Southern Cross University
ePublications@SCU

Centre for Children and Young People Papers | Centre for Children and Young People

2011

Building capacity for ethical research with children and young people: an international research project to examine the ethical issues and challenges in undertaking research with and for children in different majority and minority world contexts

Mary Ann Powell
University of Otago

Anne Graham
Centre for Children and Young People, Southern Cross University

Nicola J. Taylor
University of Otago

Sallie Newell
Centre for Children and Young People, Southern Cross University

Robyn Fitzgerald
Centre for Children and Young People, Southern Cross University

Publication details

Powell, MA, Graham, A, Taylor, NJ, Newell, S & Fitzgerald, R 2011, *Building capacity for ethical research with children and young people: an international research project to examine the ethical issues and challenges in undertaking research with and for children in different majority and minority world contexts*, report prepared for the Childwatch International Research Network, Oslo, Norway.
© 2011 University of Otago Centre for Research on Children and Families
This work may be reproduced, in whole or part, for study or training purposes, subject to the inclusion of an acknowledgement of the source. It should not be used for commercial purposes.

ePublications@SCU is an electronic repository administered by Southern Cross University Library. Its goal is to capture and preserve the intellectual output of Southern Cross University authors and researchers, and to increase visibility and impact through open access to researchers around the world. For further information please contact epubs@scu.edu.au.

Centre for Children and Young People

research, education & advocacy

UNIVERSITY of OTAGO

SAPERE AUDE

Te Whare Wānanga o Otāgo

NEW ZEALAND

Southern Cross UNIVERSITY

A new way to think

BUILDING CAPACITY FOR ETHICAL RESEARCH WITH CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

AN INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH PROJECT TO EXAMINE THE ETHICAL ISSUES AND CHALLENGES IN UNDERTAKING RESEARCH WITH AND FOR CHILDREN IN DIFFERENT MAJORITY AND MINORITY WORLD CONTEXTS

Childwatch INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH NETWORK

March 2011

PREPARED BY:

UNIVERSITY OF OTAGO

DR MARY ANN POWELL

DR NICOLA TAYLOR

CENTRE FOR CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE

DR SALLIE NEWELL

PROFESSOR ANNE GRAHAM

DR ROBYN FITZGERALD

PLEASE CITE THIS REPORT AS: Powell, M.A., Graham, A., Taylor, N.J., Newell, S., & Fitzgerald, R. (2011, March). *Building Capacity for Ethical Research with Children and Young People: An International Research Project to Examine the Ethical Issues and Challenges in Undertaking Research with and for Children in Different Majority and Minority World Contexts* (Research Report for the Childwatch International Research Network). Dunedin: University of Otago Centre for Research on Children and Families / Lismore: Centre for Children and Young People.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THIS REPORT can be accessed at:
http://epubs.scu.edu.au/ccyp_pubs/32

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to gratefully acknowledge:

- The many researchers who shared their time and experiences to respond to this international survey, often in considerable depth.
- Our Thematic Study Group partners for their ongoing contributions to the development and implementation of this research project:
  - Emeritus Professor Jan Mason, Associate Professor Natalie Bolzan and Dr Janet Falloon from the Social Justice and Social Change Research Centre at the University of Western Sydney, Australia;
  - Professor Rebecca Wallace from the Centre for Rural Childhoods at Perth College University of the Highlands Millennium Institute, Scotland.
- Dr Renata Phelps, Centre for Children and Young People, Southern Cross University, Lismore, NSW, Australia.
- The Childwatch International Research Network for their financial support of, and interest in, the *Building Capacity for Ethical Research with Children and Young People* Thematic Study Group.
- The Widjabul people, from the Bundjalung Nation, who are the traditional custodians of Lismore, where the Centre for Children & Young People is based.

NOTE: All quotes from open survey responses are presented in this report exactly as they were entered into the online survey, including any typographical or grammatical errors. Only minor edits have been made to enhance their readability.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT:

Professor Anne Graham – Thematic Group Chairperson

Mail: Southern Cross University, PO Box 157, Lismore, NSW 2480, Australia

Phone: +61 2 6620 3613 ***Fax:*** +61 2 6620 3243 ***Email:*** anne.graham@scu.edu.au

© 2011 University of Otago Centre for Research on Children and Families

This work may be reproduced, in whole or part, for study or training purposes, subject to the inclusion of an acknowledgement of the source. It should not be used for commercial purposes.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY **1**
- Context For This Report 1
- Overview Of The Project Methods 1
- Sample Characteristics 1
- Main Findings 2
- Recommendations For The Future 6

INTRODUCTION **7**
- Project Background 7
- About The Childwatch International Research Network 7
- About the Thematic Study Group 7
- Project Rationale 8

METHOD **9**
- Survey Development 9
- Sampling Approach 9
- Survey Delivery Approach 10
- Data Processing and Analyses 10

RESULTS **11**
- Sample Characteristics 11
  - Survey response rates 11
  - Participant characteristics 11
- Country Context 12
  - Age defining a child 12
  - Recognition of the age defining a child 13
  - Including children's views in research 14
  - Reasons for not including children's views in research 15
  - Importance placed on including children's views 18
  - Children as researchers and co-researchers 19
- Researcher Context 20
  - Focus of participants' research 20
  - Inclusion of children's view in participants' own research 21
  - Methods used to gather children's views 21
  - Consent for children to participate in research 23
  - Influences on research 23
  - Issues restricting children's inclusion in research 25
  - Ethical issues of most concern to researchers 26
  - Cross cultural research 30
  - Issues restricting children's inclusion in cross cultural research 31
- Researcher Training And Resources 32
  - Training, support and mentoring of researchers 32
  - Nature of the training 33
  - Details of training 33
  - Publications and resources on the ethics of conducting research with children 34
  - Resources that would be helpful to researchers 35
  - Accessing resources 36
  - Additional comments 37

DISCUSSION **38**
WHERE TO FROM HERE? **40**
REFERENCES **42**
APPENDICES **43**
APPENDIX A: CHILDWATCH INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH ETHICS SURVEY 43
APPENDIX B: PROJECTS WITH CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE AS RESEARCHERS OR CO-RESEARCHERS . 45
APPENDIX C: MAIN FOCUS OF PARTICIPANTS' RESEARCH PROJECTS 50
APPENDIX D: PUBLICATIONS AND RESOURCES ON ETHICS OF CONDUCTING RESEARCH WITH CHILDREN .. 54
APPENDIX E: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS 58

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CONTEXT FOR THIS REPORT

The Childwatch International Research Network is a global, non-profit, non-governmental network of institutions that collaborate in child research for the purpose of promoting child rights and improving children's well-being around the world. In April 2010, the Childwatch Board approved the establishment of a new Thematic Study Group to undertake an international scoping project entitled *Building Capacity for Ethical Research with Children and Young People.* This project aimed to identify the ethical issues and challenges in undertaking research with and for children and young people in different majority and minority world contexts; and to identify and collate existing ethics guidelines and resources. It was anticipated that the findings would extend existing knowledge and provide information and resources that could usefully contribute to promoting the conduct of ethical, respectful research in different cultural and social contexts.

This report presents the findings from the Childwatch project. To the best of our knowledge it is the first international project of its kind to identify and explore the ethical issues facing researchers, in a range of contexts, when undertaking research with children, particularly in relation to participatory research with children.

OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT METHODS

This project used purposive and snowball sampling methods to recruit participants, issuing invitations through specific child research focused international networks. Researchers who undertake research with children were invited to participate in an online survey, which could be accessed through a website link in the email invitation. The survey was administered using Qualtrics online survey software and was open from November 2010 until February 2011. The completed surveys were collated, coded and analysed using thematic, descriptive and comparative approaches.

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

This report presents the data collected from 257 researchers who participated in the online survey. Participants came from 46 countries, with 39 based in Majority world countries and 213 based in Minority world countries. The majority of participants were female and ages ranged from below 30 years to over 60 years. The median age group of participants was 41 to 50 years. The participants had varying amounts of experience in research with children, with over two thirds of the sample having six or more years experience. Over half the participants very often include children's views in their own research.

MAIN FINDINGS

1. **A 'child' is defined, and widely recognised, in most countries as under 18 years of age.**

- Almost all participants reported that the age defining a 'child' is under 18 years in their country.
- The recognised age of a 'child' varies in accordance with social, cultural, legal and policy contexts.
- In some contexts there is a differentiation between 'child' and young person and/or very young child.

2. **Children's views are included in research at least some of the time in most countries.**

- Almost all participants, across both Majority and Minority world contexts, indicated that children's views are at least 'occasionally' included in child-relevant research within their country.
- Only 2% of participants thought children's views are never included.
- Reasons for not including children's views are related to features of the research project itself (research design, method or resources), perceptions of children and/or adults' competence, and external considerations (such as ethics requirements and policy).
- There is a perception that the inclusion of children's views in research is increasing.

3. **Key stakeholders are perceived as placing different amounts of importance on inclusion of children's views in research.**

- Children themselves are perceived to place the most importance on inclusion of their views in research.
- Researchers and professionals who work with children are perceived as placing some/quite a bit of importance on this.
- Funders are seen as placing very little/some importance on including children's views.
- Policy makers are perceived as placing the least, or no, importance on children's views.

4. **Over two thirds of researchers were aware of projects in which children had been researchers or co-researchers.**

- Participants from Minority world countries are more aware of research in which children had been researchers or co-researchers than Majority world researchers.
- Nearly half the Majority world researchers are not aware of any such projects.

5. **Researchers use a wide range of methods to gain children's views, and most often those that involve directly listening to and observing children.**

- The most frequently used methods of gaining children's views, consistent across Majority and Minority world contexts, are talking with children individually and in groups, and observing children.
- The least often used methods are inviting children to complete standardised tests and surveys.
- Researchers also use a wide range of creative methods to gain children's views.

6. **Most researchers require both parent/carer(s) and children's consent for children to participate in research.**

- Approximately two thirds of researchers require the consent of parents/carers for children to take part in research, and more than this require children's own consent.
- This does not vary much over different contexts.

7. **The three major influences on the way researchers do research with children are the same in Majority and Minority world countries.**

- The three major influences on the way researchers do research with children are: researchers' own ethical principles, their previous experiences, and their institutional ethics requirements.
- These three influences are perceived as being 'major' by over two thirds of Minority world researchers and over half of Majority world researchers.

8. **Other influences on the way researchers do research with children vary in different contexts.**

- Nearly a third of Majority world researchers are not aware of any national ethics standards, guidelines or requirements, whereas nearly half of Minority world researchers consider national ethics standards/ requirements to be a major influence on the way they do research with children.
- Published and/or online resources are a slightly greater influence for Majority world researchers than those in Minority world countries.
- Informal advice and/or support from colleagues and collaborators are a slightly greater influence for Minority world researchers than those in Majority world countries.
- Researchers who very often include children's views in their research find informal advice/support from colleagues and formal training/mentoring more of an influence, than researchers who include children's views less.

9. Researchers' capacity to include children in research is restricted by a range of issues.

- The issues most restricting researchers' capacity to include children's views in their research are: concerns about anonymity, families/communities not wanting children to participate, confidentiality, overly-protective ethical review processes, and a sensitive topic that may upset the child.
- The issues least restricting researchers' capacity to include children's views in research are: concerns about their own ability to undertake research with children or concerns about religious beliefs and practices.
- Ethical issues do not necessarily restrict researchers' capacity to include children as they are aware of the issues and/or have strategies to manage them.

10. The ethical issues that concern researchers differ, particularly across Majority and Minority world contexts.

- Overly-protective ethical review processes and consent/gatekeeper/access issues are the greatest concern for: researchers overall; Minority world researchers; researchers with greater than 5 years experience; and researchers who very often include children in their research. They are of less concern to researchers based in Majority world countries.
- Majority world researchers are also less concerned than Minority world researchers about keeping children's views confidential or that children may be coerced.
- The greatest concerns for Majority world researchers include cultural beliefs about children's place or role in society, fear for the child's safety, and concern that the topic is sensitive and may upset the child.

11. Researchers who undertake cross cultural research with children have the same, and additional, ethical concerns.

- Cross cultural research was undertaken more by Majority world researchers than those based in the Minority world.
- The key issues most frequently restricting participants' capacity to include children's views in cross cultural research were families/communities not wanting children to participate, anonymity, confidentiality, cultural beliefs about children's place or role in society, and overly-protective ethical review processes.
- Four of the five most restrictive issues concur with issues restricting the inclusion of children's views in research generally.
- Cultural beliefs about children's place/role in society are more restrictive for researchers undertaking cross cultural research.

12. Most researchers have a combination of formal and informal training

- Over half the researchers had a combination of formal and informal training in relation to conducting research with children, and most thought they had 'just enough' training.
- Formal training includes graduate and postgraduate academic courses, attendance at workshops and training courses, and supervision/mentoring within academic and professional contexts.
- Informal training includes collegial sharing and discussion, and the researcher's own research experience and reading.
- Some personal and professional experiences provide researchers with skills related to children that are transferable to research contexts.

13. Researchers identified resources that have been helpful in guiding and informing their work.

- Researchers identified a number of specific publications and authors which help guide and inform the undertaking of research with children.
- Researchers based in Majority world countries placed a greater emphasis on publications than on other forms of resource.

14. Researchers need greater access to resources to help guide and inform their work undertaking research with children.

- Researchers are not sure what resources exist and find them difficult to locate and/ or access.
- Environmental and resource issues impact negatively on researchers being able to access publications and resources in Majority world countries.
- Participants identified a wide range of potentially helpful resources including: publications, researcher networks and conferences, ethical codes/guidelines, research examples/case studies and online resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

The project has drawn on and enriched the existing knowledge base about ethical research within the Childwatch Network, and capitalised on the information shared at the Child Participatory Research Roundtable at the 2009 *Children's Rights at a Crossroads Conference* in Addis Ababa. It has provided useful information about the ethical issues and challenges facing researchers undertaking research with children. Existing resources and publications that provide guidelines to researchers have been identified and collated. The information can be used to expand the existing Child Research Methodology section of the Childwatch website, interface with the work of the Childwatch Training Courses for Young Researchers to build research capacity, and extend the work already achieved in other Thematic Study Groups. The project has provided a valuable opportunity to explore the merits and challenges faced by researchers and to identify 'best practice' internationally in relation to ethical research with and for children and young people.

The online survey was effectively a scoping exercise for the first phase of the Thematic Study Group's work. We anticipate drawing on the material collected to identify further phases of the project and will be aiming to maintain the broader involvement of majority world Key Institutions in any subsequent activities. Possible future initiatives to showcase the application of ethical principles in different research contexts include: i) an international action research project (incorporating children and young people's participation); ii) collaborating with the existing Childwatch training programs for young and emerging researchers; iii) developing training and seminar opportunities for more experienced researchers; and iv) enhancing accessibility to the recommended resources on ethical research with children and young people via the Childwatch website.

INTRODUCTION

PROJECT BACKGROUND

In April 2010 the Board of the Childwatch International Research Network approved the establishment of a new Thematic Study Group to undertake an international scoping project entitled *Building Capacity for Ethical Research with Children and Young People*. This project aimed to:

- identify the ethical issues and challenges in undertaking research with and for children and young people in different majority and minority world contexts; and
- identify and collate existing ethics guidelines and resources in use in different countries that could potentially be translated, analysed and disseminated amongst researchers in the Childwatch network - and beyond – as a way of promoting the conduct of ethical, respectful research in different cultural and social contexts.

It arose from Childwatch's commitment to encouraging ethical research practices by providing up-to-date information, training and resources to help its Key Institutions and other researchers undertake high-quality, effective and creative research studies with children and young people.

ABOUT THE CHILDWATCH INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH NETWORK

Childwatch International is a global, non-profit, non-governmental network of institutions that collaborate in child research for the purpose of promoting child rights and improving children's well-being around the world. It was founded in 1993 as a response from the research community to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) - an instrument for changing the focus of research and for ensuring that the perspectives of children are heard. The Convention is the basis for the Network's common agenda. Fifty Key Institutions within the field of child, youth and family research are the core of the Childwatch research network. These Institutions represent all continents and a variety of disciplines. See www.childwatch.uio.no for further information.

ABOUT THE THEMATIC STUDY GROUP

The Thematic Study Group *Building Capacity for Ethical Research with Children and Young People* is comprised of experienced researchers from four Childwatch Key Institutions in Australia, New Zealand and Scotland:

- Professor Anne Graham (Chairperson), Dr Robyn Fitzgerald, Dr Sallie Newell and Dr Renata Phelps, Centre for Children and Young People, Southern Cross University, Lismore, NSW, Australia;
- Dr Nicola Taylor and Dr Mary Ann Powell, Centre for Research on Children and Families, University of Otago, New Zealand;
- Emeritus Professor Jan Mason, Associate Professor Natalie Bolzan and Dr Janet Falloon, Social Justice and Social Change Research Centre, University of Western Sydney, Australia; and
- Professor Rebecca Wallace, Centre for Rural Childhoods, Perth College University of the Highlands Millennium Institute, Scotland.

PROJECT RATIONALE

Including children as participants in social research raises many ethical dilemmas for researchers. Ethical and methodological choices made by researchers clearly impact on children's participation in research (Powell & Smith, 2009). 'Research ethics' is understood as a concept that varies from place to place, but a universal challenge facing researchers is balancing the interests of the child with those of the community/society/family and the goals of research studies (Morrow, 2008). Legal responsibilities to uphold children's rights within the research process, enshrined by the UNCRC, sit alongside researcher obligations to respect the principles of justice, consent, confidentiality and avoiding doing harm to child participants – whether they are subjects, respondents or researchers themselves.

The guidance available on ethical issues involved in including children in research is variable; ethics documentation can lack specificity and ethics committees vary widely in their responses, tending to focus on children's vulnerability and need for protection (Powell & Smith, 2006). Perceptions of children's vulnerability and competence are one of the key issues in making decisions about children's participation in research. Discussion of ethics in research can be reduced to a conflict between children's right to be protected and their right to have a voice (Sandbaek, 1999). Researchers have to find the balance between protection and participation to enable children to be heard - without exploiting or distressing them - and protected, without silencing and excluding them (Alderson & Morrow, 2004).

