

For Child Abuse Review

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Obstacles for child participation in care and protection cases – why Norwegian social workers find it difficult.

By Svein Arild Vis ^a, Amy Holtan ^b and Nigel Thomas ^c

^a Assistant Professor, Child Protection Research Center, University of Tromsø, Norway;

^b Associate Professor, Center for Child and Adolescent Mental Health, University of Tromsø, Norway;

^c Professor, School of Social Work, University of Central Lancashire, UK

Corresponding author: Svein Arild Vis, Barnevernets utviklingscenter, University of Tromsø, 9037 Tromsø, Norway

E-mail: svein.arild.vis@uit.no, Phone: +47 45467979

Word count: 4944

Abstract

Although some attempts are being made to increase children's participation in Norwegian child protection cases, much needs to be done in order to comply with the participation principle in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. This paper reports on a study of factors that are likely to predict if social workers will attempt to give children an effective voice in decision making processes. 54 child protection case managers and 32 social work students participated in a questionnaire survey in which they were asked to agree or disagree with 20 statements about child participation. Statistical factor analysis was used in order to identify underlying factors in the dataset. The results suggest three main reasons for children not being allowed to participate: communication difficulties (communication factor); because child participation was not deemed necessary (participation advocacy factor); or that participation was considered inappropriate because it might be harmful (protectionism factor). This research suggests that, if we are to improve participation within the child protection system, formal regulations and guidelines need to be accompanied by a greater attention to development of social work skills in working with children through participatory processes.

Keywords: child participation, case processing, social worker, attitudes

Introduction

Following the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, part of the Norwegian implementation strategy was to incorporate into national child protection legislation a legal right for children from the age of seven to participate in the processing of their case. This right carries three main elements: (1) children are given information; (2) children are given opportunity to express their own views; (3) children's views are considered and given weight according to age and maturity (Child Welfare Act §6-4). Similar steps have been taken to ensure greater participation by children in decision-making within child protection services in England and Wales, where the regulations and guidance accompanying the Children Act 1989 prescribe that children in care should be able to contribute to their statutory review meetings. These measures have, in effect, closely linked participation for children who are looked after or in care to formal decision-making in case processing. The case manager will be the person responsible for case processing when decisions about delivery of services are about to be made. In this article, we focus on the priorities and attitudes of case managers towards child participation, assuming this may be an important factor in understanding why some children are given the opportunity to participate when others are not. The purpose of this study is to investigate the reasons why social workers find it difficult to include children in decision making processes.

Within social work, development of practical tools and guidance for working with children in decision-making processes has been addressed by a number of authors (O'Kane, 2008; Thomas *et al.*, 1999; Vis, 2005), although most attention seems to have been aimed at decisions made in formal settings such as review meetings, family group conferences or court proceedings. In research, some studies have focused on whether children are taking part in decision-making processes (Sinclair and Boushel, 1998; Thomas, 2005; Thomas and O'Kane, 1999) whether they are influencing outcomes (Bell, 2002; Vis and Thomas, 2009), and what the important factors to enable child participation are (Hill *et al.*, 2004; Sanders and Mace, 2006; Skivenes and Strandbu, 1996). One important finding is that case processing need to be made more 'child-friendly' (Cousins and Milner, 2006; Leeson, 2007; Willumsen and Skivenes, 2005) for children to participate effectively and that participation needs to be viewed as a process rather than a one-off event. Within the context of child protection case processing, participation is about influencing the outcome of a specific decision that will require

some sort of process where arguments are presented and taken into consideration (Franklin and Sloper, 2005; Percy-Smith and Thomas, 2010). The decision-making process is thus an activity that starts with the definition of a problem and ends at a specific point in time when a decision has been reached on a proposal to solve the problem.

