ETHICS AND INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH WITH CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

ADVANCES IN RESEARCH ETHICS AND INTEGRITY

Series Editor: Dr Ron Iphofen, *FAcSS, Independent Consultant, France*

Recent volumes:

Volume 1: Finding Common Ground: Consensus in Research Ethics Across the Social Sciences, *Edited by Ron Iphofen*
Volume 2: The Ethics of Online Research, *Edited by Kandy Woodfield*
Volume 3: Virtue Ethics in the Conduct and Governance of Social Science Research, *Edited by Nathan Emmerich*
Volume 4: Ethics and Integrity in Health and Life Sciences Research, *Edited by Zvonimir Koporc*
Volume 5: Ethics and Integrity in Visual Research Methods, *Edited by Savannah Dodd*
Volume 6: Indigenous Research Ethics, *Edited by Lily George, Juan Tauri and Lindsey Te Ata o Tu MacDonald*

ADVANCES IN RESEARCH ETHICS AND INTEGRITY,
VOLUME 7

ETHICS AND INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH WITH CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

EDITED BY

GRACE SPENCER
Anglia Ruskin University, UK

United Kingdom – North America – Japan
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2022

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-80043-401-1 (Print)
ISBN: 978-1-80043-400-4 (Online)
ISBN: 978-1-80043-402-8 (Epub)

ISSN: 2398-6018 (Series)

For Harry, Emily and Oliver, and all the incredible children and young people that have inspired the chapters in this volume and my broader programme of work.

This page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

This page intentionally left blank

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLES

FIGURES

This page intentionally left blank

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Fitri Arlinkasari, Psy is a psychologist and Lecturer in the Faculty of Psychology, YARSI University, Indonesia. She received her doctoral degree in Architecture and Built Environment from Queensland University of Technology. Her current research includes linking children's experiences of neighbourhood spaces and childhood social capital, gendered playground, education and sustainable behaviour among young people, and ethical practice in research with children.

Abneet Atwal is a PhD student in the Child and Youth Studies programme at Brock University, Ontario, Canada. She is the Project Coordinator for the Inclusive Early Childhood Service System project at Ryerson University, Toronto. Her PhD focusses on the intersection of childhood disability with citizenship, race, culture and language.

Ruth Barley is a Reader of Sociology in the College of Social Sciences and Arts at Sheffield Hallam University, UK. Her research interests lie within the area of cultural diversity, identity and inclusion and more specifically how children conceptualise and operationalise identity and the impact this has on their development.

Ayuko Berchtold-Sedooka is a Senior Research Associate in the Center for Children's Rights Studies, University of Geneva, and at the University of Teacher Education Valais. Her research and teaching activities focus on interdisciplinary and intercultural dialogue between educational sciences and children's rights in Asia and Europe.

Sarah Burch is the Director of Research in the Faculty of Health, Education, Medicine and Social Care at Anglia Ruskin University. She is an experienced academic and research manager and has worked in a range of public sector organisations. Her research addresses wellbeing and need across the life course.

Sara Camponovo is a PhD candidate in Educational Science at the University of Geneva. She is working on the project, 'Exploring the way to and from school with children: an interdisciplinary approach of children's experiences of the third place'. Her participatory research focusses on children's experiences of school journeys.

Penelope Carroll is a Public Health Researcher at the SHORE and Whariki Research Center, Massey University. Her research interests include social policy, housing, neighbourhoods and health and children's rights to participate in the design of child-friendly cities. She has a strong commitment to social sustainability, equity and social justice.

Debra Flanders Cushing, is an Associate Professor of Landscape Architecture in the School of Architecture and Built Environment, Faculty of Engineering at the Queensland University of Technology, Australia. Her research focuses on creating intergenerational community places, including neighbourhood parks and other urban spaces, that promote health and wellbeing for all ages.

Ernestina Dankyi is a Research Fellow at the Center for Social Policy Studies, University of Ghana. Her research focusses largely on the rights and welfare of diverse groups of child and young migrants (internal, international, forced and voluntary).