The Thematic Study Group initiative was specifically designed to address the child research capacity building objective identified at the 2009 Childwatch Key Institutions Assembly held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. By providing up-to-date information/resources and identifying current issues specific to research contexts internationally it will help to support researchers to walk the ethics tightrope (van den Hoonard, 2002) in the pursuit of high-quality, effective and respectful research with children (Morrow, 2008; Powell & Smith, 2006). A particular focus of the study has been on the ethical issues that arise in participatory research with children; an approach to research that is widely utilized in Majority and Minority world contexts and which allows for strengthening the qualities of childhood, including in contexts which rely on low-cost, locally adapted and creative research approaches (Nieuwenhuys, 2004).

METHOD

SURVEY DEVELOPMENT

During 2010, an online survey was developed by members of the Thematic Study Group. Consultations were undertaken with Majority world researchers in Nigeria, Jordan, South Africa and Colombia to help ensure the ethical issues they face in research with children and young people were adequately taken into account. The project was formally reviewed and approved by the Southern Cross University's Human Research Ethics Committee (approval number: ECN-10-184). See Appendix A for a copy of the survey.

SAMPLING APPROACH

In November 2010, a wide range of researchers who undertake research with children and young people were invited to participate in the survey. Purposive and snowball sampling methods were used to specifically target researchers from Majority and Minority world countries.

The terms Majority and Minority world are used to broadly delineate two different world areas - Majority world refers to the world area in which most of the world's population live, the economically poorer countries sometimes referred to as the 'developing world', namely Africa, Asia and Latin America. Minority world refers to the economically more privileged countries, such as Europe, United States, Australia and New Zealand. This fairly broad distinction is problematic, as are all dichotomies, as not all countries fit neatly into one area. However, distinguishing between the two has been useful in the context of this study so as to enable "the reader to reflect on the unequal relations between these two world areas previously referred to with negative connotations (Third/First World) or with geographical inaccuracy (North/South, or East/West)" (Punch, 2001, p. 819).

To determine which countries were in the Majority or Minority world the World Bank country classification system was used (www.worldbank.org/about/country-classifications). This classifies countries according to the Gross National Income (GNI). The World Bank acknowledges anomalies, but the classification system is used for operational and analytical purposes. Countries with low and middle income economies are considered to be 'developing' and these equate with Majority world countries in this study, while those with high incomes equate with Minority world countries.

Using a snowball method of recruitment, information about the survey was disseminated to all Childwatch Key Institutions and affiliates associated with the Childwatch International Research Network. Information about the survey was included on the Childwatch website (www.childwatch.uio.no/projects/thematic-groups/ethical-research). The survey invitation was also sent out through these other networks, following email contact:

- Childhood Email List at the Childhood Research and Policy Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London - SSRUAdmin@ioe.ac.uk
- Child Participation Network - childparticipationnetwork@jiscmail.ac.uk
- *International* Childhood and Youth Research Network, European University, Nicosia, Cyprus - www.icyrnet.net
- Exploring Childhood Studies mailing list, hosted by the Department of Childhood Studies, Rutgers University, Camden - Exploring_childhood_studies@email.rutgers.edu
- Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth, ARACY – email newsletter

This method of recruitment has meant it has not been possible to ascertain where information about the survey was 'snowballed' to, following its initial dissemination to Childwatch Key Institutions, affiliates and the networks named above.

SURVEY DELIVERY APPROACH

The survey was administered using Qualtrics online survey software. Researchers were asked to complete the survey themselves by 30 November 2010 and to send the survey link onto 6-10 other research colleagues within their country and to encourage their participation. Having responses from a range of researchers in universities, NGOs and government agencies was thought to add greatly to the diversity of the project and the scope of the information obtained. Responses continued to be received through to mid-February 2011.

DATA PROCESSING AND ANALYSES

All data were exported from the Qualtrics software for processing (collation and coding) and analysis, using Microsoft Excel. The surveys generated both qualitative data (from open-ended questions) and categorical data (from questions requiring selection of predetermined coded responses). The qualitative data were analysed using a content analysis approach, whereby the number of times thematic codes occur were systematically recorded (Liamputtong, 2009). This approach allowed the presentation of basic descriptive statistics for both the quantitative and qualitative survey questions, as well as significance testing of any apparent differences between various sub-groups of respondents. The latter involved Unmatched two-sample t-tests (for continuous data) and Z tests (for categorical data).

RESULTS

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

SURVEY RESPONSE RATES

All responses received over the time the survey was available online, from 17th November 2010 to 20th February 2011, were analysed. A total of 314 responses were received, with 257 survey responses considered eligible for inclusion in the data analyses (having answered at least one of the research-related questions). Almost all of these 257 participants went on to complete the entire survey, with 214 (83%) responding to the final cluster of questions.

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

As shown in Table 1 below, **the 257 participants were based across 46 countries.** Of these, 15% were in 22 Majority world countries and 85% were based in 24 Minority world countries. Five participants did not name the country they were based in.

Table 1: Number of participants by country		
Majority world (N=39)		
Argentina – 1	Ghana – 2	Romania -2
Botswana – 1	India – 4	South Africa – 4
Burma – 1	Indonesia – 1	Sri Lanka – 1
China – 1	Jamaica -2	Tanzania – 2
Colombia – 2	Jordan – 1	Turkey – 1
Egypt – 1	Lebanon – 1	Venezuela – 1
Ethiopia – 2	Lithuania – 2	
Gaza Palestine – 1	Mexico – 5	
Minority world (N=213)		
Australia – 20	Italy – 1	Taiwan – 1
Austria – 1	Japan – 1	United Kingdom – 69
Belgium – 2	Netherlands – 2	*(Comprising: UK-unspecified– 44;*
Canada – 20	New Zealand – 28	*England – 11; Scotland – 6;*
Czech Republic - 1	Norway – 6	*Wales -5; Northern Ireland – 3)*
Denmark – 3	Poland – 1	USA – 36
Germany – 2	Portugal – 4	
Greece – 1	Spain – 4	
Ireland – 7	Sweden – 1	
Israel – 1	Switzerland – 1	

Personal characteristics collected from the participants in the Childwatch research ethics survey are shown in Table 2 below.

- **Females were notably over-represented**, accounting for just over three quarters of the total participant sample. However, this differed significantly across countries, with just over half (54%) of the Majority world participants being female, as compared to 82% of the Minority world participants ($z=-3.8600$, $p<0.005$).
- **Participants were spread across the age range groupings**, with nearly 80% in the mid three ranges of 30 to 60 years.

- Nearly two thirds of the participants (64%) had six or more years of experience in research, with more than half of these having been involved for over 10 years.
- More Majority world (44%) than Minority world (34%) researchers reported having less than six years experience doing research with children, although this difference did not reach statistical significance (z=1.1995, p=0.2303).
- Just over half the participants include children's views in their own research very often. This was fairly similar across both Majority and Minority world countries.

Table 2: Survey participant characteristics

Characteristic		Total (N=257) Count	%	Majority world (n=39)	Minority world (n=213)
Gender	Female	**196**	**77%**	54%	82%
	Male	**59**	**23%**	46%	18%
Age	1. Up to 30 years	**31**	**12%**	10%	13%
	2. 31-40 years	**69**	**27%**	33%	25%
	3. 41 - 50 years	**62**	**24%**	23%	24%
	4. 51-60 years	**73**	**28%**	26%	30%
	5. 60 years +	**22**	**9%**	8%	8%
Experience doing research with children	1. Less than 1 year	**8**	**3%**	8%	2%
	2. 1 - 5 years	**84**	**33%**	36%	32%
	3. 6-10 years	**66**	**26%**	13%	29%
	4. 11+ years	**97**	**38%**	44%	37%
Inclusion of children's views in own research	1. No, never	**12**	**5%**	9%	4%
	2. Occasionally	**16**	**7%**	9%	6%
	3. Sometimes	**39**	**17%**	6%	19%
	4. Quite often	**46**	**20%**	22%	20%
	5. Very often	**117**	**51%**	53%	51%

NOTE: Two people did not answer the question asking their gender; five people did not answer the question asking about their experience doing research with children; and 27 people did not answer the question asking how often they include children's own views in their research.

COUNTRY CONTEXT

AGE DEFINING A CHILD

Under 18 years - As shown in Table 3, almost all participants selected the Childwatch definition of 'under 18 years' as the age that defined a child in their country, across both Majority and Minority world countries.

Table 3: Age defining a 'child'

What age defines a child in your country?	Total (n=254) Count	%	Majority world (n=39)	Minority world (n=210)
Under 18 years (as defined by Childwatch)	**222**	**87%**	85%	88%
Defined younger	**28**	**11%**	13%	10%
Defined older	**4**	**2%**	2%	2%

18 years and/or over – Only four participants stated that the age defining a child in their countries was older than the Childwatch definition (Canada, India, USA, Wales). These responses did not accord with others from these countries.

14 years and below – A small number of participants, nearly 3%, defined the age of a child in ranges 14 years and below. It is statistically significant that more than half of these were from Majority world countries (Romania, Sri Lanka, China and Mexico) ($z=3.0914$, $p<0.005$). The others were from New Zealand and the USA.

Varying ages – A small group of Minority world participants (4%), from Australia, New Zealand and the UK, defined the age of a child as under 17 or under 16 years. Along with other Minority world participants from Canada, NZ, the UK and USA, who did not give a defined age, these participants noted that the age of a child varied in different legal and social contexts according to province/area, social context and legal statute. This theme was expanded on by these and other participants in the following section.

RECOGNITION OF THE AGE DEFINING A CHILD

Nearly two thirds of participants thought that their age definition for a 'child' was widely recognised in their country, as shown in Table 4. This result included 66% of the 222 participants who selected the Childwatch definition of under 18 years. However, **many participants (32%) made reference to variations in the definition of 'child'** (according to age) across a range of contexts including legislation and/or policy, cultural and social contexts.

Table 4: Recognition of age defining a child

Is this age for a child widely recognized? (>1 can apply, so %s may add to >100)		Total (N=214) Count	%	World context: Majority (n=34)	World context: Minority (n=177)	Research experience: <6 years (n=76)	Research experience: 6+ years (n=137)
Yes		**155**	**60%**	62%	61%	64%	58%
No		**20**	**8%**	10%	7%	8%	8%
Varies:	Legal / Policy variation	**50**	**19%**	23%	19%	11%	25%
	Cultural / Social variation	**29**	**11%**	21%	10%	11%	12%
	Early childhood / Child / Young person	**28**	**11%**	5%	12%	10%	12%

The area for greatest variation of a child's age was within policy and legislation. This incorporates legal differences noted between states, provinces and areas in some countries. Interestingly, researchers with greater experience were significantly more likely to note the legal and policy variations in defining the age for a child, than those with less than five years research experience ($z=2.4468$, $p<0.05$). **Social and cultural variations were more often noted by researchers in Majority world countries** than those in Minority world countries, although this difference did not quite reach statistical significance ($z=1.8228$, $p=0.0683$). Participants' comments about these variations in definition included the following:

- [Under 18 years] - *Rather depends on why the definition is needed that is for what proposed the definition is to be used* [United Kingdom]
- [Under 18 years] - *There is some debate, as the age of consent has fluctuated. However, it is at this age that in many regions people may legally purchase alcohol, and may vote. The category of youth, however, extends up to age 30.* [Canada]
- [Under 18 years] - *Yes generally, though area of criminalisation of children a bit grey (age of criminal responsibility)* [United Kingdom]
- [Under 18 years] - *By the law: yes. They have right to vote, on the other hand they are not allowed to buy strong alcohol until the age of 20. In practice: no. Children stay normally at home with their parents until finishing upper secondary school, at the age of 19. In this frame, they normally are considered to be children.* [Norway]
- [Under 18 years] - *I´m not sure, but I don´t think so. I think that such is an academic definition. Maybe urban and upper classes may also share this definition, but rural and lower classes may define 'child' different (less years).* [Colombia]
- [Under 14 years] *In the urban areas yes, but in the rural one, they have to work, so they are not considered children* [Romania]
- [Under 12 years] - *Yes in cities. After that age the concept of teenager is used. This age also coincides with the transition to secondary education. However, in indigenous communities the concept varies according to the ethnic group. A person of 15 years can be considered an adult if s/he marries someone.* [Mexico]

Some participants stated that in their country there was a differentiation between child and young person, and/or early childhood, (in legislation, social services and in social opinion) when defining a 'child'. Most of these respondents were from Minority world (12%) rather than Majority world (5%) countries, however this difference did not reach statistical significance (z=1.5587, p=0.1191).

- [Under 18 years] - *No. Teenagers are 'adolescents'. The term for 'child' ('bambino') would NEVER be applied to a teenager.* [Italy]
- [Under 18 years] - *Yes, but there's also the categories of youth, adolescent and young person and sometimes 16 is used instead of 18.* [Australia]
- [Under 14 years] - *Yes, because the Child, Youth & Family Service treats children over 14 as young persons or youth.* [New Zealand]

Some other examples of variations in the age definition of child include:

- In Canada provinces differ in recognising 18 or 19 as the age of 'majority'.
- Participants from four Majority world countries (Colombia, Indonesia, Mexico, Romania) made a distinction between children in rural and urban areas, with children in rural areas not being seen as children so much as those in urban areas.
- Two participants (Norway and Indonesia) also commented that sometimes those who are older than 18 are considered children if they remain living at home with their parents.

INCLUDING CHILDREN'S VIEWS IN RESEARCH

Almost all the participants thought that children's views were included in research in their country 'occasionally' to 'very often' (92%), as shown in Table 5. Only 2% of the total sample

indicated that children's views were 'never' included (participants from Ghana, USA, UK-Scotland). Less than ten percent of the total sample thought children's views were very often included. The largest response category for the total sample was that 'sometimes' children's views are included (42%).

Table 5: Inclusion of children's views in research, by country and experience

How often does research [in your country] include children's own views?	Total (N=255)		World Context		Research experience		Includes children	
	Count	%	Majority (n=39)	Minority (n=211)	<6 years (n=91)	6+ years (n=162)	Never - Quite Often (n=113)	Very often (n=115)
Never	**4**	**2%**	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%
Occasionally	**81**	**32%**	38%	29%	37%	28%	39%	26%
Sometimes	**108**	**42%**	38%	44%	33%	48%	42%	43%
Quite often	**45**	**18%**	13%	19%	19%	17%	17%	17%
Very often	**17**	**7%**	8%	7%	9%	6%	1%	11%
Mean (1=lowest, 5=highest)		**2.96**	2.85	3.00	2.95	2.97	2.76	3.10

There were no significant differences between researchers from Majority and Minority world countries, or between those with less than or more than five years experience, in regard to children's views 'never' being included (2% of total sample) or 'very often' being included (7% of total sample). There were, however, areas of difference in the middle three categories, with more Majority (38%) world participants, than Minority (29%), stating that children's views are 'occasionally' included and conversely more Minority (44%) world participants, than Majority (38%), stating that children's views are 'sometimes' included. More Minority (19%) world participants, than Majority (13%) also stated that children's views were 'quite often' included. However, none of results approached statistical significance.

Participants with more than five years research experience thought that children's views were more likely to be included 'sometimes' (48%) than any other response category. Participants with less experience were most likely to say that children's views were 'occasionally' included (37%).

Perhaps unsurprisingly, participants who very often included children's views in their own research were significantly more likely to think that children's views were often included in research in their country, than those who included children's views less often ($t=2.92352$, $p=<0.005$).

REASONS FOR NOT INCLUDING CHILDREN'S VIEWS IN RESEARCH

The range of reasons, given by participants for why they thought children's views were not included in their own country, are shown in Table 6. Reasons why children's views were less likely to be included: perceptions of children and/or adult's competence (26%); research methods and/or design issues (23%); ethics and policy considerations (11%) and resource issues, particularly related to funding and time involved in research with children (5%).

Table 6: Reasons for not including children's own views in research

How often research involving children in your country include children's own views? _ Why do you think this is so? (>1 can apply, so %s may add to >100)	Total (N=178)		World Context		Research experience		Includes children	
	Count	%	Majority (n=29)	Minority (n=146)	<6 years (n=52)	6+ years (n=124)	Never - Quite Often (n=77)	Very often (n=90)
Perceptions of children / adult competence	**67**	**26%**	36%	23%	21%	29%	21%	27%
Research methods and design issues	**59**	**23%**	23%	23%	14%	28%	20%	23%
Ethics and policy considerations	**27**	**11%**	10%	11%	8%	13%	11%	10%
Funding/time/resource issues	**14**	**5%**	3%	6%	4%	6%	0%	9%

Perceptions of children/adult competence was the largest response category, and Majority world participants were the largest sub-group to see this as the reason underlying why research does not include children's views (36%). Although this did not reach statistical significance, when compared to the Minority world responses in this category (23%), it is close enough to be of interest ($z=1.4737$, $p=0.1406$).

The responses related to perceptions of children include both perceptions of children's place/role in society, and children's and/or adults' (in)competence, as the following quotes illustrate:

- *Because children are often seen as incompetent*. [Portugal]
- *Lack of the cultural acceptance that child / children should be respected* [Turkey]
- *There is still a general perception that particularly young children cannot express their feelings, knowledge and ideas. Adults continue to feel they know what is best for children.* [UK England]
- *This is because children are conceived as subjects needing protection and as vulnerable persons. For that reason Spanish society thinks that children must belong to the private sphere out of public questions, even, researchers.* [Spain]
- *In Colombia there are groups researching children's experiences, but generally it is quite prescriptive. I think because of Colombia's experience of conflict the role of children is more visible, but it also frequently falls into the trap of portraying children as either victims or delinquents and not considering the multitude of children's experiences here.* [Colombia]

Most participants placed approximately the same amount of importance on the research methods or design as being a reason underlying the exclusion of children's views from research. An exception to this was apparent in comparing researchers with different amounts of experience. Researchers who had less than five years experience were significantly less likely, than researchers with greater experience, to think that research methods or design prevented the inclusion of children's views ($z=-1.9880$, $p<0.05$).