Strandbu (2004) proposed that this process may be characterised by five main steps: First the child is given the (1) information that is necessary in order to (2) form an opinion that will have to be (3) expressed in the appropriate setting in order for it to come into (4) consideration when a decision is reached. The outcome will finally have to be (5) explained to the child. (See Lundy 2007 for a similar analysis.) In this process there are some questions that will be addressed in a more formal part of the process and others that will be dealt with in a more informal matter. Formal decisions in a care and protection case will usually relate to the extent and type of services to be offered, leaving practicalities of delivery to be solved later in a different and more informal process that may also involve other decision makers. In many cases, these two processes are going on simultaneously, since formal decisions raise practical questions to be solved and *vice versa*. It has thus been argued that decision-making in care and protection cases is a continuous ongoing process and children will both be able and expect to have a say in some, if not all, of the issues being addressed (Littlechild, 2000). Participation will usually involve discussions with parents/carers and a social worker if it is a less formal decision, but is more likely to include attending meetings or talking to an independent representative or children's advocate if it is a more formal part of the decision-making process.

In a recent study (Vis and Thomas, 2009) of Norwegian care and protection cases, it was found that during a six month period case managers (N=16) had attempted to achieve child participation in 43 cases and that (according to criteria used in the study) effective participation was achieved in 20 (46.5%) of these. The single most important factor affecting participation was whether the child had attended a meeting during the decision-making process. Children who attended meetings were about three times more likely to have an impact on outcomes than those who only participated through individual consultations with a case manager. The study concluded that, although attending meetings is important for children in order to influence decisions, a question

remains why some children are allowed to attend meetings whilst others are not.

The reasons for social workers having differing priorities and attitudes towards children's participation, may be because the idea of children's participation is at the centre of contested discourses about the nature and meaning of childhood (Sanders and Mace, 2006; Wyness, 2006). Thus, attitudes towards participation may be reflecting broader systems of beliefs about children in society that are and have been subject to change through time (Ariès, 1996; Lee, 2001) . One conflicting imperative commonly identified is the view of children as active constructors of meaning versus children as objects of change (Lee, 2001). Opdal (2008) proposed that the differing views on participation can be portrayed as a continuum between child liberating and paternalist approaches, in which the liberator will let children decide for themselves and the paternalist thinks that adults always know what is in children's best interests. Sanders and Mace (2006) argue that the complexity of this dualism has had the effect of making progress on children's participation within child protection 'more challenging and more contentious than in other areas where significant progress has already been made, both in policy and practice' (*ibid.*, 90).

The ambiguity of children's participation becomes particularly evident in child protection cases. This may be attributed to the fact that a child protection case will likely be dealing with issues that are often thought of as adults' problems. For children to be participating in dealing with these problems, children will have to be informed of and involved in what are commonly thought of as adult issues. It is arguably this distinction between children's and adults' worlds that underlies the dichotomy between participation and protection in child care and protection cases. Shemmings (2000) found that social workers' views on participation fell into one of two dichotomous attitudinal positions: a *rights* position expressing almost complete agreement with increased decision-making powers for children, and a *rescue* position reflecting the opposite view. Although most social workers seemed to agree that children should attend conferences, the social workers adhering to the rescue position may have been struggling with the dilemmas posed. Shemmings concluded that to resolve the tension between personal beliefs and official policy, social workers may appear to agree with child participation in principle 'by paying lip service to increasing service user involvement in decision-making' (p.241) while actually subscribing to a less

empowering model of participation in practice.

Ideology may not be the only reason why child participation has proved difficult to achieve in child protection. Other reported barriers towards children's participation include social workers feeling insecure about communicating with children (Vis, 2004) levels of training and supervision (Katz, 1997) and, more generally, lack of skills, confidence and guidance (Alderson, 2008). In a study involving 61 Family Court Advisors (FCAs) in the UK employed by the Children and Family Court Advisory Support Service (CAFCASS)¹, participants were asked whether their training needs had been met in relation to communicating with young children. Twenty-five per cent responded that their needs had been met at qualifying level, 60 per cent only after qualifying and 15 per cent said they had not been met at any time. The study conclude that training in communication with younger children appears to be limited, and that training should include opportunities to develop skills in synthesising and applying theory to practice while working directly with young children, rather than simply following procedures (Handley and Doyle, 2008).

Methods

Data were collected as part of a larger research programme that was commissioned in order to implement and evaluate new ways of working with children in order to increase child participation in decision making within the care and protection system in Norway (see also Vis, 2004; Vis and Thomas, 2009).

