)	Document analysis	Care order court-like proceedings	Evaluation of whether and in what way children participates in care order decisions, including whether children are represented in written decisions and the reasoning surrounding this
Miller et al. (2017)	US (one southeastern state)	Foster youth and alumni (N=100)	Surveys	Dependency proceedings court	Perspectives on the representation children received during dependency court proceedings
Miller et al. (2018)	US (one southeastern state)	Foster youth and alumni (N=31)	Group concept mapping (i.e., focus group-style brainstorming sessions)	Dependency proceedings court	Perspectives of the conceptualization of effective representation for foster youth and priority of aspects of this conceptualization in terms of feasibility and importance
Miller et al. (2019)	US (one southeastern state)	Foster parents (N=792)	Surveys	Dependency proceedings court	Perspectives on the legal representation of foster youth
Miller et al. (2020) ²⁶	US	Attorneys and attorney GALs (N=934)	Surveys	Dependency proceedings court	Perspectives on the legal representation of foster youth
O'Mahony et al. (2016) ²⁷	Ireland	Solicitors (n=15); Judges (n=8); Barristers (n=4)	Interviews; Focus groups	Child care court proceedings	Perspectives on whether the location of child care proceedings within a general courts system is appropriate, including its impact on mechanisms for hearing children
Orlebeke et al. (2015) ²⁸	US (Georgia)	Attorneys/child representatives (N=123)	Surveys/evaluations	Child dependency court cases	Perspectives on the characteristics, experiences, and circumstances of representing children
Parkes et al. (2015) ²⁹	Ireland	SWs and managers (n=30); Solicitors (n=15); GALs (n=10); Judges	Interviews; Focus groups	Child care court proceedings	Perspectives on the extent to which children participate (directly or) indirectly in child care proceedings, including indirectly through GALs

²⁶ Broader research focus: As described in the background and mentioned in the analysis (Miller et al., 2020, pp. 2, 5), attorneys were practicing in states with best interest representation, direct legal models, and hybrid models. Representatives were asked general questions about the current state of the legal representation of children, but they could be answering the questions thinking about the model in their state.

²⁷ Broader sample: The study also includes interviews with GALs, but they do not appear to be used in the section relevant to this review.

²⁸ Broader sample/research focus: The study includes two states (Georgia and Washington); this review focuses on Georgia. In Washington, attorneys almost always represent children's expressed wishes (i.e., a client-directed model); in Georgia, attorneys generally do best interest representation (i.e., a GAL model).

²⁹ Unclear sample: Unclear who participated in interviews and who participated in focus groups.

		(n=8); Barristers (n=4) (N=67)			
Pert et al. (2017)	England	Children (n=25); Foster carers (n=16)	Interviews	Looked after children review meetings	Perspectives on how well children take part in reviews and what factors impede this, including the use of advocates
Pugh & Jones (1999)	Wales	GALs (N=39)	Surveys	Care and adoption court proceedings	Perspectives on the Welsh language (minority language) provision within the GAL service and the views GALs have on bilingualism
Pösö & Enroos (2017) ³⁰	Finland	Court decisions (N=36, about 40 children)	Document analysis	Care order court decisions	Evaluation of the representation of children's views in Finnish written care order court decisions, including its indirect representation by guardians
Ross (2013) ³¹	Australia (New South Wales)	Children's lawyers (N=21)	Interviews	Child protection court proceedings	Perspectives of lawyers on their practice and approach to representation of children and their roles and contact with children
Ruegger (2001)	England	Children (N=47)	Interviews	Public law proceedings (i.e., care and related proceedings)	Perspectives on the nature and quality of the GAL service children received
Sanders & Mace (2006) ³²	Wales	SWs (n=10); Conference chairs (n=9); Conference minutes (n=89)	Interviews (SWs, conference chairs); Document analysis (minutes)	Child protection agency decision-making (particularly review/initial CPCs)	Perspectives on issues and dilemmas surrounding children's participation, including confusion amongst social workers about the purpose of representation, the support of social workers and chairs about representation
Selwyn (1996) ³³	England	Guardians' reports/case files (N=52, about 62 children, where 46 had guardians)	Document analysis	Adoption court proceedings	Evaluation of differences in reports where guardians were appointed and where SWs were involved
Strömpl & Luhamaa (2020) ³⁴	Estonia	Professionals (advocates and child protection workers) (N=107)	Surveys (open- and closed-ended questions)	Child removal judicial proceedings	Perspectives on children's participation in decision-making, including advocates' understanding of child participation and

³⁰ Broader research focus: Guardian-like spokespersons are grouped with legal representatives/advisors.