Research methods and design issues included: consent and/or access issues; emphasis on quantitative research and/or on 'traditional' or psychology approaches; and the requirement of

specialist methods and skills. Some of the responses made by participants that related specifically to research method and design issues include:

- *The dominance of developmental psychology in the United States; most of these researchers use a developmental model which focuses on children's lack of competence and skills.* [United States]
- *Much depends on the research paradigms used by the researchers. Some positivist researchers who attract large amounts of funding do not consider that the child's voice is an integral part of their data gathering.* [New Zealand]
- *Because much of the research done with children is done ON children. I have ticked 'sometimes' because although many researchers in the UK and Ireland would claim active participation the claims do not bear scrutiny! There are grand delusions by adult researchers when it comes to active and informed participation of children.* [Ireland]

'Funding/time/resource issues' was the second largest response category across the total sample (23%). Those with more than five years research experience were significantly more likely than those with less experience to see 'funding/time/resource issues' as a reason underlying the lack of children's views included in research ($z=-2.6988$, $p<0.01$). There were no other statistically significant differences between other subgroups in this category. Similarly, there were no significant differences between subgroups in relation to 'ethics and policy considerations' which were perceived by 11% of the total sample as a reason contributing to the lack of inclusion of children's views in research.

There was some overlap between responses in the 'funding/time/resource issues' category and the 'research methods and design' category. Half of the responses in the resource category (5%) also made reference to research methods and design.

- *In Ethiopia children are included mostly in surveys or studies that are conducted by NGOs only, or in collaboration with government institution and these kind of surveys are conducted rarely. This is may be due to lack of resources or give less attention to children's views, feelings, aspirations, etc.* [Ethiopia]
- *Researchers often think they need special skills to talk with children, it is seen as not efficient (time consuming, tedious, costly) but also difficult to utilise rigorous data collection methods leading to not as valid findings.* [Australia]
- *I think working with children is very resource intensive and likely to be the realm of qualitative social science. By far the most money in research goes into less resource intensive and higher - quantitative - impact research. I know due to personal experience also that actually getting the views of children into research is not always easy - access may be tricky, particularly with younger children.* [United Kingdom]

A number of participants (22%) noted that there was an increasing emphasis on inclusion of children's views in research. Reasons for this were: increased emphasis on participation/children's voice; policy/politics/funding supporting children's participation; and a few participants who suggested inclusion of children may, in fact, be tokenism. Researchers with more than five years

experience (25%) seemed more likely to perceive an increase in the inclusion of children's views, than those with less experience (17%), although this did not reach statistical significance (z=-1.1571, p=0.2472). Participants' responses in this section included:

- *Impact of UNCRC; role of The Commissioner for Children and Young People answerable directly to Scottish Parliament / legislative mandate in Scotland requiring that the wishes and feelings of children be taken into account in all decisions affecting them.* [UK Scotland]
- *The focus on including children's views is increasing in Australia, although this is often still within parameters set by adults rather than research with children.* [Australia]
- *Increasingly so - policy of involvement.* [UK England]
- *The child's voice is being increasingly recognised, but a strong culture of 'adults know best' remains*. [United Kingdom]
- *Over the past few years, with a growing number of professional social workers being trained in Child Rights and a growing interest in the Right to Participation there is at least tokenistic participation of children in a fair amount of research*. [India]

IMPORTANCE PLACED ON INCLUDING CHILDREN'S VIEWS

Table 7 shows the importance placed on the inclusion of children's views in research by various people involved in the research process, **from the perspective of participants**:

- ***Children themselves* were seen to place the most importance on inclusion of their views in research.** The highest number of total responses in the categories of **quite a bit** (31%) and **lots** (33%) were accorded to the importance children placed on including their views.

- ***Researchers and professionals*** working with children were seen mostly to place **some** importance on children's views (across Minority and Majority world contexts), and **quite a bit** (in Minority world contexts).

- ***Funders*** were seen by most participants, across Majority and Minority world contexts, to put **very little** and **some** importance on including children's views.

- ***Policy makers* were perceived to place the least importance on including children's views in research.** They were mostly seen to put **some**, **very little** or **no(ne)** importance on including children's views, across Majority and Minority world contexts.

Table 7: Importance placed on including children's views in research							
And how much importance is placed on including children's own views in research relating to them? … by each of the following:		None	Very little	Some	Quite a bit	Lots	Mean
Children themselves	**Total (N=232)**	**2%**	**13%**	**21%**	**31%**	**33%**	**3.81**
	Majority world (n=34)	9%	29%	12%	21%	29%	3.32
	Minority world (n=194)	1%	11%	22%	33%	34%	3.88
Professionals working with children	**Total (N=241)**	**1%**	**13%**	**43%**	**29%**	**14%**	**3.41**
	Majority world (n=37)	3%	19%	46%	19%	14%	3.22
	Minority world (n=200)	1%	12%	43%	31%	14%	3.46
Researchers	**Total (N=240)**	**2%**	**12%**	**46%**	**30%**	**10%**	**3.35**
	Majority world (n=37)	3%	19%	49%	16%	14%	3.19
	Minority world (n=199)	2%	11%	45%	34%	10%	3.39
Funders	**Total (N=237)**	**8%**	**34%**	**37%**	**16%**	**5%**	**2.75**
	Majority world (n=36)	11%	36%	33%	6%	14%	2.75
	Minority world (n=197)	7%	34%	38%	19%	3%	2.77
Policy makers	**Total (N=240)**	**15%**	**41%**	**30%**	**9%**	**4%**	**2.46**
	Majority world (n=36)	33%	47%	8%	3%	8%	2.06
	Minority world (n=200)	11%	40%	35%	11%	4%	2.56

Differences between Minority and Majority world participants:
Minority world participants were significantly more likely than Majority world participants to consider that children themselves placed importance on including their views (t=-2.79487, p<0.01). Interestingly, less participants overall answered this question in relation to children's views (n=232), than other categories of people involved in the research process, which may suggest a lack of awareness of children's views or perhaps a reluctance to speak on their behalf.

More Minority than Majority world participants considered researchers and professionals working with children to place greater importance on including children's views, although this trend did not reach statistical significance (professionals working with children t=-1.51896, p=0.1301; and researchers t=-1.26517, p=0.2071).

Participants from Majority world countries were significantly more likely, than Minority world participants, to consider that policy makers placed no(ne) importance on including children's views (z=3.4655, p<0.001).

CHILDREN AS RESEARCHERS AND CO-RESEARCHERS

Minority world researchers and those with greater experience were more aware of research projects with children as researchers or co-researchers. As shown in Table 8, participants based in Minority world countries (58%) were significantly more aware of at least 'a few' or 'many' research projects with children as researchers or co-researchers in their country, than Majority world participants (30%) (z=3.1388, p<0.005). Similarly, more experienced researchers (60%) had greater awareness of such projects than researchers with less than five years experience (42%) (z=2.6743, p<0.01).

Table 8: Children as researchers and co-researchers								
Are you aware of any research in your country where children have been researchers or co-researchers?	Total (N=242)		World context		Research experience		Includes children	
	Count	%	Majority (n=37)	Minority (n=201)	<6 years (n=85)	6+ years (n=155)	Never- Quite Often (n=112)	Very often (n=115)
No, none	**73**	**30%**	49%	26%	35%	27%	29%	31%
Yes, one project	**38**	**16%**	22%	15%	22%	12%	17%	14%
Yes, a few projects	**115**	**48%**	27%	51%	35%	54%	51%	45%
Yes, many projects	**16**	**7%**	3%	7%	7%	6%	4%	10%

The Minority world participants who indicated an awareness of 'many' research projects were mostly from the UK (60%) although researchers based in the UK comprise only 31% of participants in the Minority world sub-group (a statistically significant difference $z=2.3291$, $p<0.05$).

Nearly half the participants based in Majority world countries (49%) were not aware of any research in their country where children had been researchers or co-researchers. This is significantly different from the Minority world participants, of whom about a quarter (26%) were not aware of such research ($z=2.8171$, $p<0.005$).

There were no significant differences in awareness between researchers who very often include children's views in research and those who do less often or not at all. Examples given by participants of research projects in which children have been researchers or co-researchers are collated in Appendix B.

RESEARCHER CONTEXT

FOCUS OF PARTICIPANTS' RESEARCH

Most of the 220 participants who responded to this question indicated that their own research had a social research focus. They identified a wide range of topics (see Appendix C) and many noted multiple areas in which they had conducted research. The areas of focus named by the participants included:

- children's welfare/wellbeing/child protection (n=51);
- children's lives/participation/citizenship (n=37);
- health (n=37);
- education (n=35);
- children's rights (n=22);
- socio-legal/justice (n=22);
- creativity/play/leisure (n=19);
- young people/youth (n=20);

- violence/abuse/trauma (n=14);
- refugee/migrant/homeless children (n=11);
- early years (n=10);
- working children/child labour (n=7);
- conflict/war/peace building (n=7);
- identity/gender/culture (n=7);
- technology (n=6);
- family issues (n=5); and
- environment (n=4).

INCLUSION OF CHILDREN'S VIEW IN PARTICIPANTS' OWN RESEARCH

As shown in Table 9, just over half of the participants 'very often' include children's own views as part of their research, overall and within each of the explored sub-groups.

Table 9: Inclusion of children's views in own research

Do you include children's own views as part of your research?	Total (N=230)		World context		Research experience	
	Count	%	Majority (n=32)	Minority (n=194)	<6 years (n=77)	6+ years exp (n=151)
No, never	**12**	**5%**	9%	4%	5%	5%
Occasionally	**16**	**7%**	9%	6%	10%	5%
Sometimes	**39**	**17%**	6%	19%	13%	19%
Quite often	**46**	**20%**	22%	20%	17%	22%
Very often	**117**	**51%**	53%	51%	55%	49%

METHODS USED TO GATHER CHILDREN'S VIEWS

Researchers participating in this study used a range of methods to gather children's views – see Table 10. The most often used methods across the total sample (in descending order) were talking with children individually (44%), talking with children in groups (36%), observing children (35%), asking adults about children (30%) and using creative methods.

While both Majority and Minority world participants very often talked with children, those based in Majority world countries were more likely to talk with children in groups than Minority world participants (t=1.9516, p=0.0523).

The least often used methods by participants in this survey overall, and across Majority and Minority world contexts, were inviting children to complete standardised tests (66% of the total sample never use this method) and inviting children to complete surveys (36%).

Table 10: Methods used to gather children's views

Have you used the following methods to gain children's views?	Total Sample (n= 218)						Comparative Means					
	Never	Occasionally	Some-times	Quite often	Very often	**Mean** 1=never 5=all time	World context		Research Experience		Includes children	
							Majority (n=31)	Minority (n=184)	<5 yrs (n=71)	>5 yrs (n=146)	Never- Quite Often (n=98)	Very often (n=116)
Talking with children individually	5%	6%	18%	27%	44%	**4.01**	4.06	4.02	3.92	4.05	3.44	4.47
Asking adults (eg: parents, teachers) about children	3%	14%	20%	33%	30%	**3.75**	3.84	3.72	3.68	3.79	3.77	3.74
Talking with children in groups	11%	8%	21%	24%	36%	**3.67**	4.10	3.60	3.63	3.67	2.99	4.21
Observing children	18%	13%	16%	19%	35%	**3.41**	3.90	3.32	3.35	3.44	3.28	3.51
Employment of creative methods (photography, video-making, dance etc)	22%	12%	20%	17%	28%	**3.17**	3.39	3.15	3.28	3.10	2.73	3.50
Analysis of pre-existing data sources	18%	21%	23%	23%	15%	**2.95**	3.55	2.84	2.86	3.00	2.95	2.91
Inviting them to complete surveys	36%	18%	23%	16%	8%	**2.42**	2.90	2.33	2.23	2.50	2.36	2.42
Inviting them to complete standardised tests	66%	10%	11%	6%	7%	**1.79**	2.27	1.70	1.80	1.78	1.89	1.68

Unsurprisingly, participants who very often included children's views in research were much more likely, than those who included them less, to talk with children individually (t=7.422288, p=<0.001) and in groups (t=7.431723, p=<0.001).

Examples of other methods described by participants included:

- *writing exercises by young people* [Canada]
- *use of child appropriate tools/toys/cue cards to help elicit description of feelings* [New Zealand]
- *using stories and films to discuss their rights* [India]
- *experiential approaches to sharing information and insights (e.g. ranking activities, role-play, peer interviews)* [South Africa]
- *virtual ethnography and sites in social networks* [Mexico]
- *mapping social networks* [Canada]
- *sound recordings* [Australia]
- *online discussions* [Canada]
- *recording height, weight and accelerometer data with permission (pre- /post-intervention design)* [New Zealand]
- *analysing diaries by the children and parents* [UK – Wales]
- *Participatory Rural Appraisal Techniques* (PRA) [Germany]
- *archives, letters, diaries.* [Israel]

CONSENT FOR CHILDREN TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Table 11 clearly shows that **most participants require consent from parents/carers and children 'all of the time'**. There was very little difference in researchers gaining consent between Majority and Minority world contexts or in relation to the experience of the researcher. However, researchers who very often include children in research are significantly more likely to gain children's consent, than those who include children less (t=-3.97888, p<0.0005), and less likely to get parents' consent (t=1.414615, p=0.1587).

Table 11: Consent for children to participate in research

Whose consent do you need?	Total Sample (n= 215)						Comparative Means					
							World context		Research Experience		Includes children	
	Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Frequently	All of the time	**Mean** 1=never 5=all time	Majority (n=31)	Minority (n=182)	<5 yrs (n=69)	>5 yrs (n=145)	Never- Quite Often (n=97)	Very often (n=114)
Parent(s) or Carer(s)	3%	3%	9%	19%	65%	**4.40**	4.32	4.43	4.36	4.42	4.49	4.29
Children themselves	5%	2%	5%	9%	78%	**4.52**	4.54	4.54	4.42	4.57	4.20	4.77

INFLUENCES ON RESEARCH

Researchers are influenced by a range of sources, as shown in Table 12. **Their own ethical principles were a major influence for most respondents** (91%). The other major influences for more than two thirds of the participants were participant's previous experiences (77%) and their institutions ethics standards, guidelines or requirements (69%).

The potential influences that researchers were **not aware of**, or had **no influence**, were the guidelines of professional associations they may belong to (15%) and national ethics standard, guidelines or requirements (14%).

The major influences and areas of least influence noted above were consistent between Majority and Minority world participant responses, although there were considerably less Majority world participants selecting the three top major influences (own ethical principles-79% (z=2.0698, p<0.05); own previous experiences-65% (z=1.4895, p=0.1364); own institutions ethics standards, guidelines or requirements-53% (z=3.2244, p<0.005)).

Table 12: Influences on research with children

How much, if at all, does each of the following influence the way you do research relating to children?	Total Sample (n= 225)						Comparative Means					
	Not aware of these	No influence	Minor influence	Moderate influence	Major influence	**Mean 1=never 5=all time**	World context		Research Experience		Includes children	
							Majority (n=34)	Minority (n=187)	<5 yrs (n=71)	>5 yrs (n=146)	Never-Quite Often (n=105)	Very often (n=116)
Your own ethical principles	0%	1%	0%	8%	**91%**	**4.89**	4.74	4.91	4.85	4.91	4.86	4.93
Your previous experiences	0%	2%	3%	18%	**77%**	**4.68**	4.53	4.71	4.51	4.76	4.57	4.81
Your institution's ethics standards, guidelines or requirements	3%	2%	6%	20%	**69%**	**4.50**	4.18	4.58	4.61	4.45	4.45	4.55
Informal advice &/or support from colleagues or collaborators	0%	6%	13%	41%	**39%**	**4.12**	3.76	4.18	4.15	4.10	3.94	4.31
Formal training &/or mentoring	4%	6%	20%	33%	**38%**	**3.96**	3.97	3.97	4.06	3.91	3.82	4.10
Published &/or online resources	1%	4%	24%	42%	**28%**	**3.91**	4.09	3.87	4.00	3.86	3.75	4.05
National ethics standard, guidelines or requirements	14%	7%	8%	28%	**43%**	**3.80**	2.91	3.97	3.70	3.84	3.72	3.85
The guidelines/ requirements of any professional association(s) you belong to	15%	9%	15%	26%	**35%**	**3.57**	3.38	3.62	3.49	3.59	3.50	3.62

Majority world participants were significantly less aware of any national ethics standard, guidelines or requirements (with 32% not being aware of any at all), than Minority world participants (of whom only 10% were not aware of any) (z=-3.4657, p<0.001). In fact, nearly half of the Minority world participants (48%) found those national ethics standards or requirements to be a major influence.

Published and/or online resources appear to be a major influence for Majority world participants (38%), more so than those in Minority world countries (26%), although this is not of strong statistical significance (z=1.4359, p=0.1510). Informal advice and/or support from colleagues and collaborators were a major influence for 41% of Minority world participants, compared to 29% of those in Majority world countries, although, again, this was not of strong statistical significance (z=1.3187, p=0.1873).

Informal advice and/or support for colleagues was a significantly greater influence on researchers who included children in their research very often, than those who included them less often (t=3.141201, p<0.005). Formal training and/or mentoring was also a greater influence on researchers who included children very often, than those who did not (t=1.968073, p=0.0503).

Other influences raised by participants include: the ethics requirements of other (than their own) institutions involved/participating in the research; consultation with/advice from children and young people; legal statutes and UNCRC. For example responses included:

- *Standards, guidelines or requirements from collaborating institutions where applicable* [Jamaica]
- *The ethical guidelines of our partners (mainly voluntary organisations)* [UK - Northern Ireland]
- *Advice from young people on methodology* [UK]
- *Young people's consultations and participation in research design* [UK]
- *Young people's ethical principles* [USA]
- *The UNCRC, 1989* [Ghana]
- *National and local authority governance procedures where we need access* [UK – England]

ISSUES RESTRICTING CHILDREN'S INCLUSION IN RESEARCH

All of the issues listed in the survey were perceived by participants as restricting their capacity to include children in research to varying degrees, as shown in Table 13. **The key issues restricting researchers' capacity to include children's views** were concerns about anonymity, families/communities not wanting children to participate, confidentiality, overly-protective ethical review processes, and a sensitive topic that may upset the child. All of these, except families/communities not wanting children to participate, were seen as the issues restricting the inclusion of children's views most 'all of the time'.