Participants

There were two groups of participants in the study. One was a group of child protection case managers, social work graduates recruited from 30 different local municipalities in Norway, who had volunteered to attend a training programme in child participation. The other group were social work students in the final year of a bachelor programme in child protection studies. Data for the study were collected through a questionnaire administered to both groups. The case manager group were asked to complete the questionnaire twice, once before the training programme started and once upon

¹ An agency that undertakes assessments and advises the courts about what decision would be in the best interests of the child.

completion of the programme six months later. The response rates were 100 % (N=54) for the pre-measure and 38 % (N=21) for the post-measure. The majority of these social workers (57%) had less than six years' experience in social work; 39 per cent had between seven and twelve years of experience, and 4 per cent had been in social work for more than twelve years. The total number of participants in the study was 86.

Measures

Twenty statements about participation were formulated on the basis of findings in a previous interview study (Vis, 2004), which identified a broad range of reasons that case managers gave for not including children aged 7-12 years old in decision-making processes. Chief among these were: (1) fear of inducing psychological harm to children; (2) difficulties communicating with children; (3) loyalty issues making it difficult to interpret children's views; (4) children not having the competence to participate; (5) children not wanting to participate; (6) different perceptions of what participation means; (6) a wish to avoid conflicts between children and parents.

Participants in the present study were asked to indicate agreement or disagreement with these statements on a five-point Likert scale.

Analysis

Exploratory statistical factor analysis was applied to the responses to the statements on the questionnaire in order to reduce the quantity of data and to enable exploration of common themes among the statements in the dataset. The analysis was carried out in three main steps. Based on the assumption that variables should correlate fairly well for factor analysis to be appropriate, correlations between all variables were first produced and variables that did not correlate significantly ($p > 0.05$) at $r > .3$ with at least one other variable were excluded (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). The factor analysis was then carried out with eleven remaining variables using the principal component extraction method with Oblimin rotation² (Costello, 2005; Field, 2005).

Factor composite scores were calculated for each of the three factors based on the mean

² Two, three and four factor solutions were examined. A three factor solution explaining 50 per cent of the variance was preferred because it produced more primary loadings and fewer cross loadings than the other solutions. The decision to avoid weak and cross loading variables was based on a criterion for minimal factor loading of 0.32 (Tabachnick and Fidell 2001).

of the items which had their primary loadings on each factor. Differences between case managers pre- training scores and students' scores were tested by the independent means t-test and differences between case managers' pre-training scores and post-training scores were tested with the dependent means t-test.

Results

Data Screening

A data screening process showed that nine of the 20 items on the questionnaire were not suited for factor analysis because they did not correlate significantly ($r > .3$) with any other variable.

The remaining eleven statements were included in the factor analysis. A three factor model was judged to best fit the data. Distribution and statistics for all twenty variables is shown in Appendix 1.

Factor structure

The three identified factors were labelled communication, participation advocacy and protectionism. There was a small correlation between the 'communication' factor and the 'protectionism' factor and minimal correlation between the other factors.³ The factor structure is shown in Table 1.

-- Table 1 about here

Internal consistency for each of the factors was examined using Cronbach's alpha. The alphas were moderate for communication and weaker for the other factors (bearing in mind that they only had three item loadings).

'Communication' factor

The strongest factor from the analysis contained five of the items from the questionnaire that seemed to relate to different aspects of communication with children. First of all, in statements three and six, emphasis is apparently on the problem of knowing whether

³ Pearson $r=.21$, $p=.056$

children are telling ‘the truth’ in the sense that what they are saying reflects their true feelings. Having a good relationship with the child may make it easier for children to say what they ‘really mean’ and knowing a lot about the child may make it easier for the case manager to conduct an evaluation of whether the child’s statements reflect his or her true feelings. Social workers agreeing to this also seem to agree that children do not like to consult with their case manager (statement 2) and that special skills are needed in order to consult with children on how they are doing (statement 1). This also coincides with the view that children should not be allowed to attend meetings.

‘Protectionism’ factor

One common feature of the statements included in the protectionism factor is the emphasis put on the potential burdens for children that may result from participation. This is in particular associated with talking about problems and difficult experiences, as shown in statements 7 and 14. This coincides with the view that establishing short-term relationships should be avoided, suggesting that the relationship between the child and the social worker is itself being seen as a potential risk factor. The concern that having children participate would require them to think and talk about their problems in a way that could be distressing, and that this would have to be dealt with in a therapeutic manner that might require building and maintaining a lasting relationship, is thus identified as one obstacle towards participation (because this may not be possible to achieve within a child protection system). The social workers who tend to agree to these three statements may be seen as taking a protectionist approach towards participation in that they are putting emphasis on potential risks and harm as reasons for not having children participate.