³¹ Broader research focus: This study includes guardian representation (i.e., independent legal representation) and direct legal representation; this review focuses on the former.

³² Unclear sample: The study included 89 conference minutes, with 35 analyzed in more depth (Sanders & Mace, 2006, p. 101). Unclear why/how these 35 minutes were selected.

³³ Broader research focus: This review focuses on reports by guardians.

³⁴ Broader/unclear sample: The study also includes children's perspectives, but on participation more generally/not on representation. Representatives are grouped with child protection workers when the sample is presented, so the subgroup sample sizes are unclear.

					their competence to support child participation
Stötzel & Fegert (2006) ³⁵	Germany	Children/young people (n=52); Children's guardians (n=50)	Surveys	Court proceedings on endangerment of the child (child abuse/neglect) or removal of the child	Perspectives on the representation of children, satisfaction with representation, and guardians' roles, and whether/how guardians' activities are connected with children's perceptions
Thomson et al. (2017) ^{36 37}	Australia (Australian Capital Territory)	Children's court key stakeholders/court-related workers (e.g., judicial officers, out-of-home providers) (N=46)	Interviews; Focus groups	Children's court proceedings	Perspectives on the quality of and access to representation for children (and parents)
Vis & Fossum (2013)	Norway	Written Tribunal rulings; Spokespersons' reports (N=151 cases)	Document analysis	Dependency court-like proceedings (on care/custody and parental visitation)	Evaluation/comparison of children's views and what was ruled (within a representative arrangement)
Walsh & Douglas (2011) ³⁸	Australia (Queensland)	Child protection lawyers (n=26); Community service providers (n=32)	Interviews (n=21, with lawyers); Focus groups (n=5, with community service providers)	Child protection matters (e.g., court and tribunal/legal proceedings)	Perspectives on the role of advocacy within the child protection system, including advocacy for children
Weisz & Thai (2003) ³⁹	US (Nebraska)	CASAs (volunteers); GALs (attorneys); Judges	Case assessments/surveys about court hearings for children who had a CASA (n=21) or who did not/were on a waiting list for a CASA (n=22)	Child abuse and neglect court hearings (i.e., dispositional, permanency planning, and adoption reviews)	Perspectives on CASAs bringing information to the courts, compared to GALs, and impacting GAL/legal representation of children
<p><i>Note.</i> Year refers to the printed publication year, not early access/online publication. Interviews refer to individual interviews. Focus groups refer to group interviews. Abbreviations: SWs = social workers; GALs = guardians ad litem; CASAs = court-appointed special advocates; FGC = family group conferences; CPC = child protection conferences. For transparency, the sample names that the authors themselves use are here reported.</p>					

³⁵ Note on sample: Some children were subject to court proceedings concerning custody and access, as the representation legislation applies to private and public law cases. 82 guardians provided background information on, e.g., their and children's ages (Section A, Stötzel & Fegert, 2006, pp. 210-213). Since this was a background, the review focuses on the 50 guardians paired with children.

³⁶ Decision type: Children's court dealt with protection and justice, including children who offend.

³⁷ Unclear sample: The study includes various professionals, and the subgroup sample sizes are unclear (Thomson et al., 2017, p. 25).

³⁸ Decision type: The study also examines parents' advocacy in court, tribunals, and family group meetings, but children's advocacy focuses on judicial decision-making in court and tribunals (Walsh & Douglas, 2011, p. 637).

³⁹ Unclear sample: The number of judges, GALs, and CASAs answering the survey is unclear. It is unclear whether there are unique individuals in each of the hearings. If so, there are 39 judges, 21 CASAs, and 19 GALs (Weisz & Thai, 2003, p. 206). The abstract says there were 20 hearings with children on a waiting list, while later in the article, it says there were 22 non-CASA cases (Weisz & Thai, 2003, pp. 206, 208).