Table 13: Issues restricting children's inclusion

To what extent, if at all, do the following issues restrict your capacity to include children's own views in your research?	Total sample (N=216)						World context	
	Not at all	Occasio-nally	Some-times	Frequently	All of the time	**Mean**	Majority (n=33)	Minority (n=179)
Concern about maintaining the children's anonymity	22%	23%	23%	18%	**13%**	**2.77**	3.33	2.65
Families/ communities not wanting children to participate	15%	25%	34%	20%	**6%**	**2.76**	2.61	2.80
Concern about keeping the children's views confidential	25%	22%	22%	16%	**15%**	**2.75**	3.30	2.63
Overly-protective ethical review processes	25%	19%	26%	18%	**12%**	**2.73**	2.67	2.72
Concern the topic is sensitive and may upset the child	19%	28%	27%	16%	**10%**	**2.71**	3.24	2.60
Fear it will make the children vulnerable to discrimination/ retaliation	32%	24%	25%	9%	**10%**	**2.39**	2.91	2.27
Fear for the child's safety	32%	22%	27%	11%	**7%**	**2.38**	3.00	2.25
Cultural beliefs about children's place or role in society	35%	22%	23%	13%	**7%**	**2.34**	2.55	2.31
Concern children may be coerced	25%	35%	26%	9%	**5%**	**2.34**	2.53	2.28
Concerns about religious practices and beliefs	50%	23%	16%	6%	**5%**	**1.92**	2.67	1.78
Doubt about your ability to undertake research with children	50%	25%	14%	7%	**4%**	**1.91**	2.15	1.87

The issues drawing the greatest response were: that half the participants felt children's inclusion was 'not at all' restricted by the participant's own ability to undertake research with children (50%) or concerns about religious beliefs and practices (50%).

Majority world participants were significantly more likely than Minority world participants to consider that over half of these ethical issues restricted their capacity to include children's views: anonymity ($t=2.73023$, $p=<0.05$); confidentiality ($t=2.627744$, $p=<0.05$); concern the topic is sensitive and may upset the child ($t=2.816952$, $p=<0.05$); make children vulnerable to discrimination/retaliation ($t=2.681127$, $p=<0.05$); fear for the child's safety ($t=3.32327$, $p=<0.001$); and concerns about religious beliefs of practices ($t=4.284371$, $p=<0.001$). There was no significant difference between the Majority and Minority world participants regarding the other issues: families/communities not wanting children to participate; overly protective ethical review processes; cultural beliefs about children's place or role in society; concern the child may be coerced; and doubts about their ability to undertake research with children.

Other issues that some participants (n=20) considered restricted their capacity to include children's views in research included: time and budget constraints; meaningful reporting back to children and young people; fear for their own safety (gang-involved young people), gatekeepers including parents, professionals and other adults; seeing children independently without parents and family; community and family tensions; consent issues; law; and the reliability of information. Examples of other responses included:

- *Not being given enough time (and budget) to facilitate a process in an ethical way.* [South Africa]
- *Timely and meaningful reporting back to the children after they have left the school setting (if that was the path for recruitment)*. [New Zealand]
- *Adults the biggest barrier!* [New Zealand]
- *Getting access to speak to children directly to ask if they would like to participate, often the request goes through many gatekeepers, e.g. other professionals*. [UK]
- *Tensions within conflicted communities/ families*. [Ireland]
- *Sometimes difficult to use children's views and be regarded as a rigorous scholar.* [USA]
- *The child not wanting to participate*. [Norway]
- *The social position of children in society, and the inseparability of children's concern over family priority makes it difficult to simply seek children's views only. Children are part of the wider family collective so any ethical concerns re them need to take such broader contexts seriously*. [Norway]

ETHICAL ISSUES OF MOST CONCERN TO RESEARCHERS

In addition to the issues outlined above, that restricted researchers' capacity to include children's views, respondents raised two additional ethical issues of concern: consent/gatekeeper/access issues, which were sometimes related to ethics boards; and interpreting/disseminating findings, including providing participants with feedback. These are included in Table 14 which shows the ethical issues that were of greatest concern to researchers.

Table 14: Ethical issues of most concern to researchers

Do any of the above ethical issues concern you? If so, which of the above ethical issues concern you most and why? (>1 can apply, so %s may add to > or < 100)	Total (n=122)		World context		Research experience		Includes children	
	Count	%	Majority (n=23)	Minority (n=95)	<6 years (n=37)	> 5 years (n=82)	Never-Quite often (n=47)	Very often (n=71)
Overly-protective ethical review processes	**31**	**12%**	3%	13%	8%	14%	11%	16%
Consent / Gatekeeper Access issues	**18**	**7%**	3%	8%	8%	7%	6%	9%
Concern children may be coerced	**11**	**4%**	0%	5%	5%	4%	6%	3%
Cultural beliefs about children's place or role in society	**11**	**4%**	15%	2%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Concern about keeping the children's views confidential	**10**	**4%**	3%	4%	3%	4%	0%	9%
Families / communities not wanting children to participate	**9**	**4%**	8%	3%	7%	2%	1%	6%
Fear it will make the children vulnerable to discrimination/ retaliation	9	4%	8%	3%	3%	4%	2%	5%
Concern the topic is sensitive and may upset the child	**8**	**3%**	10%	2%	3%	3%	2%	5%
Concern about maintaining the children's anonymity	**8**	**3%**	5%	3%	5%	2%	4%	3%
Findings / Feedback	**5**	**2%**	5%	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%
Doubt about your ability to undertake research with children	**5**	**2%**	8%	1%	2%	2%	4%	0%
Fear for the child's safety	5	2%	10%	0%	2%	2%	3%	2%
Concerns about religious practices and beliefs	**2**	**1%**	3%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%
Does concern but doesn't restrict	**21**	**8%**	10%	8%	9%	8%	6%	12%

The issue of greatest concern to researchers overall was overly-protective ethical review processes (12%), followed by consent/gatekeeper/access issues (7%). These were the issues of greatest concern to all sub-groups of participants except Majority world researchers.

Majority world participants: Their greatest concerns were: cultural beliefs about children's place or role in society (15%); fear for the child's safety (10%); and concern that the topic is sensitive and may upset the child (10%).

Majority world researchers tended to have greater concerns than Minority world participants with regard to **all** the issues, except: concern about keeping children's views confidential; that children may be coerced; overly-protective ethical review processes; and consent/gatekeeper/access issues.

Minority world researchers: The issues of greatest concern to Minority world participants were the same as for researchers overall: overly-protective ethical review processes (13%), followed by consent/gatekeeper/access issues (8%).

Researchers who very often include children in their research shared the concerns of Minority world participants regarding overly-protective ethical review processes (16%), followed by consent/gatekeeper/access issues (9%). They also had greater concerns about keeping children's views confidential.

Researchers who were more experienced were most concerned with overly-protective ethical review processes (14%) and consent/gatekeeper/access issues (7%), in keeping with Minority world participants and those who very often include children in their research. ***Researchers with less research experience*** shared those concerns, but they were also concerned about families/communities not wanting children to participate (7%) and maintaining children's anonymity (5%).

The following quotes are examples of responses related to overly-protective ethical review processes, which was the area of greatest concern overall:

- *Overly protective ethical review processes: In my experience membership of such committees changes regularly and there appears therefore to be little 'institutional memory', thus one has to reassure members - who are on the whole well motivated people - that talking with children about sensitive issues can be done in such a way that children are not harmed, and in fact often gain from such involvement.* [New Zealand]
- *Ethics committees in Australia are very restrictive and more concerned about risk and the potential to be sued than ethical issues.* [Australia]
- *Overly protective institutional ethical review processes are particularly concerning. Ethical review in my own institution is conducted by people who have no experience of working with children and who promote ethical practice in research with children which is at odds with my personal principles of ethics. I regard gaining informed consent from children as of the utmost importance in conducting research with children whereas the institutional ethics board refuse to recognise children's ability to provide consent, insisting on the use of assent.* [UK – England]
- *I was very concerned by overly-protective ethical review processes because I had heard of other researchers having to go through year-long ordeals around this. However, my review process was actually rather straightforward.* [Canada]

The following quotes are examples of responses related to consent/gatekeeper/access issues, which was the second greatest area of concern overall:

- *One issue which you haven't mentioned is accessibility (e.g. with disabled children or those for whom English isn't a first language) - a barrier that many researchers find difficult to address. Also - accessing a representative and diverse sample including 'harder to reach' children.* [UK]
- *When trying to gain research access to vulnerable young children we often need to go through other professionals rather than the family e.g. social workers, youth offending workers, who can be difficult to get hold of, not be motivated to contact the young person or just be too busy to ask the young person if they would like to take part in the research.*

Although, having said this, many professionals have been really helpful for us gaining access to vulnerable groups. The ethical issue this raises is that young people may not get their voice heard, although this obviously needs to be balanced against the dangers of vulnerable young people feeling coerced into agreeing to take part by an unknown researcher. [UK]

- *I think the issue of informed consent is a tricky one when involving children in research. It is something that has to be constantly monitored and researchers have to take note of children's behaviour as well as of what they say.* [UK]

Other issues researchers expressed concern about included: over-interpretation of children's drawings; having to seek parental consent for young people to participate in research about topics that they may want privacy around (e.g. sexuality); using non-academic institution researchers in a team as Principal Investigators to mobilise academic resources while avoiding academic ethics boards; accessibility e.g. children who speak a different first language, or hard to reach children; obtaining children's informed consent; and lack of openness about balancing confidentiality with disclosures of abuse. The following quotes are examples of ethical concerns that researchers have:

- *Researchers awareness of confidentiality for children and their rights etc. Research for children's better life outcomes NOT as a means to an end for professional qualification or solely for researcher. Mechanisms in place prior to research for vulnerable children and skill of researcher to provide follow up and support. General awareness of the longer time frame of research so that children are not the new 'lab rats'.* [New Zealand]
- *The children's safety and doubt about our ability to undertake research with children from the perspective of protecting them in case we bring up issues that we are not equipped to help them with. I am also concerned not to allow research with children by researchers who don't fully understand the value or the children's voice and embrace the philosophy of child participatory research.* [Jordan]
- *Children may be coerced. Ethics committee at my school insist I get 'consent' from a NGO because in many cases can't get parental consent due to absent parents. Thus, as a researcher being linked formally with a NGO in the field, this may lead children to believe that access to services of the NGO is linked to participation in my research. It's a power issue.* [UK]
- *Paternalism in protecting children by IRBs and many researchers; cultural colonialism that ignores local mores and imposes foreign standards (mostly legal and not ethical concerns).* [Canada]
- *I am a researcher in a non-academic institution. As such, academic partners often position me as a PI so that we can mobilize the resources of an academic institution without having to go through the IRB process. While I have confidence in our consent procedures/ethical safeguards, I am concerned that we are setting a precedent for community-driven research that does not comply with acceptable ethical guidelines.* [USA]
- *Age-specific concern - doing research with 12-14 is different than with 16-18 or with young adults about their experience when they were children.* [Canada]
- *Ethics requires anonymity but at times children have the right to be heard under their own name and the information they provide has to be 'masked' which requires amending*

their information which constitutes its own ethical dilemma. This is especially problematic when working with spatial information. [New Zealand]

- *Issues around topic sensitivity as this is a real risk in my work - constant balancing act between value (to young people) of hearing and sharing direct voices of young people vs additional stress that their involvement in the process may cause. It's never all one sided.* [UK]
- *We are very concerned about how best to conduct our research so that participation is a safe and positive experience for children and young people. All of our research is highly sensitive although we have found young people really want to take part as they mostly consider the topic to be important There is a lack of openness about the ethical issues raised about how to balance confidentiality of children with responsibilities to refer those who disclose any abuse*. [UK]
- *Cultural beliefs about children's place in society are problematic, as this is one of the things I am interested in critiquing - however, if these beliefs and practices work to exclude children from research then they would appear to be disempowering. This is particularly difficult however, because of the importance of safeguarding etc it is very difficult to oppose safeguarding without appearing to be putting children at risk.* [UK – England]
- *The greatest ethical issue that I face in my research is witnessing corporal punishment in cultural contexts outside of the United States that would probably be considered 'abusive', but that are not really a focus of concern for the context in question.* [USA]

Some researchers (8%) expressed concern about the ethical issues raised but indicated that these did not restrict their research capacity, as they were aware of them and/or used strategies to manage them.

CROSS CULTURAL RESEARCH

Table 15 shows the extent to which participants undertake cross cultural research with children. **Approximately two thirds of the participants (68%) undertake cross cultural research with children occasionally – very often.**

Table 15: Cross cultural research with children

Do you undertake cross cultural research with children?	Total (N=214)		World context		Research experience		Includes children	
	Count	%	Majority (n=33)	Minority (n=177)	<6 years (n=67)	6+ years (n=145)	Never-Quite often (n=96)	Very often (n=114)
No, never	**69**	**32%**	27%	33%	40%	29%	34%	30%
Occasionally	**51**	**24%**	18%	25%	21%	26%	29%	19%
Sometimes	**41**	**19%**	18%	19%	13%	21%	21%	18%
Quite often	**28**	**13%**	21%	11%	10%	14%	11%	15%
Very often	**25**	**12%**	15%	11%	15%	10%	4%	18%

A third of Majority world researchers (36%) undertake cross cultural research with children quite often – very often, compared to 22% of Minority world participants. This difference is very close to having statistical significance (z=1.7239, p=0.0847).

Researchers who very often include children in their own research have a significantly higher rate of cross cultural research (33% quite often – very often), than those who include children less often (15%) (z=3.0101, p<0.005).

ISSUES RESTRICTING CHILDREN'S INCLUSION IN CROSS CULTURAL RESEARCH

As shown in Table 16, the key issues restricting researchers' capacity to include children's views in cross cultural research were: families/communities not wanting children to participate, anonymity, confidentiality, cultural beliefs about children's place or role in society, and overly-protective ethical review processes. These are also the key issues (outlined above) restricting participants' capacity to include children in research generally, with the exception of cultural beliefs about children's place or role in society.

Table 16: Issues restricting inclusion of children in cross cultural research

For those who conduct cross cultural research - To what extent, if at all, to the following issues restrict your capacity to include children's views … (N=129)	Not at all	Occasio-nally	Some-times	Frequently	All of the time	Mean
Families/ communities not wanting children to participate	15%	27%	34%	17%	7%	**2.75**
Concern about maintaining the children's anonymity	23%	22%	28%	16%	10%	**2.68**
Concern about keeping the children's views confidential	26%	25%	22%	18%	9%	**2.60**
Cultural beliefs about children's place or role in society	25%	26%	23%	17%	9%	**2.59**
Overly-protective ethical review processes	30%	22%	22%	14%	12%	**2.55**
Concern the topic is sensitive and may upset the child	22%	30%	28%	13%	7%	**2.52**
Fear it will make the children vulnerable to discrimination/ retaliation	25%	30%	28%	9%	8%	**2.44**
Fear for the child's safety	33%	30%	21%	8%	9%	**2.30**
Concern children may be coerced	34%	30%	20%	11%	5%	**2.21**
Concerns about religious practices and beliefs	38%	33%	16%	9%	5%	**2.11**
Doubt about your ability to undertake research with children	42%	28%	19%	8%	3%	**2.02**

Other issues that researchers (n=12) expressed concern about included: fear for their own safety, fear of betrayal, language barrier, fear of further stigmatising a particular group, different conceptions of privacy/confidentiality and relevance of research, families/communities highly driven to please researchers, lack of knowledge of society, and "my whiteness and privilege interacts with the oppression and racism experienced" by the community. The following quotes are examples of other concerns expressed by researchers:

- *Language (tribal language in rural India), families and communities appear highly driven to please researcher, different conceptions of privacy/ confidentiality (open processes in community generally).* [New Zealand]

- *Fear for my own safety (gang-involved young people on US-Mexico border)*. [UK – Northern Ireland]
- *Fear of further stigmatising a particular group - in my case Gypsy and Traveller young people*. [UK]
- *Fear of betrayal*. [Ghana]
- *The interaction between my whiteness and privilege interacts with the oppression and racism experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples*. [Australia]
- *Schools/gatekeepers not seeing the relevance*. [New Zealand]
- *Own lack of knowledge of society*. [New Zealand]

RESEARCHER TRAINING AND RESOURCES

TRAINING, SUPPORT AND MENTORING OF RESEARCHERS

As shown in Table 17, 12% of the total participants said they received no training at all for undertaking research concerning children, whereas 10% felt they had extensive training. The remaining participants were distributed fairly evenly between these two extremes.

Participants based in Majority world countries were significantly more likely to have had extensive training (23%), than those in Minority world countries (9%) (z=2.2865, p<0.05). However, the average amount of training both groups received across the categories overall was very similar.

Researchers who include children's views in research very often, were likely to have received a greater amount of training, than those who include children's views less. This difference was of interest, although not statistically significant (t=-1.42868, p=0.1546).

Table 17: Training, support and mentoring of researchers

How much training, support or mentoring did you receive for undertaking research concerning children?	Total (N=210)		World context		Research experience		Includes children	
	Counts	%	Majority (n=31)	Minority (n=175)	<6 years (n=65)	6+ years (n=143)	Never-Quite often (n=96)	Very often (n=110)
None at all	**25**	**12%**	19%	11%	11%	13%	13%	11%
A little	**61**	**29%**	29%	29%	34%	27%	38%	23%
Just enough	**44**	**21%**	13%	22%	17%	22%	18%	24%
Quite a lot	**58**	**28%**	16%	30%	28%	27%	20%	35%
Extensive	**22**	**10%**	23%	9%	11%	10%	13%	8%
Mean	**2.96**		2.94	2.96	2.94	2.96	2.82	3.06

NATURE OF THE TRAINING

Less than half the total participants had either solely formal training (9%) or solely informal training (32%). The majority had a combination of both formal and informal training (59%), as shown in Table 18 below, with very similar results across all sub-groups.