‘Participation advocacy’ factor

The third factor contained statements that seem to relate more directly to whether social workers think participation is really necessary (statement 10) and whether it is in the best interests of children that they get to have their say (statement 13). We have labelled this factor ‘participation advocacy’ because it seems to measure social workers’ inclination to value participation as necessary and valuable regardless of what the chances are that children’s views will change decision outcomes. The social workers who do not think participation is always necessary, or who consider that it is not always in the best interests of the child, may be putting greater emphasis on the results of

participation than the participation process itself, because agreement to statements ten and thirteen was negatively associated with agreement to statement 19. The participation advocates are also more inclined to agree that children should be able to attend decision-making meetings, although this item loaded more heavily onto the 'communication' factor. The case manager not being an advocate for children's participation is obviously going to be an obstacle towards achieving this.

The effects of work experience and participation training

Factor composite scores for the three factors were calculated for each participant by adding the scores on the statements which had their primary loadings on each factor. Differences between how the social workers and the students scored on the three factors that were found to be obstacles towards achieving children's participation were tested (see Table 2).

--Table 2 about here

There was no significant difference between the groups with regard to the communication factor or the protection factor. We did however find that the students scored significantly higher on the participation advocacy factor than the case managers. A high score means the factor represents an obstacle towards participation, so this indicates that case managers were more likely to agree that participation should always be pursued in case processing than students were. Although the case managers were older than the students, age did not explain the differences in child advocate composite scores ($t(59) = -.057, p = .96$). There were not enough men to test for gender differences. When the case managers completed the questionnaire six months after having attended the participation training programme, we found that additional experience in participatory work with children decreased the participation advocacy factor scores further. The other factors did not change significantly.

Relative importance of factors

In order to give an indication of the validity of the factors that have been explored, we used case managers' pre-training factor scores and tested for differences between case managers who had consulted with children about participation the last six months following the training programme, and case managers who had not ($N=21$). The case

managers who had not attempted to initiate children's participation scored higher on all obstacle factors, although only significantly so on protectionism ($p = .003$). This does indicate that the protectionism factor was most important in predicting whether case managers would engage children in participation. To give a crude measure of the impact protectionism had on the likelihood of participation we calculated the odds of participation in relation to protectionism scores. The results show that a standard deviation increase in protectionism scores decreased the likelihood of participation almost seven times⁴. We have to note though that a more thorough evaluation of factor criterion validity would require a larger sample.

Discussion

We identified three main obstacles towards achieving participation based on case managers' and social work students' responses to a 20 statement questionnaire. These were (1) difficulties associated with establishing communication with children in order to elicit and interpret their true feelings, (2) protectionism putting emphasis on protecting rather than empowering children and (3) the degree to which the social worker was advocating the participation principle. This did confirm the notion that there are indeed differing priorities and assumptions among child protection workers on several aspects of children's participation.

Communication with children – personal and organisational barriers

Communicating with children is obviously a requirement for achieving child participation. Where child protection workers do not feel competent or comfortable with carrying out individual consultations with children or having them attend meetings, this may of course be addressed by offering more training and guidance. Indeed, the need for this has been suggested (Coad and Shaw, 2008; Leeson, 2007) and may be one of the most common features of recent attempts to increase participation in Scandinavia and the UK. In the autumn of 2009, The Norwegian Ministry for Children and Equality issued a written guide accompanied by a instructional video on how to set up

⁴ We did so by estimating a simple binary regression model using participation as dependent variable and protectionism scores as dependent variables. Standard deviation for protectionism was 2.58. $OR(2.58)=6.89$, Model $e=2.113$, 95% CI: 1.011 – 4.415.

communication with the child as a part of case planning and processing, in an attempt to increase children's involvement (NMCE, 2009). We are, however, concerned that this may not be a sufficient measure to address the communication obstacle, primarily because this obstacle is also associated with problems establishing relationships with children. (These in turn seem to be related to the ways in which case processing in Norway is organised, with responsibility for assessment, implementation and follow up often being divided between different departments and offices.)