Table 18: Nature of researcher training

Was this training formal, informal or both?	Total (n=184)		World context		Research experience		Includes children	
	Count	%	Majority (n=25)	Minority (n=155)	<6 years (n=59)	6+ years (n=123)	Never-Quite often (n=83)	Very often (n=98)
Formal	**17**	**9%**	12%	8%	12%	8%	8%	10%
Informal	**58**	**32%**	28%	32%	32%	31%	37%	28%
Both	**109**	**59%**	60%	59%	56%	61%	54%	62%

DETAILS OF TRAINING

The nature of the training participants received is outlined in Table 19. ***Formal training*** of researchers included graduate and postgraduate academic courses and attendance at workshops and training courses (30%), and supervision/mentoring within academic and professional contexts (12%). ***Informal training*** was in the form of collegial sharing and discussion (16%) and researcher's own research experience and reading (15%). Professional and personal experiences (prior to, or concurrent with, undertaking research), enabled skills to transfer to the research context, and some participants considered these to be relevant training (7%).

Table 19: Details of researchers' training

Please provide details … *[of training]* (>1 can apply, so %s may add to > or < 100)	Total (n=108)		World context		Research experience		Includes children	
	Count	%	Majority (n=17)	Minority (n=91)	<6 years (n=34)	6+ years (n=74)	Never- quite often (n=41)	Very often (n=65)
Academic / Course / Workshop	**77**	**30%**	33%	30%	28%	31%	24%	41%
Supervision / mentoring	**32**	**12%**	10%	13%	15%	11%	8%	19%
Collegial sharing	**41**	**16%**	13%	17%	11%	19%	15%	21%
Own research experience/ readings	**38**	**15%**	15%	15%	9%	18%	10%	23%
Other experience - Personal / Practitioner	**19**	**7%**	3%	8%	4%	9%	8%	9%

As would be expected participants with less research experience had less collegial sharing, research experience/readings, and other professional or personal experiences, than those with more experience, although none of these differences reached statistical significance.

Participants who very often include children in their own research tended to have more experience, than those who include children less, in all categories across the board. This tendency was only close to reaching statistical significance in the areas of academic courses and workshops (z=1.7941, p=0.0728), and participants' own research experience and reading (z=1.6977, p=0.0896).

PUBLICATIONS AND RESOURCES ON THE ETHICS OF CONDUCTING RESEARCH WITH CHILDREN

Participants identified a number of resources and publications that have helped to guide and inform their work in the areas shown in Table 20. This predominantly included naming specific publications (22%) and authors (18%). Participants identified professional and academic associations and institutions, whose ethics codes and resources they have found helpful (19%). A smaller number of participants named websites (4%).

Table 20: Publications and resources that guide and inform researchers

Can you identify any publications or resources on the ethics of conducting research with children that have helped to guide or inform your work? (>1 can apply, so %s may add to > or < 100)	Total (n=146)		World context		Research experience		Includes children	
	Counts	%	Majority (n=25)	Minority (n=119)	<6 years (n=48)	6+ years (n=98)	Never-quite often (n=60)	Very often (n=84)
Specific Publications	**57**	**22%**	41%	19%	26%	20%	19%	30%
Assocs / Institutions / Codes / Resources	**48**	**19%**	18%	19%	17%	20%	18%	24%
Authors	**47**	**18%**	8%	20%	12%	22%	14%	26%
Websites	**10**	**4%**	5%	4%	1%	6%	4%	4%

Significantly more Majority world, than Minority world, researchers named publications that have helped to guide or inform their work (z=2.3827, p<0.05). Conversely, a greater (although not statistically significant) proportion of Minority world researchers named specific authors. Although not statistically significant, there was a trend for researchers who very often include children's views in their research to be more likely, than those who include children less often, to name specific publications (z=1.4947, p=0.1350) and authors (z=1.7430, p=0.0813).

The 'Top Twelve' most frequently cited references are listed in Table 21 (see Appendix D for the full list of citations). The asterisks following the references denote the number of times it was cited by participants.

Table 21: Most frequently cited references
Publications
Alderson, P., and Morrow, V. (2004) *Ethics, social research and consulting with children and young people.* Essex: Barnardos. ***
Christensen, P., & James, A. (2000) *Research with children: Perspectives and practices.* London: Falmer Press. *********
Farrell, A. (2005). *Ethical research with children.* Berkshire: Open University Press. ******
Morrow, V., & Richards, M. (1996). The ethics of social research with children: An overview. *Children and Society, 10*, 90-105. ***
Thomas, N., & O'Kane, C. (1998). The ethics of participatory research with children, *Children and Society, 12*, 336-348 ****
Authors
Priscilla Alderson ********
Allison James *****
Mary Kellett ***
Berry Mayall ****
Virginia Morrow****
Organisations / Institutions
Save the Children Guides ********
UNICEF Guidelines ****

RESOURCES THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO RESEARCHERS

A total of 154 participants responded to a question asking if there were any other resources that they would find helpful. Of these, 64% (n=99) responded that there were other resources that would be helpful, and 36% (n=55) said no. Table 22 shows the resources that researchers identified as potentially being helpful. Participants from Majority world countries who responded to this question were more interested (than other sub-groups) in publications, and less interested in researcher networks and training, or research examples and case studies. Although not statistically significant, this is indicative of a trend toward publications overall.

Table 22: Resources that would be helpful to researchers

Are there any other resources that you would find helpful? IF YES: What are they? (>1 can apply, so %s may add to > or < 100)	Total (n=84)		World context		Research experience		Includes children	
	Count	%	Majority (n=12)	Minority (n=72)	<6 years (n=23)	6+ years (n=61)	Never-quite often (n=38)	Very often (n=45)
Publications	**25**	**10%**	18%	8%	9%	10%	11%	11%
Researcher networks /conferences/ training	**24**	**9%**	3%	11%	7%	11%	8%	13%
Ethical codes/ guidelines	**15**	**6%**	5%	6%	2%	8%	8%	5%
Research examples/case studies	**16**	**6%**	0%	8%	3%	8%	7%	7%
Websites/online resources	**11**	**4%**	3%	5%	5%	4%	2%	7%

Respondents identified the following resources that they would find useful:

- Publications (10%) - including topics such as data collection methods, research methodologies, and ethical issues, specifically related to research with children and young people.
- Network of researchers/conferences/training (9%), for collegial discussion and providing the opportunity to learn from others' experiences, possibly online networking, with

training opportunities that focus on research methodologies and ethics in the context of research with children.

- *I would appreciate training sources that use audio-visual media.* [USA]
- *Networks to discuss specific ethical issues with other researchers*. [UK]
- *Don't know / As a clinician I rely a lot on my academic colleagues / I have no time to study papers independently nor do I have easy access to them / There is a great divide between clinicians and academics and their focus is different / It would be helpful to link them much earlier and plan for what happens post research on a clinical level as well as the presentation/academic level / What is the point in the best research if practice does not change?* [UK – Wales]

- Research guides (n=16) - particularly those incorporating case studies.
  - *Practical information about how to engage children in research.* [UK]

- Ethical codes and guidelines (6%) - including collations of national and international codes, with a call from several participants to unify codes of ethics from other countries, collections from a range of disciplines, codes specifically relevant to young people/youth populations.
  - *Unifying the codes of ethics of researchers from other countries.* [Venezuela]

- Websites and online resources (4%) relevant to child research and ethical issues, such as a cross-discipline database of research projects, access to electronic academic journals, online communities and networks, research ethics blog, and central pool of information.

- Other (n=9) – including policy documents such as the UNCRC, participatory tools, and
  - *Video/film of researchers in action with children.* [UK – Scotland]

Participants also raised specific areas that they would like resources about, including cross cultural research, young people/youth, early childhood/young children, participatory tools, children's rights, use of digital images, school based research, connecting academics and practitioners, and feedback from children and young people themselves.

ACCESSING RESOURCES

Participants were unable to access these resources for a number of reasons including; not knowing whether the resources exist or being unable to find much (13%), and environmental and resource issues, such as isolation, lack of funding and/or time (8%).

Non-existent and difficult to find resources were an issue for Minority world participants and not for Majority world researchers at all. Conversely, environmental and resource issues were more of an issue for Majority world researchers.

Table 23: Accessibility of resources								
What stopped you from finding or accessing these resources?	Total (N=69)		World context		Research experience		Includes children	
	Count	%	Majority (n=11)	Minority (n=58)	<6 years (n=19)	6+ years (n=50)	Never-quite often (n=29)	Very often (n=39)
Non-existent/Hard to find	**33**	**13%**	0%	15%	13%	13%	11%	18%
Environmental/resource issues	**21**	**8%**	18%	7%	5%	10%	10%	8%

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Participants were asked if there was anything else they would like to say in relation to ethical issues and research with children. Nearly a third of participants (31%, n=79) responded with comments offering opinions and/or advice about ethical issues. These have been collated verbatim, and coded, in Appendix E. The comments focused on:

- respect for children's rights and hearing their views (n=19);
- issues related to ethical guidelines and ethics boards (n=16);
- research methods including using findings and giving feedback to participants (n=14);
- liaison and collaboration with others in undertaking research with children (n=7); and
- cultural issues (n=6).

Specific issues raised (n=17) included the research setting and safety; researcher training; legal regulations, especially with excluded children; age specific research with young people e.g. with 12-18 year olds; use of spatial technology and GIS; use of images and the internet; researcher identity; and research agendas.

Eighteen participants (6% of the total) also gave feedback on the survey and the topic of ethical research with children and young people. They all expressed their appreciation of the project, highlighting the current interest in this area.

DISCUSSION

The survey findings have drawn on and enriched the existing knowledge base about ethical research within the Childwatch Network, and capitalised on the information shared at the Child Participatory Research Roundtable at the 2009 *Children's Rights at a Crossroads Conference* in Addis Ababa. They have also provided useful information about the ethical issues and challenges facing researchers undertaking research with children.

In summary, the key findings of the study are:

- A 'child' is defined, and widely recognised, in most countries as under 18 years of age.
- Children's views are included in research at least some of the time in most countries.
- Key stakeholders are perceived as placing different amounts of importance on inclusion of children's views in research.
- Over two thirds of researchers were aware of projects in which children had been researchers or co-researchers.
- Researchers use a wide range of methods to gain children's views, and most often those that involve directly listening to and observing children.
- Most researchers require both parent/carer(s) and children's consent for children to participate in research.
- The three major influences on the way researchers do research with children are the same in Majority and Minority world countries.
- Other influences on the way researchers do research with children vary in different contexts.
- Researchers' capacity to include children in research is restricted by a range of issues.
- The ethical issues that concern researchers differ, particularly across Majority and Minority world contexts.
- Researchers who undertake cross cultural research with children have the same, and additional, ethical concerns.
- Most researchers have a combination of formal and informal training
- Researchers identified resources that have been helpful in guiding and informing their work.
- Researchers need greater access to resources to help guide and inform their work undertaking research with children.

There are a number of prominent themes emerging from these findings that merit brief discussion.

Children are Increasingly Directly Involved in Research

A significant finding of this study is that researchers internationally consider that children's views are included in research 'occasionally' to 'very often' and that the inclusion of children in research is increasing. Such a finding points to the importance of mapping the diversity of ethical issues and challenges facing researchers currently undertaking research with children, an observation reinforced by the strong interest in the study.

At the same time, researchers identify perceptions of children, in particular their (lack of) competence, as a key reason for limiting their inclusion in research across different world contexts. Despite the emergence of new ways of theorizing childhood, such as those offered through the field of Childhood Studies, and the near universal adoption of the UNCRC, including the right for children to have their views heard in matters that affect them, there remains a need for further education around notions of children's 'competence' and their right to participate in research. Such a development should, of course, be framed in relation to notions of children's safety and protection as this is understood and navigated in quite complex cultural and social settings (see further discussion below).

Given the related finding that it is funders and policy makers who place the least amount of importance on children's views, particularly in Majority world contexts, there is an evident need to explore ways to increase understanding of the value, relevance and importance of children's views in influencing the development of respectful and responsive policies.

Contexts and Constraints: Key Ethical Concerns

A second important theme emerging from this study is that the ethical concerns of researchers do not exist independently of their social, cultural, political and economic contexts, with researchers based in Majority and Minority worlds identifying quite different ethical issues of concern to them. Majority world researchers are more likely to be concerned about cultural beliefs and fear for children's safety, as well as concern about sensitive topics upsetting children. Researchers in Majority world countries are less likely to be concerned with those issues of greatest concern to their Minority world counterparts, that is, overly protective ethical review processes and consent/gatekeeper/access issues.

In addition, Majority world researchers are more likely than Minority world researchers to undertake cross-cultural research with children. Again, the ethical issues restricting researchers conducting cross-cultural research are, in the main, the same as those encountered by researchers including children's views generally, but with differing emphases.

Role of Ethical Committees, Codes and Policies

A third key noteworthy theme is the difference in researcher attitudes to the role of national ethical standards and requirements. Whilst there are common ethical issues constraining the inclusion of children's views within and across multiple research relationships and contexts, researchers' response to and engagement with these is again characterized by diversity. Majority world researchers are far less likely to be aware of, or guided by, national ethics standards or requirements, than Minority world researchers. Minority world researchers tend to be influenced by informal collegial support and advice, and Majority world researchers place emphasis on publications as an influential source.

However, across Majority and Minority world contexts the major influences on the way researchers do research with children are very similar: researchers own ethical principles, their previous

experiences and their institutions ethics requirements. The ways in which researchers respond to the diverse ethical issues they face is therefore determined, to a large extent, by their personal understandings and experiences, and their environmental context. The training received and resources that researchers have access to shape their ethical understandings and practice.

Training and Resources

Finally, most researchers have a combination of formal and informal training, with an emphasis on the informal, and consider they have had 'just enough training'. Within the study a large cohort of researchers use participatory research methods and clearly more training opportunities and resources are needed in this field. Informal training is an ongoing, evolving process, dependent in part on availability and accessibility of resources, including publications and access to mentoring and collegial support. There are indications that accessing resources can be difficult for some Majority world researchers, as a function of environmental issues, and for some Minority world researchers, who do not know if the resources exist or how to locate them.

Limitations

One of the key limitations of the current study is the lack of children's and young people's voices about research ethics. This issue was noted by some participants in their feedback and is an important area to be addressed in future projects.

Another limitation concerns the nature of the sample as this included a large cohort of researchers using participatory methods. Whilst this can also be considered a strength of the study, it means the emphasis has been on ethical issues faced by this particular cohort rather than the general population of researchers undertaking research with children.

WHERE TO FROM HERE?

This study was exploratory in intent and constitutes the first phase of the Childwatch Thematic Group's work. We anticipate the findings will inform further phases of the project such that it will be possible to maintain a broader involvement of majority world Key Institutions in any subsequent project activities.

Possible future initiatives to showcase how ethical principles are applied in different research contexts include:

- An international action research project building on the findings of the current study, and incorporating children and young people's participation.
- Collaborating with the existing Childwatch training programs for young and emerging researchers.
- Development of training and seminar opportunities for more experienced researchers.

- Development of a universal ethical code that incorporates the need for diversity across different contexts. The increase in participatory research with children, in conjunction with the uneven nature of ethical codes and access to resources, supports the call from some researchers for a universal code of children's research ethics (perhaps similar to the UNCRC). The shared and shifting ethical concerns, in different world contexts, is a challenge in the development of universal ethics guidelines and parameters. Simultaneously, it highlights the need for developing and implementing guidelines that would be sensitive to, and have relevance across, different world contexts, whilst maintaining unifying core principles.
- Promoting publications linking research methodology and ethics since publications are seen as key resources for Majority and Minority world researchers. In addition, some researchers stressed the importance of having access to research examples and case studies to guide and inform their research with children. A forum for providing this could be regular journal issues dedicated to case studies addressing ethical issues.
- Expanding online and other access to existing resources including those identified and collated through this study, for example, through the Childwatch website and through collaborating with the work of the Childwatch Training Courses for Young Researchers. Such initiatives would help build further research capacity and extend the work already achieved in other Thematic Study Groups.

In summary, this project has provided a valuable opportunity to explore the merits and challenges faced by researchers and to identify 'best practice' internationally in relation to ethical research with and for children and young people. It has been a useful scoping exercise, providing clear directions for future investigation and action.

REFERENCES

Alderson, P., & Morrow, V. (2004). *Ethics, social research and consulting with children and young people*. Barkingside: Barnardos.

Liamputtong, P. (2009). *Qualitative research methods* (3rd ed.). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Morrow, V. (2008). Ethical dilemmas in research with children and young people about their social environments. *Children's Geographies, 6,* 49-61.

Nieuwenhuys, O. (2004). Participatory action research in the majority world. In S. Fraser, V. Lewis, S. Ding, M. Kellet & C. Robinson (Eds.), *Doing action research with children and young people* (pp. 206-221). London: Sage.

Powell, M., & Smith, A.B. (2006). Ethical guidelines for research with children: A review of current research ethics documentation in New Zealand. *Kotuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online, 1,* 125-138.

Powell, M., & Smith, A.B. (2009). Children's participation rights in research. *Childhood, 16,* 124-142.

Punch, S. (2001). Negotiating autonomy: childhoods in rural Bolivia. In L. Alanen & B. Mayall (Eds.), *Conceptualizing child-adult relations* (pp. 23-36). London: Routledge Farmer.

Sandbaek, M. (1999). Adult images of childhood and research on client children. *International Journal of Social research Methodology, 2,* 191-202.

Van den Hoonard, W. (2002). Walking the tightrope: Ethical issues for qualitative researchers. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: CHILDWATCH INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH ETHICS SURVEY

Key Topics	Suggested Questions
Warm-up	**1. Details of respondent's position, institution, country and number of years undertaking research relating to children.** Questions to come
Country Context	**CHILDWATCH DEFINES CHILD RESEARCH AS CONCERNING CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS** **2. What age defines a 'child' in your country?** **3. Is this age for a 'child' widely recognised in your country?** *Open text box*
	THINKING GENERALLY ABOUT RESEARCH RELATING TO CHILDREN IN YOUR COUNTRY … **4. How often does this research include children's own views?** *Never / Occasionally / Sometimes / Quite often / Very often*
	5. Why do you think this is so? *Open text box*
	6. And how much importance is placed on including children's own views in research relating to them? … by each of the following: *Dot matrix: None / Very little / Some / Quite a bit / Lots* • Policy makers • Professionals working with children • Researchers • Children themselves • Funders
	7. Are you aware of any research in your country where children themselves have been researchers or co-researchers? *No, none / Yes, one project / Yes, a few projects/ yes, many projects* ***IF YES* – Please give an example.**
Researcher Context	**NOW, THINKING ABOUT YOUR OWN RESEARCH RELATING TO CHILDREN …** **8. What is the main focus of your research?** *Open text box*
	9. Do you include children's own views as part of this research? *No, never / Occasionally / Sometimes / Quite often / Very often*
	ASKED UNLESS NEVER at Q9 **10. Have you used the following methods to gather children's views?** *Dot matrix: No, never / Occasionally / Sometimes / Quite often / Very often* • Talking with children individually • Talking with children in groups • Inviting them to complete surveys • Inviting them to complete standardised tests • Observing children • Asking adults (eg: parents, teachers) about children • Analysis of pre-existing data sources • Employment of creative methods (photography, video-making, dance etc) • Other (***please specify***)
	ASKED UNLESS NEVER at Q9 **11. Do you need parent(s)/carer(s)'/the child's consent to involve children in your research?** *No / Yes, from either parent / Yes, from both parents / Yes, from the child / Yes, from the child and either/both parent/s*
	12. How much does each of the following influence the way you do research relating to children? *Dot matrix: Not aware of any of these/ No influence / Minor influence / Moderate influence / Major influence* • National ethics standards, guidelines or requirements • Your institution's ethics standards, guidelines or requirements • The guidelines or requirements of any professional association(s) you belong to • Your own ethical principles • Your previous experiences • Formal training &/or mentoring • Informal advice &/or support from colleagues or collaborators • Published &/or online resources • Other (***please specify***)

Key Topics	Suggested Questions
	13. To what extent do the following issues restrict your capacity to include children's own views in your research? *Dot matrix: Not at all/ A minor or 'occasional' challenge / A moderate or 'sometimes' challenge / A major or 'frequent' challenge* • Fear for the child's safety • Concern the topic is sensitive and may upset the child • Fear it will make the children vulnerable to discrimination/ retaliation • Concern about maintaining the children's anonymity • Concern about keeping the children's views confidential • Families/ communities not wanting children to participate • Difficulty obtaining children's informed consent • Limited organisational support for involving children • Doubt about your ability to undertake research with children • Concern children may be coerced • Overly-protective ethical review processes • Cultural beliefs about children's place or role in society • Concerns about religious practices and beliefs • Other (***please specify***) • Other (***please specify***) • Other (***please specify***) Do any of the above ethical issues concern you? If so, which of the above ethical issues concern you most and why? *(Open ended text box)*
	14. Do you undertake cross cultural research with children? *No, never / Occasionally / Sometimes / Quite often / Very often*
	ASKED UNLESS NEVER AT Q14 **15. Have you faced ethical issues specifically related to undertaking cross cultural research with children?** *No / Yes, as indicated in Q13 / Yes, in addition to those indicated in Q13* **16. If yes, in addition to those indicated in Q13, please specify:** *Open text box*
Training of Researchers	**17. How much training, support or mentoring did you receive for undertaking research concerning children?** *Dot matrix…* None at all /A little/ Just enough/ Quite a lot/ Extensive
	18. And was this training… a) Formal b) Informal c) Both **Please provide details:** *(Open ended text box)*
	19. Can you identify any publications or resources on the ethics of conducting research with children that have helped to guide or inform your work? **20. Are there any other resources that you would find helpful?** *Yes/No*
	21. IF YES: What are they? … and …What stopped you from finding or accessing these resources? FORM: *Open text boxes – to get 3 suggestions*
Closing	**22. Finally, is there anything else you'd like to say that we haven't asked you about – in relation to ethical issues when doing research relating to children?** *Open ended text box*
	Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey. Please do not hesitate to contact Mary Ann Powell at: mapowell@clear.net.nz if you have any further questions or comments about this project.

APPENDIX B: PROJECTS WITH CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE AS RESEARCHERS OR CO-RESEARCHERS

Majority World Projects

The Child Led Data Collection, in 4 countries including Lebanon. It is a team of young researchers interviewing children about their everyday lives. The project is still a pilot that will finish in March 2011.
Child Rights and You (CRY) – a supported child participation advocacy and research project in displaced camps in Jammu and Kashmir.
The Information and Research Center is conducting a child-led research project to determine the identity and sense of self-belonging of the children born to Jordanian mothers and foreign husbands in light of a legal environment, in contravention of CEDAW, which does not allow these children the nationality of their mother or the right to reside in the country on the strength of their relationship to their mother.
Research conducted by Save the Children about violence against children.
In intercultural research with migrant and indigenous children, they co-authored some publications on narratives of their daily life in their communities, they peer reviewed the works of children of towns other than theirs.
1) PROTAGONISMO DE NIÑOS, NIÑAS Y ADOLESCENTES EN LA CONSTRUCCIÓN Y DEFENSA DE SU HÁBITAT (ROLE OF CHILDREN AND TEENS IN THE CONSTRUCTION AND DEFENSE OF ITS HABITAT); López, G. y Guaimaro, Y.; Research Center for Children and the family (CENDIF); Venezuela. http://envia.xoc.uam.mx/redinvestiga/childwatchla/webftp/documentos/xUsuarios/admi/File/Libro%20Ninez%20y%20Juventud.pdf / / 2) RINCONES DE DERECHOS DE LOS NIÑOS, NIÑAS Y ADOLESCENTES (CORNERS OF THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS) by Lopez, G. and Guaimaro, Y. Research Center for Children and Families (CENDIF); Venezuela. http://www.cienciared.com.ar/ra/revista.php?wid=3&articulo=1121&tipo=A&eid=11&sid=136&NombreSeccion=Articulos&Accion=Completo 3) National Conference of Children and Adolescents made from 14 to 16 July 2010 at the headquarters of Cecodap, Caracas (Venezuela), in order to provide space for participation and exchange of views on children and young representatives from each state the country connected to the project so they can build proposals from their different realities and needs, and thus achieve a National Final Document with the proposals made by the children and adolescents will be presented later to the candidates for deputies of all to achieve political trends incorporate the views of children and adolescents in the legislative agenda of the candidates so elected. Cecodap, Caracas, Venezuela.
There was a project with former child soldiers demobilised from the FARC which included children as researchers to help overcome trust issues with the participants, and to foster more independent research driven by the children themselves.
Ecology studies, leisure studies.
One study conducted by Save the Children, and another I conducted with a local Delhi based NGO Butterflies.
The Caribbean Child Research Conference since 2007 has included a section highlighting research done by school-children (typically 17-18 years old) about child- or family related matters. Awards are given to the top 10 participants who present their research at a conference with academics, policy makers, educators and other school children. The research is usually a part of their school-based assessment for school-leaving examinations.
When a project included their view about the city they live in (Guadalajara), the children ask for instant cameras to present images they selected of the 'most relevant' in their city.
I work in southern and eastern Africa. I have undertaken research with children as co-researchers. So has Rachel Bray - see below. Clacherty, G. and Kistner, J. (2001) Evaluating the Zimiseleni Researcher's project, Participatory research as intervention with "hard-to-reach" boys. PLA Notes October 2001. Clacherty, G. and Bray, R. Participatory child-led research with children who are carers: A report on four case studies undertaken in Angola, Nigeria, Uganda and Zimbabwe. September 2009. Save the Children. Rachel Bray et al Growing up in a new South Africa. 2010 HSRC press.
Children's oic s project in KwaZulu-Natal in which children researched primary health care provision.
Review of World Vision Street Children's Program.
Yolanda Corona Caraveo has many approaches in that way as Participacion infantil / Valentina Glockner Fagetti, Infancia y representacion, hacia una participacion activa de los niÃ±os en las investigaciones sociales.

Minority World Projects

Homelessness research project.
A study involving young people's view of being low SES. Study devised and undertaken by adolescent participants.
Children at a school have been asked about their understanding of maturity and presented this at an international conference.
School children at Milperra Public School undertook research as a demonstration or pilot project.
ICPS (ACU) has run a number of projects where children and young people have been engaged as peer researchers. One included a study of Aboriginal young people in Out of Home Care. Peer facilitators helped develop the methodology and conducted research activities alongside the research team. They provided feedback on the analysis and co-presented the findings.
Professor Lisa Maher's ethnographic and participatory action research with street-based injecting drug users in south-western Sydney in conjunction with the National Centre for HIV Epidemiology and Clinical Research.
Children have researched aspects of their learning environments and local communities; often photographs and interviews are the main data gathering sources.
What about me? Children as co-researchers. University of Wollongong. Marr & Malone.
Jan Mason's research at UWS and with ACWA - not sure how important to children since this is an empirical question, and so in fact are the other categories.
'The School I'd Like' project in 1995 used two major Australian newspapers, The Age and the Sydney Morning Herald, to collect the views of children across the school age (5-17) on their own schooling and schooling in general. Thousands of children responded - very frankly - in a variety of formats, and much of this material is now housed in the National Library of Australia.
The School I'd Like (Australian survey).
A friend of mine did a study on the UN Declaration of Human Rights and children were researchers.
Andrew Large and Jamshid Beheshti at McGill University have a major programme of research that involved participatory design of user interfaces for children.
Children almost always defer to adult views in India, although this is changing. There, very few policy makers take any account of children's views. Some NGOs/non-profits do, but not all. Social workers are often extremely conservative and not open to change, believing that they fully understand a child's perspective, or that it should be subordinated to the adult view.
A music library was created at a Community Health Centre where children were directly asked what songs they wanted included.
Research regarding experiences of racism among young high school students in Montreal.
SHHRC Voices from digital natives.
Beheshti, Large and colleagues design information portals for children using them as co-designers.
Darren O'Donnell runs a project called Mammalian Diving Project that has done several child-specific projects where the children themselves direct the research - Haircuts by Children, Eat the Street and, currently, The Torontonians.
Research by university professors on the push and pull factors behind their exploitation, their situation, etc.
Research by Andrew Large (McGill University).
Research undertaken by Nairn et al who have used young people as researchers in their projects.
There is some research by people associated with the Centre for Research on Children and Families at Otago University in New Zealand (and the Children and Young People as Social Actors Research Cluster).
Children sharing their views on environments and sustainability / Children talking about being disabled / Children talking about what they like at early childhood.
Children's Issues Centre, University of Otago projects. At least one M Ed thesis from Victoria University in Wellington.
High school children researching physical activity.

Several conferences I have been at - that have been about children's issues - have included young people speaking to the issues.
Young people involved in service evaluation, providing input into evaluation development.
Projects where children have been co-researchers - doing interviews etc.
Nicola Taylor and Anne B. Smith collaborated on a study with children of their views and understanding of citizenship, rights and responsibilities for a joint Childwatch International project with the former Children's Issues Centre (University of Otago, NZ) in 2005.
Child Poverty with the Office for the Commissioner for Children; some PhD projects have sought children's perspectives but strictly speaking, children were not included in the design or in the final stages; a science research project; a literacy project.
My own research into children's views at parental separation.
I did my master's thesis with children as co-researchers, whereby the children decided the topic and were part of the whole project, including presentation at an educational conference.
I believe that there is some research of this type being undertaken by academics at the Open University, UK.
Peer researchers identifying what young people want in a professional in order to be able to participate in job selection interviews for youth workers.
Research at the Open University.
Barnados research.
Children were involved at the start with the planning and undertaking of the research.
Research on young people's views of citizenship and citizenship education.
Work looking at children's experiences of the care system.
Focus group of children who previously had been abducted and subject to Hague Convention proceedings.
A colleague did a project working with children in a special school for emotional and behavioural difficulties, in which the children re-wrote the school's disciplinary policy.
Narrative landscapes for looking closely at children's perception of their experience on adoption.
Consultation with Scotland's Commissioner for Children and Young People.
Research by the NSPCC on children's views of neglect (some preliminary work undertaken and larger study planned). Research I am involved in led by my colleague, Jeannette Cossar, concerning children living at home with abuse/neglect for the Children's Commissioner.
I have run a project using young people as co-researchers to find out about young people's views of the child protection process.
Cardiff University.
In a current project we have used a child in care group to function as research consultants helping us with recruitment and research materials and dissemination. I also know of other projects who have done this. One project actually used young people in care to run a focus group with other young people in care.
Palliative care model for children with terminal illness.
I work at the NCB Research Centre (National Children's Bureau) in England where we have had a variety of projects which have involved young people as researchers, including young disabled people and young people who have been in state care: Young people in public health research: www.ncb.org.uk/PEAR / Young disabled researchers: www.ncb.org.uk/cdc/other_work/participation_research.aspx / Young evaluators: www.looklistenchange.org.uk/ / Young people-led research: www.ncb.org.uk/young_people_media / We are also planning a conference on this subject in London in March 2011. See also the work of the Open University Children's Research Centre and others.
Work currently being undertaken at the University of East Anglia by Jeanette Cossar where young people are being used as co-facilitators of focus groups with other young people as participants. The theme of the research is children's experiences of the

child protection process.
Information needs (TRLNR).
Public law – children's experiences in care proceedings.
Children at a secondary school were supported by a researcher to undertake their own research projects in science.
Children's voice in school management.
Lesley Lowes' work on diabetes in children.
IMary Kellett, for Open University.
Article 12 the organisation lobbying for incorporation of the UNCRC into UK law comes to mind. Young Scot's 'Truth about Youth' project. Others I have also encountered whilst reading materials released by Together Scotland and Children in Scotland.
Jane Coad's study where children were involved in analysis. Various others.
This was a research project started by young people to research improvements in service provision to them, particularly the library service.
National Children's Bureau regularly do pieces of research with children and young people as co facilitators.
A PhD student where I work has looked at participation and children as co-researchers.
Children's perceptions to risk and play, using their own narratives and photographs to articulate their views.
Priscilla Alderson's research at Institute of Education, London.
National Youth Agency projects.
Northern Ireland Commissioner for Children and Young People include children as peer researchers and/or on advisory boards on every research project they develop. National Children's Bureau UK also do many.
Children looking at genetic conditions in their own environment; Children linking research to politics and presenting at a youth forum.
A visual research project asking young people's perceptions on where they live and what things are important to them. Young people were trained in the use of cameras and video recorders and collected the data themselves.
Work at Leicester University - Jennie Fleming et al.
Investing in Children in Durham uses a practice model where children and young people are supported to research and campaign for change on issues they identify. These are diverse and numerous - for example, public transport, or the provision of insulin pumps for diabetic patients.
Work at the Open University, UK.
Research in Oxford (Barton) to re-develop a playground in Waynflete Road. In conjunction with adults, there was a survey designed, and children and indeed parents were asked to choose what sort of playground and the actual equipment should be installed. Highly participatory and a feeling of ownership developed - one of the best kept places in Oxford.
See National Youth Agency, young researchers network, and Open University work by Mary Kellett.
Recently, the Youth Alcohol Commission. A number of years ago I was involved in supporting young people to research the health needs of young people in their locality.
Research into the lives of young women in Northern Ireland involved a peer researcher - fully trained, paid and involved in all aspects of the research. A number of voluntary organisations have come together to set-up a network which supports peer researchers (Children and Young People as Researchers Network) - nice example of a project by young people at NCB who are currently doing work on body image (they identified this as an issue themselves).
See Mary Kellett's work. There are numerous 'peer research' projects too. Also Lolichen and CWC in Bangalore, India, children researching their environments.
Kids in care projects.

Community safety research done in Tower Hamlets in London and also in Wales. Research on violence at school.
People SAY they want children and young people's views, but do they really? Young people themselves always tell us one of the main reasons they want to take part in research is to make things better for young people.
Young people doing peer interviews for teenage cancer patients.
There are many projects funded by government, charities and research councils that show this. My recently completed project on planning for permanence in foster care - the funders were specifically asking us to include children's views and asked us to take more time/have more money in order to do so. Where this research has been presented, children's perspectives and the nature of the research methods with children have been seen as high priority by practitioners and policy makers. Our current project - on looked after children and offending - different funder - we have 120 interviews with young people and a young people's reference group advising, piloting and helping with analysis/dissemination. This is not universal but is quite standard.
I have worked with young people to research their own communities e.g. young refugees research educational support needs amongst their peers.
Work completed by young people in the youth forum which I manage. A survey into young people and feeling safe in the locality.
My own PhD research with 'at risk' young people participating in therapeutic horsemanship and research with children on (ex)traordinary lives project at Cardiff University.
Northern Ireland Commissioner for Young People research on the rights of young people in Northern Ireland. Care Pathways and outcomes study ICCR / BYDS study ICCR.
Effects of divorce.
The work being done by the Public Science Research Group such as 'Polling for Justice', but there are others as well.
Students helped their teacher/researcher with a project studying the effects of dance on literacy. The students helped design the questions and collect the information.
Organizations such as United Way support youth-driven research projects on school quality.
Research assistant/data collector on protocol, such as conducting surveys or community mapping/interviews, data analysis.
High school students completing science fair projects.
Howard Gardner's Good Play project interviewed children under the age of 18 to ask their perspective on digital media and ethics.
Researchers for commercial organizations ask children about their preferences and views vis-a-vis media and fashion because it helps them market to children more efficiently.
There are a number of ethnographies that have taken unexpected turns because of the children and their experiences. Participatory research and inquiry based projects are also around that begin with the children.
Youth media instruction frequently includes critical thinking skills and critical engagement with media representations. I know of a few studies / projects that include youth in the gathering and examination of these representations.
UN Study process.
The former St. John's Urban Institute in SF involved youth in participatory research, self-evaluation of projects. The organization has since changed their name to Mission Graduates.
I know there have been high school projects that my students have been involved in research.
Elizabeth Chin, see Appendix to Purchasing Power.
Arts-based comics research, University of Utah.