We also suggest that the difficulties child protection workers face in consulting with children are not only related to communication skills, but reflect fundamental characteristics of a child protection system that has been considered by many not to be 'child-friendly' (Cousins and Milner, 2006; Willumsen and Skivenes, 2005). Fragmented responsibilities for delivering health and social services, as well as increasing specialisation of different tasks in child protection case processing, may require children to be in contact with a number of health and social workers as cases move along from initial investigation through assessment, delivery and coordination of services from many agencies. This may be one reason why case managers think not knowing enough about the child, and thus not seeing the whole picture, disqualifies them from engaging children in participation. The fact that communication obstacle scores did not decrease significantly with level of experience, or through direct training in communication with children, is a further indication that some systemic changes may be required if the communication obstacles are to be overcome. The review system in the UK, in which children are invited to mandatory review meetings, is one measure aimed at addressing this problem, and we have earlier (Vis and Thomas, 2009) called for a similar system to be put in place in Norway if children are to be able to participate. The fact that views on whether children should attend meetings feed into the 'communication as obstacle' factor in this study may be a further indication that such meetings need to be made more 'child-friendly'. We may also need to look at ways of organising services that will enable social workers to establish and maintain relationships with children who are in long-term care. We need to address the problem of 'exhausting' children by requiring them to tell the same stories over and over to different social workers, as these children may at some point become very difficult to engage.

Participation advocacy

Even though participation as a fundamental and legal right for children is widely accepted in Norwegian public debate, there does not seem to be consensus among social workers that children should always participate. We do suggest that this may be explained by social workers giving differing meanings to the concept of participation. Some put more emphasis on the outcomes of decision making, others on the process. It may well be that, when emphasis is put on the results of decision-making, participation is seen as less important if room for negotiation is limited or if the child's wishes are thought to have little impact on the decision. The participation advocates are those who think it is always in children's best interests that they get to give their opinions and that children should always be asked what they think before decisions are being made, because being part of a participation process is more important for children than being able to decide what the outcome should be. About 56 per cent of the participants in this study considered it more important for children to 'have their way' as opposed to 42 per cent who thought 'being listened to' more important (see item 19). When participation is understood primarily as a means of getting what you want, it is perhaps reasonable that participation should only be attempted if it could possibly affect the decision in question, otherwise participation will be meaningless when the outcomes are pre-determined or non-negotiable. There are surely many decisions being made in child protection cases in which children's views may have little impact on the decision outcomes – such as whether it is safe for children to stay at home, or whether to offer respite services to parents. Case managers emphasising the results of decision-making may thus be less likely to include children in the process and more likely to think that participation is not always necessary.

The participation advocacy factor was the only one that seemed to differ significantly between students and social workers and between social workers with more or less experience in participatory work. Consulting with children may lead case managers to adjust their understanding of participation, to be more in line with what children seem to think. Thomas and O'Kane (1999) compared the reasons children give for wanting to participate and found that children rated 'to be listened to', 'to have my say' and 'to be supported' as most important, and 'to get what I want' as least important. Social workers with more experience in having children participate are probably more likely to emphasise participation processes.

Students were more likely to think that participation is always necessary, and we found that this idealism decreased with greater experience. This may be an effect of disillusionment among case managers when they come to realize that participation in practice is not so easy to achieve, and that in some cases much effort may lead to very little. It may also be that faced with a system that is not essentially child-friendly, or set up to maximise the impact of children's input, social workers develop a more realistic view of what can be achieved and at what cost. We do not claim to say authoritatively what is the correct level of participation, so we are careful not to characterise students as naive or experienced case managers as cynical. However, we do think that the decreasing enthusiasm for participation that was observed as an effect of facing actual children in real cases, is in itself a problem that will have to be addressed in the process of introducing processes of child participation into services. We need to study the circumstances surrounding these participation processes more closely, in order to assess whether case managers' loss of enthusiasm is rooted in some serious malfunction of the case processing system, or if it is merely the novelty effect wearing off.

Protectionism in social work

The term protectionism is commonly used in the context of economics, referring to policies which 'protect' businesses within a country by restricting or regulating trade with other countries. In a social work context, we suggest that protectionism may be used to describe the action of *restricting the information that children are given, the people they are allowed to meet with or the discussions they are allowed to participate in, with the intent to protect them from possible disturbing or upsetting experiences.* When what is done in the name of protection goes at the expense of children's participatory rights, and when all aspects of a case are viewed in terms of risk and danger, protection turns to protectionism. The '-ism' in protectionism refers to the ideology of protection. The protectionism concept may also be related to prevalent discourses about children and childhood. The notion of children as vulnerable creatures, reflected sometimes in the way introductions to child development are being taught in social work training with its emphasis on risks and pathology, may be partly responsible for some social workers seeing participation only in terms of possible risks and dangers.

The protectionism scores of case managers significantly predicted whether they would attempt to engage children in the case process. Although we do not agree that participation done sensitively poses any real threat or harm for children's development and well being, we have to acknowledge that some case managers do think so. Whether it is helpful towards overcoming the protectionism obstacle or not, we do call for more research to be conducted in order to identify in more detail the benefits and side effects associated with participation in its various forms and circumstances.

Limitations

We acknowledge that exploratory factor analysis is a process that has to be carried out with great discretion. In eliminating nine items from analysis we decided to not consider possible obstacles towards participation that were represented by responses to single statements. This may have led us to overlook some important obstacles. We also think that, although it does fit theory, because the factor solution that was finally chosen is statistically weak on some measures, another solution might be preferred with a different sample.

We did not set out to construct or validate a questionnaire, and would advise against any use of these questions in order to diagnose or predict the actions of individual case managers.

Conclusions

This study found that the reason why many Norwegian case managers in child protection services are not engaging children in decision making, despite the fact that child participation has explicitly been made mandatory through regulations in the Norwegian Child Welfare Act may be attributed to three main factors. First, some social workers will never attempt to facilitate participation because they are afraid of harming children in the process. Second, others do think that participation is necessary, and will try to work with children in a participatory way, but may eventually come to realise the difficulty and complexity of achieving effective participation in the context of child protection case processing. Finally, social workers may feel that they do not have the communication skills needed to engage children and that organisational barriers will sometimes not allow them to develop the necessary relationships.

We do conclude that communication skills training and guidance is necessary and argue that in order to reduce barriers towards child participation, social work training and guidance should also put greater emphasis on ways of working with children in participation processes rather than ‘hearing’ children for the sake of decision-making. We also need to look into ways of making case processing more ‘child-friendly’ in order to overcome organisational barriers.

The fact still remains that if case managers for some reason do think that participation is harmful for children, they will not facilitate it. More research may be warranted on the possible benefits and disturbances associated with new attempts to include children. However, we may have to admit that, even if we could prove that participation is as healthy as vegetables, we still would not know how to convince everybody to do it.

References

- Alderson, P. (2008) *Young children’s rights : exploring beliefs, principles and practice*, London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Ariès, P. (1996) *Centuries of childhood*, London, Pimlico.
- Bell, M. (2002) Promoting children’s rights through the use of relationship. *Child & Family Social Work*, 7, 1-11
- Coad, J. E. and Shaw, K. L. (2008) Is children’s choice in health care rhetoric or reality? A scoping review. *J Adv Nurs*, 64, 318-27. JAN4801 [pii] DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2008.04801.x
- Costello, A. and Jason, W. (2005) Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 10.
- Cousins, W. and Milner, S. (2006) Children’s rights: A cross-border study of residential

- care. *Irish Journal of Psychology*, 27, 88-96.
- Field, A. (2005) *Discovering statistics using SPSS*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Franklin, A. and Sloper, P. (2005) Listening and responding? Children's participation in health care within England. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 13, 11-29.
- Handley, D. and Doyle, C. (2008) Giving young children a voice in legal proceedings. *XVIIth ISPCAN International Congress*. Hong Kong, China SAR.
- Hill, M., Davis, J., Prout, A. and Tisdall, K. (2004) Moving the participation agenda forward. *Children & Society*, 18, 77-96.
- Katz, I. (ed.) (1997) *Approaches to empowerment and participation in child protection*., Chichester, John Wiley/NSPCC.
- Lee, N. (2001) *Childhood and society : growing up in an age of uncertainty*, Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Leeson, C. (2007) My life in care: Experiences of non-participation in decision-making processes. *Child and Family Social Work*, 12, 268-277. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2206.2007.00499.x>
- Littlechild, B. (2000) Children's rights to be heard in child protection processes -- law, policy and practice in England and Wales. *Child Abuse Review*, 9, 403-415
- Lundy, L. (2007) 'Voice is not enough': Conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, *British Education Research Journal* 33(6), 927-942.
- NMCE (2009) *Snakk med meg* Norwegian Ministry of Children and Equality, Q-1156 B.