APPENDIX C: MAIN FOCUS OF PARTICIPANTS' RESEARCH PROJECTS

Majority World Researchers

Information sharing among child-focused organisations.
Know the conditions on health, rights to work in it, through the public policies.
Play, emotional problems, the relation with their caregivers.
Poverty alleviation and development in general.
Violated child rights.
Creativity.
Children's end of life issues.
Understanding the way childhood is conceptualised in India and how it impacts on the Right to Participation. I am also engaged in studies for organisations that work in the field of Child Rights.
Designing engagement strategies for children taking into account their respective learning styles.
Social and economic consequences of armed conflicts on children in displaced camps.
The identity and feeling of self-belonging among children of Jordanian mothers and foreign husbands. The Social, Cultural and Legal Status of the Girl-Child in Jordan.
Child labour, street children, child participation and protection within and outside of schools, sex education and juvenile justice.
My main topic is substitute child care in the families and institutions, (foster care, adoption) and child rights.
Educational Pathways of different groups of youth.
An intended one in the near future (Children the future backbone of the country). That is, to what extent are children being seen as our future leaders and what is currently being done by all stakeholders interested in children's development to see that children get the best of everything for their total development and quality of life.
My research is focused on children's ideas of peace and the future and their role in it in Colombia. More broadly, I want to challenge ideas of children who have been affected by violence as unable to contribute to peace building.
Our research focus is in all areas that relate to children like, for example, violence against children in school / within the family / In the community, about their disability and access to services, situations of street children, children's rights, legal and policy framework, etc.
Participation.
Children, teacher.
Currently, I am based in the US - for my doctoral research. Hence the focus of my research has shifted from children in India to children in the Diaspora.
Working Children, Roma education.
In different issues such as violence against children, child rights violations, understanding of concepts such as justice.
Children and migration; currently parental migration.
Vulnerable children: describing their situations and testing interventions to improve these.
I focus more on adolescents, with whom I work issues of migration, social exclusion, and also sexuality. It is, with people from 13 years ongoing.
Cultural and sexual diversity in young people (12 to 29 years old).
Ethics in Child Participation.
I focus on participatory research with children - on creating processes so that I can facilitate the capturing of authentic voices and also processes where children can be co-researchers into their lived reality.
Children's socio-economic rights, HIV/AIDS, child labour.
Public health, child rights, children's participation
Children's mental health; Intervention with children victims of trauma; Trauma, coping, and resilience.
Youth cultures and agency, cultural practices of youth, urban space and Indian youth, musicians, performance and body, street Corners boys, punks in Mexican cities. They are children and youth cultural and social practices. Agency.

Minority World Researchers

Post-separation parenting.
Evaluations of health and social welfare programs.
Studying everyday interactions of children, their peers and adults.
Adolescents with type one diabetes.
The individual adult-child interaction that occurs in the research process that many researchers refer to as rapport-building or building trust, and the reciprocity that may or may not result.
Mental Health.
Children who work and refugee children. Children and their rights.
Research with children engaged in the welfare system.
Infant sleep and crying and early trauma.
Youth service delivery (encompassing health, education, accommodation and welfare) and strengths-based programs for marginalised young people.
Children's interests, knowledge and learning in early childhood centres.
Family law and post-separation parenting; Chronic illness and family functioning.
Children's perceptions of legal and other processes that affect their lives.
Children's lives and child welfare/well-being.
Children's folklore.
Children's traditional lore - games, rhymes etc. Children's folklore.
Advertising, marketing and the construction of the 'tween' market in the 1980s/1990s.
Literature written for children.
Child labour. Sexual assault on children, including rape. Criminal offending by children, including violent offending.
Children in armed conflict.
Children's behaviours related to making positive choices.
Issues of subjectivity and schooling among rural youth. In particular, I am interested in exploring how systems of gender, race, and class, as well as space, shape young people's understandings of themselves and their futures.
The relationship between technology, gender, and the construction of children as savvy or in need of protection.
Understanding their social use of digital media.
Leisure reading, geographies of reading, perceptions of libraries and bookstores, reading and print culture among teenagers.
Children's reading practices.
The impact of international measures (sanctions, naming and shaming, embargoes, travel ban, freezing assets, etc.) on the recruitment of children in armed conflict, from the point of view of children.
Youth Information Behaviour.
Children's rights.
Children without parental care and access to services for immigrant families.
Dance with children and youth.
Sociology of childhood / Constructions of childhood / Leisure and childhood.
Assessment of their learning.
Social Justice and career education.
Young children with special needs.
Looking at children's reading material and reading experiences.
Development of curricular knowledge.
Early years education.
I look at the interrelations of language, cognition and social understanding.
Teacher practice, teacher beliefs, children's views of sustainability and looking after the environment; transitions.
Environment planning.

Teaching and learning in ECE; ECE policy.
Early childhood outdoor environments.
Children's work.
Children's social participation.
Social work and education.
Intergenerational studies.
Children's physicality and body size; Parents' responses to GP information about children's overweight; Children's television-watching in their families; Children's use of new digital media.
Civil participation rights during health services for children with disabilities.
Children's rights; Early childhood education services; Parent support and development.
Finding out how children feel about their parents' separation and their perception of being heard and consulted / acknowledged as part of this major transition.
Wellbeing and disability.
Social justice, meaningful dialogue between teachers and children.
Children's stress and coping.
Socio-legal research with children, young people and their families on issues they face (especially following parental separation) and rights issues (such as citizenship, discipline, their participation and expression of views in family law dispute resolution processes).
Children's learning in early childhood education.
Inclusion of young children with impairments.
Child abuse (especially sexual abuse): prevention, treatment, children in the legal system. Parental separation and family reformation (step families), particularly systems of intervention (therapeutic, legal, prevention through parent education). Young people suicide prevention.
Socio-legal research.
Child and youth well-being.
Legal responses to child abuse, or disputes about children's medical treatment.
Participation issues, professional development of community and youth workers, role of supervision in professional practice.
Oral testimonies of childhood - retrospective.
Adoption, fostering, child protection.
Family life.
International child law.
Social inclusion in education and health contexts.
Children in orphanages in Latin America.
Child maltreatment, family support and early intervention (mostly maltreatment).
Social work processes - child protection and adoption.
Safeguarding children in the community.
My previous research has been on foster care. The current project I am working on is about children in care and offending.
Children's media.
The NCB Research Centre undertakes research to inform policy and practice across the children's sector in England and Northern Ireland. Our main research areas include early years; social care; education, health and well-being; disability and special educational needs; play and positive activities and youth justice. We carry out a wide range of small-scale and large-scale projects, often combining methodological, policy and practice expertise, and in collaboration with other research institutions and policy and practice experts. A key theme of our work is the active involvement of children and young people in the planning and process of research, as well as engaging children as research participants.
Post-adoption contact between adoptive children and their birth relatives.
Developmental psychology; education.
Chronic renal failure.
International children's cases involving abduction and relocation.

Gender.
Social inclusion.
Health needs of children affected by domestic abuse.
Marginalised and vulnerable children in developing countries - Tanzania. Children without parental care and children's rights.
Article 12.
Children's, parents' and professionals' views and experiences of speech and langauge therapy.
Children's play
To improve service provision to young people and include them in that process.
Trafficking of children from abroad.
Looked after children and offending.
Participation.
Understanding children's notions of cultural identity and its impact on how they form friendship groups.
Using child centred research methods from an ethnographic approach about children's daily lives.
Children 'looked after' including in state care.
Experience of child protection meetings.
Children's family and peer relationships.
Children's understandings of peace-building concepts.
Children and improving the facilities for them. Demonstrating measurable qualitative and quantitative outcomes to increase willingness to fund resources.
Child sexual exploitation in Wales - problems and solutions from the perspectives of young people and professionals.
Effects of participation in dynamic cycling on physical abilities and quality of life for children with Cerebral Palsy.
Exploring the position of young researchers.
My focus has mostly been on parents. I've been involved in one study that specifically sought children's views (ages 7-12). Another study looked at very young children, age three and younger. We attempted to get at their perspectives by observing what they did, were permitted to do and were restrained from doing.

APPENDIX D: PUBLICATIONS AND RESOURCES ON ETHICS OF CONDUCTING RESEARCH WITH CHILDREN

Specific Publications
Alderson, P. (1995). Listening to Children.
Alderson, P., & Morrow, V. (2004). Ethics, social research and consulting with children and young people. Barnardos, Essex. **
Areen, J. (1992). Legal constraints in research with children. In B. Stanley & J. E. Sieber (Eds.), Social research on children and adolescents: Ethical issues (pp. 7-28). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
Boyden, J. (2000). Conducting research with war-affected and displaced children: Ethics and methods, Cultural Survival Quarterly, Issue 24.2, July 31, Cambridge, MA.
Boyden, J., & Ennew, J. (1997). Children in Focus: A Manual for Participatory Research with Children. Stockholm: RÃ¤dda Barnen (Swedish Save the Children). *
Broad, B., & Saunders, S. (1998). Involving young people leaving care as peer researchers in a health research project: A learning experience. Research, Policy and Planning, (16) (1) 1-9.
Beresford, B. Personal Accounts Involving Disabled Children in Research.
Boyden, Ling & Myers. What works for working children.
Brownlie, J. Children as Researchers, University of Stirling.
Christensen, P., & James, A. (Eds.) (2000). Research with children: Perspectives and practices, Essex: Barnardos. ********
Christensen, P., & Prout, A. (2002). Working with Ethical Symmetry in Social Research with Children. Childhood, 9(4), 477-497.
Clacherty, G., & Donald, D. (2007). Child participation in research: Reflections on ethical challenges in the southern / African context. African Journal of AIDS Research, 6(2), 147-156.
Cocks, A. (2006). The Ethical Maze: Finding an Inclusive Path Towards Gaining Children's Agreement to Research Participation. Childhood, 13(2), 274-266.
Darian-Smith, K., & Factor, J. (Eds.) (2005). Child's Play. Museum Victoria, Melbourne.
Duque-PÃ¡ramo, M. C., & Dell Clark, C. (2007). Beyond regulation: Ethical questions for research With children. Anthropology News, 48(4), 5-5.
Farrell, A. (2005). Ethical research with children. Berkshire: Open University Press. *****
Fine, G. A., & Sandstrom, K. L. (1988). Knowing children: Participant observation with minors. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.
Fraser et al. (2004). Doing Research with Children and Young People. London: Sage.
Freeman, M. & Mathison, S. (2009). Researching Children's Experiences. Guilford Press, New York.
Garbarino, J. What children can tell us. *
Gollop, M. (2000). Interviewing children: A research perspective, in A. Smith, N. Taylor & M. Gollop (Eds.), Children's voices: Research, policy and practice. Auckland: Pearson Education.
Goodfellow, J., & Hedges, H. (2007). Early childhood practitioner research 'centre stage': Contexts, contributions and challenges. In L. Keesing-Styles & H. Hedges (Eds.), Theorising early childhood practice: Emerging dialogues (pp. 187-210). Baulkham Hills, NSW: Pademelon Press.
Green, S., & Hogan, D. (2005). Researching children's experience: Approaches and methods. London: Sage. *
Grieg, A., Taylor, J., & Mackay, T. (2007). Doing Research with Children. London: Sage.
Hart & Tyrer. (2006). Research with Children Living in Situations of Armed Conflict: Concepts, Ethics and Methods. RSC Working Paper No. 30.
Holland, Reynolds et al. Becoming participant.
Holt, L. (2004). The 'Voices' of Children: De-centring Empowering Research Relations. Children's Geographies, 2(1), 13–27.
James, A., & Prout, A. (1990). Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood. London: Falmer Press.
Johnson et al., Stepping forward (Intermediate Technology Publications) / Listening to smaller voices (Johnson).
Kirby, P. (2004). A Guide to Actively Involving Young People in Research, for researchers, research commissioners and managers. Eastleigh: INVOLVE. *
Lewis & Lindsay. Researching Children's Perspectives.

Lewis, V., Kellett, M., Robinson, C., Fraser, S., & Ding, S. (2004). The Reality of Research with Children and Young People. London: Sage. *
Mahon, A., et al. (1996). Researching children: Methods and ethics. Children and Society 10(2), 145-154.
March, K. (2008). The Musical Playground. New York: Oxford University Press.
Mitchell & Reid-Walsh. Researching Children's Popular Culture.
Morrow, V. (2003). The ethics of social research with children. Paper presented at CRED, University of Western England, 20 March.
Morrow, V., & Richards, M. (1996). The ethics of social research with children: An overview. Children and Society, 10, 90-105. **
Opie, I.. & P. (1969). Children's games in street and playground. Oxford University Press, UK.
Podmore, V. (2007). Wellington: NZCER.
Powell, M.A., & Smith, A.B. (2006). Ethical Guidelines for research with children: A review of current research ethics documentation in New Zealand. Kotuitui, 1, 125-138.
Punch, S. (2002). Research with Children: The Same or Different from Research with Adults? Childhood, 9, 321-341. *
Skelton. (2008). Research with children and young people: Exploring the tensions between ethics, competence and participation. Children's Geographies, 6(1), 21-36.
Shakespeare, T. Disabled children and participation in decision making.
Soto, L. (Ed.) Social research with children.
Stanley, B., Sieber, J. E., & National Institutes of Health Office for Protection from Research Risk. (1992). Social research on children and adolescents: Ethical issues. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
Thomas, N., & O'Kane, C. (1998). The Ethics of Participatory Research with Children. Children and Society, 12, 336-348 ***
Thompson, R. (1992). Developmental changes in research risk and benefit. In B. Stanley & J. E. Sieber (Eds.), Social research on children and adolescents: Ethical issues (pp. 31-64). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Tisdall, K., Davis, J., Hill, M., & Prout, A. Children, young people and social inclusion.
Tisdall, K., Davis, J., & Gallagher, M. (2009). Researching with Children and Young People. London: Sage.
Weber, L. R., Miracle, A., & Skehan, T. (1994). Interviewing Early Adolescents: Some Methodological Considerations. Human Organization, 53(4).
Westcott, H., & Littleton, K. (2005). Exploring meaning in interviews with children. In S. Greene & D. Hogan (Eds.), Researching Children's Experiences (pp. 141-157). London: Sage.
Williamson, E., Goodenough, T., Kent, J., & Ashcroft, R. (2005). Conducting research with children: The limits of confidentiality and child protection protocols. Children and Society, 19, 397-409.

Authors

Priscilla Alderson *******
Jo Boyden
Leena Alanen
Brooker (2001)
Browning & Hatch (1995)
Ann Buchanan
Cockburn
Pia Christensen
Alison Clark
Clark & Moss (2001, 2005)
Clark, Kjorholt & Moss (2006)
William Corsaro *
Cremin & Slatter (2004)
Cullen, Hedges & Bone (2009) *
John Davis
Dockett & Perry(2003)
Eide & Winger (2005)

Judith Ennew
Cecilia Fisher
Greenfield (2006)
Susan Harter
Hedges (2002)
Helen Hedges, Joy Cullen, Glenda MacNaughton
Allison James ****
Jensen & McKee, Scanlan, Robinson, Douglas (UK)
Mary John
Kaye Johnson
Mary Kellett **
Kennedy & Surman (2005)
Anne Trine Kjorholt
McIntosh (Australia)
MacNauighton, Rolfe & Siraj-Blatchford (2001)
Maguire (2004)
Jan Mason
Berry Mayall ***
Gary Melton
Virginia Morrow***
Morrow & Alderson
Bridget Pettitt
Powell & Smith
Pramling Samuelsson(2004)
Alan Prout
Carol Smart,UK
Anne Smith
Merle Spriggs
Thabet, A A., & Thabet, S.
Kay Tisdall
Martin Woodhead
Associations / Institutions / Websites / Journals
Barnados.
Belmont Report on Ethical Research Guidelines.
British Educational Research Association.
British Psychological Society ethical research guidelines. *
Caribbean Health Research Council and NIH (National Institutes of Health) websites.
Cendif-Unimet.
Children's Research Network.
Chronic Poverty Research Center. GUIDELINES FOR PASSIVE CONSENT- Healthy Kids; Methods Toolbox
Including Children (Children's Rights Centre, South Africa (2009)
An open online Disability Research List Discussion.
GMC / RCPCH.
ISPCAN ethical and safety issues.
Horizons, Population Council, etc publication. Ethical approaches to gathering information from children and adolescents.

MCRN (Medicines for Children Research Network) provide advice, as does NHS NRES website.
MOE guidelines, Ministry of Education website, New Zealand (project led by Judith Loveridge). *
MRS code of conduct / MRS guidance on research with children.
NCB Guidelines for research with children and young people.
NSPCC guidelines.
NSW Commissioner for Children website. *
NZ Association for Research in Education (NZARE) Ethics guidelines. *
Panos Institute
Participation Works - bank of resources.
Presswise Trust (now Mediawise).
Regional Working Group on Child Labour. (2002). Handbook for Action-orientated Research Bangkok, Thailand: Regional Working Group for Child Labour is Asia.
Save the Children Guides.*******
Children and Participation: Research, monitoring and evaluation with children and young people: Save the Children / So you want to involve children in research: Save the Children (2004).
So You Want to Involve Children in Research? A toolkit supporting children's meaningful and ethical participation in research relating to violence against children. Save the Children.
Ethical Approaches to Gathering Information from Children and Adolescents in / International Settings: Guidelines and Resources, Save the Children So you want to consult with children? A toolkit of good practice.
Guidelines from Society for Research on Child Development (SRCD).
Guidance by UK professional bodies (RCPCH, BMA, MRC, BPS etc).
UNICEF Guidelines. ***
Gathering Information from Children and Adolescents: An Ethical Guide / USAID/Horizons/Family Health International/UNICEF (2005).
UNICEF Evaluation Office (April 2002). Children Participating in Research, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Ethics and Your Responsibilities as a Manager, Evaluation Technical Notes, No.1, UNICEF. NY, USA.
United Nations reports and recommendations.
York University Ethics Guidelines at www.yorku.ca
www.childdata.org.uk
http://www.the-sra.org.uk/guidelines.htm /
www.invo.org.uk
http://research.shu.ac.uk/ethics-ethnicity
Journals: Gender and Education; International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education; Qualitative Inquiry; Research in Early Childhood Education Journal.