- O’Kane, C. (2008) The development of participatory techniques: Facilitating children’s views about decisions which affect them, in Christensen, P. and James, A. (eds) *Research with Children: perspectives and practices*. (2nd edition) London, RoutledgeFalmer.
- Opdal, P. M. (2008) *Pedagogisk-filosofiske analyser*, Bergen, Fagbokforl.
- Percy-Smith, B. and Thomas, N. (eds) (2010) *A Handbook of Children and Young People’s Participation : perspectives from theory and practice*, London: Routledge.
- Sanders, R. and Mace, S. (2006) Agency policy and the participation of children and young people in the child protection process. *Child Abuse Review*, 15, 89-109.
- Shemmings, D. (2000) Professionals’ attitudes to children’s participation in decision-making: Dichotomous accounts and doctrinal contests. *Child & Family Social Work*, 5, 235-243. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2206.2000.00160.x>
- Sinclair, R. and Boushel, M. (1998) Involving Children in Planning their Care. *Child & Family Social Work*, 3, 137-142.
- Skivenes, M. and Strandbu, A. (1996) A child perspective and children’s participation. *Children. Youth and Environments*, 16, 10-27.
- Strandbu, A. (2004) Children’s participation in family group conference as a resolution model. *International Journal of Children and Family Welfare*, 7, 207-227.
- Tabachnick, B. G. and Fidell, L. S. (2001) *Using multivariate statistics*, Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon.
- Thomas, N. (2005) Has anything really changed? Managers’ views of looked after children’s participation in 1997 and 2004. *Adoption & Fostering*, 29, 67-77.
- Thomas, N. and O’Kane, C. (1999) Children’s participation in reviews and planning

meetings when they are looked after in middle childhood. *Child and Family Social Work*, 4, 221-230.

Thomas, N., O’Kane, C., Phillipson, J. and Davies, E. (1999) *Children and Decision Making: a training and resource pack*, University of Wales Swansea: International Centre for Childhood Studies (available from the first author).

Vis, S. A. (2004) Samtale med barn i barnevernet. *Skriftserie*. Tromsø, Barnevernets utviklingscenter i Nord Norge.

Vis, S. A. (2005) Barn og beslutninger. Barnevernets utviklingscenter i Nord Norge: Tromsø

Vis, S. A. and Thomas, N. (2009) Beyond talking -- children’s participation in Norwegian care and protection cases. *European Journal of Social Work*, 12, 155-168.

Willumsen, E. and Skivenes, M. (2005) Collaboration between service users and professionals: legitimate decisions in child protection -- a Norwegian model. *Child & Family Social Work*, 10, 197-206.

Wyness, M. (2006) Children, young people and civic participation: regulation and local diversity. *Educational Review*, 58, 209-218.

Table 1: Factor loadings and communalities for items in three factor solution.

	Factor 1: Commun ication	Factor 2: Participation advocacy	Factor 3: Protectioni sm	Comm unality
3.It is important to know as much as possible about the child before the first consultation	.74			.56
2.Children normally don't like to talk to social workers	.73			.53
12. Children should not attend meetings	.62	-.33		.52
6. It is easier for children to say what they really mean if they know you well	.60			.39
1.Special skills are needed in order to talk to children about how they are doing	.58			.41
19. It is more important for children to be listened to than to have it their way		.79		.64
13. It is not always in the best interest of the child that children get to give their opinion before decisions are made.		-.69		.50
10. It is not always necessary to ask children what they think before decisions concerning them are made.		-.63		.46
14. Talking about their problems is an additional burden for children			.73	.56
7.One should be careful about asking children about any difficult experiences they may have had			.68	.50
8. One should not establish relations with children if they can not be maintained			.63	.40
Eigenvalues	2.47	1.68	1.32	
Variance explained	22%	15%	12%	
Cronbach's alpha	.68	.55	.49	