APPENDIX E: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Finally, is there anything else you'd like to say that we haven't asked you about - in relation to ethical issues when doing research relating to children?							
RAW COMMENTS	**Survey & topic feedback**	**Research methods/ Use of findings/ feedback**	**Respect for child rights/ views**	**Issues re: ethic guidelines/ boards**	**Cultural issues**	**Liaison/ collaboration with others**	**Specific issues**
Thank you for the opportunity to participate.	✓						
Taking in account other issues beyond regulation. We talked about that in: Duque-PÃ¡ramo, M. C., & Dell Clark, C. (2007). Beyond Regulation: Ethical Questions for Research With Children. Anthropology News, 48(4), 5-5.				✓			
Moreover, how we can make all kind of ethics respected by researchers in countries dealing with children as irresponsible and/ or their opinions were not taken seriously				✓			
I think researchers should also be asked in what setting did they enlist the participation of children because if it is outside of schools they must take full responsibility for the safety of the children and provide them with transport back to school or to their homes.							✓
Most researchers still view children as mere subjects for research but not partners in research which is still a great source of worry to working with kids.			✓				
I'd just like to say that researchers, especially trained academics in the field of anthropology and sociology, have always been inherently ethical in their research concerned with human subjects and especially children. Questions about ethics have always been at the forefront of our interactions with young people -- and ethical bodies, such as institutional boards and guidelines must take this into account, and respect it too, when suggesting guidelines.				✓			
Does this survey also involve children?			✓				
My own experience is that researchers from biomedical backgrounds are less resistant to, and more sensitized to ethics issues, while social scientists in Jamaica and the wider Caribbean are less familiar with processes of ethics approval, and far less understanding of the roles of independent oversight committees, or of many considerations of children that simple training in ethics would make clear. Training should be more accessible, and mandatory approval should be a requirement for grant funding and for publication.				✓	✓		✓
I want to emphasize the importance of cultural influences in producing culture relevant ethical frameworks for dealing with children in research but without compromising universal ethics. I also want child researchers to respect the voice of children and seek it in their research, but not forget the voices of the adults.				✓	✓		
I think to choose the proper research method into relation with the research questions and to choose the proper paradigm for the preparations and for interpretation of findings there are ethical issues as well. How much to do the research with children, if nobody pays attention to the findings, and do not change the policies to better for the children?		✓					
There is still much to do regarding legal regulations on doing research with children, specially with excluded children.							✓

Finally, is there anything else you'd like to say that we haven't asked you about - in relation to ethical issues when doing research relating to children?							
RAW COMMENTS	**Survey & topic feedback**	**Research methods/ Use of findings/ feedback**	**Respect for child rights/ views**	**Issues re: ethic guidelines/ boards**	**Cultural issues**	**Liaison/ collaboration with others**	**Specific issues**
There is a differentiation between the ethical concerns in European and North American countries in relation to Mexico in general. The awareness of the ethical concerns differ actually from the cultural standpoints.					✓		
I am very interested in this research, how you conduct it and of course, in its results.	✓						
Very interesting project! Good luck! Ethical issues are marginal in research at my home university.	✓						
I think that the cultural context in which one works is very important. I have written a joint article with Prof David Donald that sums up some of what I have learned. Clacherty, G. & Donald, D. (2007). Child participation in research: reflections on ethical challenges in the southern / African context. African Journal of AIDS Research 2007, 6(2): 147â€"156.					✓		
Just as adult subjects of/participants in research desire feedback and access to findings, children I have done research with feel very strongly about access to research findings and outcomes. They want to know whether and how their views were used/useful. It is important not just to give feedback but to ensure that it is presented in an appropriate and accessible way. I have only encountered a handful of organisations that have invested time and resources in this.		✓					
In relation to research on child related research I need training and the cooperation of expertise in this area of research.							✓
Ethics should be defined and understood by children if you want them to be protected against any harm by the research.			✓				
No, but I remain at your service to continue learning and sharing in the field of ethics because it is very important and very necessary.	✓						
On second thoughts some resources re other methods for children - and feedback from children and young people themselves would be very useful.			✓				
There is a gap in the research field. My personal view is that research participants are asked far too often about perspectives, and this is to the detriment of research that focuses on observing actual everyday practices as they unfold.		✓					
Attitudes are changing, but the adult protective focus is still an issue both as an obstacle and because of the very real dilemmas it raises.							✓
Treat children with respect.			✓				
Different research perspectives and methodologies construct the relationship between (adult) researchers and (young) participants differently - those which do not articulate how this relationship is constructed tend, in my experience, to privilege adults over children/young people and thus perpetuate a discourse in which adults 'know better' than children/young people.		✓	✓				
It would be interesting to hear children's views on what standards they actually value most / key issues from their view. Good luck to your project!	✓		✓				

Finally, is there anything else you'd like to say that we haven't asked you about - in relation to ethical issues when doing research relating to children?							
RAW COMMENTS	**Survey & topic feedback**	**Research methods/ Use of findings/ feedback**	**Respect for child rights/ views**	**Issues re: ethic guidelines/ boards**	**Cultural issues**	**Liaison/ collaboration with others**	**Specific issues**
There is the question of interviewing children with their parents versus alone. Sometimes parents do not wish to leave their child along, but this can skew the answers. However, it can also help a shy child to become more forthcoming- definitely a tension.		✓					
A more developed child interview with greater development of interviewing skills to solicit opinions from children.		✓					
It was an excellent survey!	✓						
Great survey!	✓						
We need to get children's rights issues on the agenda for national research funding bodies and regional and local ethics boards. I feel like I am banging my head against a brick wall, with most people in power coming from a quantitative perspective.		✓	✓				
I don't think there is enough on teenagers. So much is written about young children but not enough about the 12-18 age group.							✓
Very concerned about what the right thing to do is when parent says 'no' but child says 'yes'.							✓
Children and their experiences are diverse; their lives and opportunities are boundaried by the determining and inter-locking contexts of class, gender, sexuality, 'race', sectarianism, age, and so on. Ethical considerations must recognise these power dynamics and understand that research in conflicted societies / communities / families is inevitably risky and sometimes dangerous. These are the hard issues, particularly in divided and marginalised communities. Tightly drawn ethical guidelines cannot resolve these issues. For example, in order to disclose that a child was being held in solitary confinement in an adult jail for no other reason than she self-harmed and to provide the grounds for judicial review of her case and have her removed from those conditions I breached the ethical protocol that I had signed ... Happy to provide this as a case study that I now use in identifying the dilemmas faced by critical researchers involved in work that by its focus can be exposÃ© ...				✓			
There is a need for clarity around what, how and why we are including children in research, the role of parents and/or guardians (particularly when researching with young people over the age of 16), and how we might encourage schools and other 'official' organisations to see such research as contributing to positive transformative practice, rather than becoming defensive and seeing it as a criticism of them personally, or as a negative critique of their practices. There is also a need to review the language of research and the ethical review processes that may not be appropriate for all children and/or all situations.				✓		✓	

Finally, is there anything else you'd like to say that we haven't asked you about - in relation to ethical issues when doing research relating to children?							
RAW COMMENTS	**Survey & topic feedback**	**Research methods/ Use of findings/ feedback**	**Respect for child rights/ views**	**Issues re: ethic guidelines/ boards**	**Cultural issues**	**Liaison/ collaboration with others**	**Specific issues**
It is very important to start considering more meaningful ways of interacting with quantitative-oriented researchers so they start to gain an understanding of why it is important to engage with children in the research process and to value their contributions. Similarly, policy-makers need to understand why the richness of research findings can be so enhanced with information from children's own perspectives and then translated into more child-centred policy and practice. Funders also need to understand the expense of undertaking research with children, especially when it involves interviews and innovative methodologies.						✓	
Would like to see strong guidelines for qualifications of researchers.							✓
Institutional ethics procedures can act as a significant barrier to doing quality research. People on these committees do not always know a lot about young children and can make demands that are unhelpful and impractical. e.g. I was asked to give feedback to a three-year old on his 'performance'. I was merely observing a child going about his everyday play activities, so there was no 'performance' involved! The dialogue concerning this and other similar points hindered the project getting underway for some time. Some of the centre staff were irritated by the top-heavy requirements of institutions and preferred their own standards of ethical conduct for research. In some ways, this would work much better as then the researcher and staff can work collaboratively instead of the researcher coming in with mandatory requirements.				✓			
Working with spatial information and GIS presents particular issues as with availability of technology, internet GIS maps, street maps etc points can be traceable which can contravene ethics but if you use spatial information especially GIS you cannot keep amending spatial data as it invalidates it.							✓
I think how you start and end the research is as important as is the time when you are in their context - too little thought is given to disengaging from the project in ways appropriate to the age of the children.		✓					
It is important to me to consider children's views, not just in research but in their everyday learning situations.			✓				
Fascinating subject!	✓						
You ask about whether I have been mentored. I believe that I have been a mentor to many other researchers on ethical issues - especially postgraduate students, but also colleagues. I think that many Ethics Committees ought to be exposed to more recent ideas about children's rights, to ensure that they respect children's right to give their informed consent to research.			✓	✓		✓	
1) I think finding the balance between children's right to protection and their right to participation is a key issue. 2) It would be interesting to explore children's perspectives on ethical issues in research. 3) Some teaching on ethical issues when doing research with children should be a key component of postgraduate study in any area/discipline that includes the possibility of research with children participating.			✓				✓

Finally, is there anything else you'd like to say that we haven't asked you about - in relation to ethical issues when doing research relating to children?							
RAW COMMENTS	**Survey & topic feedback**	**Research methods/ Use of findings/ feedback**	**Respect for child rights/ views**	**Issues re: ethic guidelines/ boards**	**Cultural issues**	**Liaison/ collaboration with others**	**Specific issues**
Undertaking qualitative research with children is about relationships and respect. These take time to build, an issue for much funded research. Arguing for the inclusion of all participants' perspectives is vital. I cannot see how research in an early childhood context could be solely quantitative; mixed methods are essential to get the range of data, including children's views.			✓			✓	
Thank you for undertaking this project. Ethics and children and research are inextricably mixed, but there are not enough examples readily accessible which show how children benefit from the research. What difference does it make to their quality of life, or their experiences of success or failure at school, or in building relationships in communities?	✓	✓					
Ethical standards, while very useful in research that respects the human rights of children, need to be worked out together with children and communities alike - taking local ethos of childhood seriously.						✓	
This is a very important issue!	✓						
How do you think prevention concerning ethical issues when doing research relating to children could be done? What main guidelines and orientations concerning this issue you propose to be public shared? What institution, organization or committee should/could be monitoring or prevent this aspect in your opinion? At an international level? If so, how to do it respecting cultural differences sometimes is a difficult balance? At a national level? How to prevent similarities if possible?				✓			
I appreciate very much the project you are doing since I am very concerned about how children's voices and thoughts are absent in childhood policies and how the 'best interest of the child' is something only adults are allowed to decide even regardless of the children's opinion when they are the ones who would be affected by the decisions.	✓		✓				
For me the most valuable source to think on ethics is to discuss with colleagues who have been working with children.						✓	
It is a matter of respect for people not judged being of age.			✓				
We are currently dealing with challenges around protecting images of children's work on the internet i.e. we would like to put research reports up on the internet, but it is difficult to protect images, such as photographs of children's art work from being downloaded and used in other contexts. ... The images are anonymous but are personal in nature so we need to protect them - this issue is not just a problem for children's research though - applies to any images that we have consent to use in reports.							✓
We should always try to give feedback to children who have given time in a user friendly way.		✓					
Questions of accessing children – i.e. can you approach children without parental consent then seek it afterwards?		✓					
It is getting more difficult!	✓						

Finally, is there anything else you'd like to say that we haven't asked you about - in relation to ethical issues when doing research relating to children?							
RAW COMMENTS	**Survey & topic feedback**	**Research methods/ Use of findings/ feedback**	**Respect for child rights/ views**	**Issues re: ethic guidelines/ boards**	**Cultural issues**	**Liaison/ collaboration with others**	**Specific issues**
My experience is that there is a very broad range of views and practices in relation to this in the UK. i.e. some gatekeepers (e.g. schools, children's clubs, and parents) take a very cautious and protective view, others are lax / relaxed and uninformed to a surprising extent.							✓
What about feedback to children and young people? This is a problem is we want meaningful participation and research is done through schools where children move on. Also the feedback is a lot later and young people have sometimes forgotten about their involvement Are there adequate ethical guidelines on research using the web?		✓					
Issues of working with other potentially 'vulnerable' groups may also be relevant here e.g. if the child is an asylum seeker or part of a ethnic minority group. I have been involved with looking at ethical issues in relation to researching ethnic minorities. Details can be found at: http://research.shu.ac.uk/ethics-ethnicity/ While the project that we worked on focused on a UK context a lot of the material is also internationally relevant.					✓		
I think people are afraid to conduct research with children because of things that they see as constraints such as safety, confidentiality etc. ... Access to children can be an obstacle in some cases. Culturally we need to change these views and recognise that the benefits of children's voices in research outweigh the safe-guarding aspects that can be over zealous.			✓				
The UK seems to be contradictory in its approach to what children can or cannot consent to, with ability to consent to medical treatment at 16 by statute or earlier if 'competent'. Young people aged 16+ can give consent to participate in research, but under 16 consent of someone with parental responsibility is usually required (by practice rather than law). For the young people I work with that is often inappropriate e.g. if they have run away from home but are not in care, so the local authority do not have parental responsibility. Ethics committees may be very cautious, and gatekeepers e.g. in schools may also refuse access on the basis of vulnerability. But it is arguable that young people who would be regarded as 'competent' for other purposes should in most cases have the right to choose whether or not to participate.				✓			
A key feature of ethics is that it is not something that you can sort out completely before you begin the project. Ethical dilemmas arise throughout research with children and young people (and adults actually), and it is important to provide ongoing information and negotiate ongoing consent to participate. In qualitative longitudinal research with children and young people (which we have been conducting), this can mean that they drop in and out of waves, and ethical dilemmas arise at some points in their lives and not at others. We recently faced some major ethical dilemmas concerning the death of one of the young people who had been participating in our research over a 7 year period or so.				✓			
The importance of the UNCRC, and particularly Article 12, in relation to children's right to have a say in matters that affect them - including research.			✓				

Finally, is there anything else you'd like to say that we haven't asked you about - in relation to ethical issues when doing research relating to children?							
RAW COMMENTS	**Survey & topic feedback**	**Research methods/ Use of findings/ feedback**	**Respect for child rights/ views**	**Issues re: ethic guidelines/ boards**	**Cultural issues**	**Liaison/ collaboration with others**	**Specific issues**
The ethical codes and protocols relevant to doing research directly with children are rightly rigorous and protective as they need to be. However, the additional work involved in obtaining ethical approvals in this field, combined with the usual need to provide a team approach to doing research with children, means that this will remain a considerable disincentive to many scholars, in particular those that tend to work on their own rather than in a team setting.				✓			
Good survey, but you seem to refer to ethical review processes primarily as a possible obstacle to seeking children's views. Perhaps it would be useful to consider whether, and how, ethical review (or other mechanisms) could be used to improve the quality and inclusiveness of research on children (the positive side of ethical review, as well as the negative).	✓			✓			
We should be guided by children and children's panels about research processes and to a certain extent what we should be researching.			✓				
I think one of the key elements with older children is that they should feel they are making a contribution - often to the well-being of other children. For children in care in particular who feel powerless at times - or indeed feel lucky and loved - participating in research can itself be very empowering. If this is ruled out by parents or professional gatekeepers, it seems to me to be a human rights issue for children.			✓				
Ethics committees can be a hindrance when delaying research which has minimal ethical considerations - when doing social research within a health care setting for example. Those assessing the ethical issues are not necessarily best judged to do so.				✓			
Personal characteristics when conducting research with children - how the researcher's identity may affect the level of comfort children feel during data collection.							✓
Removing pre-conditioned minds and hidden agendas from 'researchers' is still the greatest barrier to genuine research. Research frequently operates upon the basis of pre-determined questions in order to present uniformity. Children are not uniform. Open dialogue (an open and receptive mind for the researcher) that becomes child-led is never explored.		✓					✓
The first questions are very general. I am not in a position to tell you what other researchers in my country do. There is such a wide difference even between centres or hospitals within my immediate neighbourhood, all depending on the personalities involved and the funding available.	✓						
Especially within the context of research in cultures that are hesitant to recognize the roles of children in their communities, how to incorporate adults and structures, how to build bridges with child researchers, how to communicate effectively with our research institutions so that they better understand how we may ethically work WITH children as co-researchers.	✓				✓	✓	

Finally, is there anything else you'd like to say that we haven't asked you about - in relation to ethical issues when doing research relating to children?							
RAW COMMENTS	**Survey & topic feedback**	**Research methods/ Use of findings/ feedback**	**Respect for child rights/ views**	**Issues re: ethic guidelines/ boards**	**Cultural issues**	**Liaison/ collaboration with others**	**Specific issues**
I believe that a big obstruction to better research on youth is that scholarship accepts as a given the narrow legal definition of 'childhood' when we might develop our own ethical relationship to it. Adolescents are not children ... and yet we must treat them both equally under all circumstances. That's absurd.							✓
Really great idea. Thanks for giving me the opportunity to reflect on my research!!	✓						
Thank you.	✓						
How do we present our work so that it is received and acted on? What happens outside the research process for youth? Can IRBs maintain the marginalization of 'vulnerable' populations through an insistence on anonymity that can run counter to a group's desire to choose how to represent themselves?		✓		✓			
Issues of photography of children working and identification of specific children in publication of research are becoming increasingly critical in an age of online publication.							✓
Thanks for promoting child / youth-centered research. We need more of it!	✓						
I think this is a very important topic. I think that we need to listen to and involve children in all our research.	✓		✓				
I've never found young people incompetent or too fragile to participate in research or in need of all the protections afforded them - in fact, forcing parental consent can endanger young people and restrict valuable research. The problem is that youths under some circumstances face negative consequences if confidentiality is not protected.							✓