Note: Only values above 0.32 are shown. Bartlett's test $\chi^2(55)=123.8 p<0.001$. The first factor not retained had Eigenvalue of 1.00

Table 2: Composite score differences between case managers and students

	Mean (SD) Students versus case managers		p- values	Mean (SD) Case manager pre training versus case manager post training.		p- values
	Student (n=33)	Case managers scores (n=51)		Pre (n=51)	Post (n=21)	
Communication	13.8 (3.4)	14.4 (4.0)	.416	13.1 (4.0)	12.4(3.3)	.445
Participation advocacy	8.3 (1.5)	6.3 (2.0)	.000*	6.3 (1.9)	5.2 (2.0)	.030*
Protectionism	8.1 (2.5)	7.9 (2.7)	.797	7.8 (3.0)	7.4 (2.7)	.560

* Statistically significant

Appendix 1: Respons to statements about child participation (N=86)

Statements sorted by factor	% Totally disagree	% Disagree	% Neutral	% Agree	% Totally agree	Mean (sd)	Kurtosis	Skewness
Communication factor								
statements:								
1.Special skills are needed in order to talk to children about how they are doing	7.3	15.9	1.2	58.5	17.1	3.62 (1.16)	-.01	-1.01
2.Children normally don't like to talk to their case manager	19.0	42.9	20.2	16.7	1.2	2.38 (1.35)	-.63	.44
3.It is important to know as much as possible about the child before the first consultation	19.0	36.9	6.0	26.2	11.9	2.75 (1.35)	-1.29	.29
6. It is easier for children to say what they really mean if they know you well	7.1	23.8	17.9	35.7	15.5	3.29 (1.20)	-.98	-.27
12. Children should not be allowed to attend meetings	30.1	38.6	22.9	8.4	0	2.10 (.93)	-.67	.45
Protectionism Statements:								
7.One should be careful about asking children about any difficult experiences they may have had	20.2	33.3	11.9	29.8	4.8	2.65 (1.24)	-1.26	.18
8. One should not establish relations with children if they cannot be maintained.	9.5	26.2	13.1	38.1	13.1	3.19 (1.24)	-1.12	-.26
14. Talking about their problems is an additional burden for children	33.3	41.7	8.3	9.5	7.1	2.15 (1.20)	.29	1.08
Participation advocacy								
statements:								
10. It is not always necessary to ask children what they think before decisions concerning them are made.	32.5	26.5	10.8	23.5	11.8	2.48 (1.38)	-1.16	.46
13. It is not always in the best interest of the child that children get to give their opinion before decisions are made.	44.0	32.1	10.7	13.1	0	1.93 (1.04)	-.42	.87

19. It is more important for children to be listened to than to have it their way	47.6	8.3	2.4	13.1	28.6	2.67 (1.79)	-1.77	.31
<hr/>								
Statements not included in factor analysis:								
4. Child consultations are hard to plan because communication is spontaneous	13.1	23.8	16.7	35.7	10.7	3.07 (1.25)	-1.12	-2.28
5. It is important not to put children in conflicts of loyalty.	1.2	0	7.5	20.5	71.1	4.60 (.73)	6.59	-2.28
9. Children should not be pressured into talking about their problems	0	6	8.4	30.1	55.4	4.35 (.88)	1.00	-1.31
11. One should not consult with the child unless the parents agrees to it	12.3	22.2	14.8	35.8	14.8	3.19 (1.29)	-1.11	-.28
15. It is important to ask questions the right way	0	2.4	2.4	30.5	64.6	4.57 (.67)	3.89	-1.81
16. It is difficult to know if children are telling the truth	4.8	31.0	25.0	36.9	2.4	3.01 (.99)	-1.02	-.18
17. Children prefer to communicate through non verbal activities	0	7.2	22.9	52.3	15.7	3.78 (.80)	.02	-.48
18. Adults can better predict consequences from children's choices	0	11.3	12.5	45.0	31.3	3.96 (.95)	-.22	-.75
20. Children may be reluctant to say what they really mean	0	8.4	14.5	43.4	33.7	4.02 (.91)	-.13	-.75

Note: Respondents scored on a five point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).