Frédéric Darbellay is an Associate Professor at the University of Geneva (Valais Campus) and Head of the Inter- and Transdisciplinary Unit at the Center for Children's Rights Studies. His research focusses on the study of interdisciplinarity as a creative process of knowledge production between and beyond disciplines.

Emma Davidson is a Lecturer and Leverhulme Early Career Fellow at the University of Edinburgh. Her work combines childhood, youth and community studies, and she has expertise in collaborative ethnography and participatory research methods.

Justyna Deszcz-Tryhubczak is an Associate Professor of Literature and Director of the Center for Young People's Literature and Culture at the Institute of English Studies, University of Wrocław, Poland. She is the author of *Yes to Solidarity, No to Oppression: Radical Fantasy Fiction and Its Young Readers* (2016). Her research focusses on speculative fiction, utopianism and participatory and child-led approaches.

Victoria Egli, PhD, is a Researcher at the School of Nursing, University of Auckland. Her research focusses on neighbourhood built environments to support children's health and wellbeing. She is interested in how where children live, play and go to school, impacts on their health and wellbeing.

Sofie Henze-Pedersen is a Researcher at The Danish Center for Social Science Research (VIVE), Denmark. Her research interests include childhood and family studies. Her PhD project at the Department of Sociology, University of Copenhagen, explored everyday family life with children who have experienced violence in the family context.

Philip D. Jaffé, by training a Clinical Psychologist, is a Full Professor at the Center for Children's Rights Studies, University of Geneva. He is a member of the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child. His main interests lie in child participation, child-friendly justice and protection.

Marketta Kytta is a Professor of Land Use Planning in the Department of Built Environment, Aalto University, Finland. Her research focusses on environments that promote wellbeing and health, active living, child-friendly environments, sustainability and new methods for public participation. Her innovation "softGIS" is an example of public participation GIS methodology.

Stephen O. Kwankye is an Associate Professor of Population Studies at the Regional Institute for Population Studies, University of Ghana, Legon. He has wide range of research publications with research interests in adolescent sexual and reproductive health, independent child migration, population-development interrelationships, population dynamics and demographic data collection.

Mateusz Marecki, MA, is a Lecturer at Jilin University in China. He has published over 20 articles, reviews and academic translations, and has co-edited a book on war and words. He has been actively involved in organising and running a number of workshops and outreach projects for young readers.

Suzanne Mavoa's research at the School of Population and Global Health at the University of Melbourne focusses on novel and improved geospatial methods in health research, and understanding the relationship between the natural and built environments and health, with a particular focus on children and young people.

Christina McMellon is a Senior Research Fellow for Moray House School of Education and Sport at University of Edinburgh. With a practice background in Community Education, her academic work focusses on participatory research with young people.

Evonne Miller is a Professor of Design Psychology and Director of the Queensland University of Technology Design Lab in the School of Design, Creative Industries at Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia. Her research focusses on how to design environments – built, technical, socio-cultural and natural – that engage and support all users.

Zoé Moody is a Professor at the University of Teacher Education Valais and Senior Research Associate at the Inter- and Transdisciplinarity Unit, Center for Children's Rights Studies, University of Geneva. Her research and teaching activities focus on children's rights to, in and through, education and on children's participation in research.

Abiodun Blessing Osaiyuwu is a qualified social worker who has practised in the UK and Nigeria. She has worked in different departments, including the Student Affairs Division, at the University of Benin, Nigeria. She is currently working with children and young persons with challenging behaviour within a secure environment.

Gillian Parekh is an Associate Professor and Canada Research Chair in Disability Studies and Education within the Faculty of Education at York University, Toronto, Canada. Her work explores how schools construct and respond to disability, as well as how students are organised across programmes and systems.

Jayne Price is a Lecturer in Criminology within the Department of Social and Political Science at the University of Chester, England. Her research interests include prisons, transitions, youth and young adulthood and youth justice. She also volunteers locally within a youth offending service and is a trustee at a YMCA.

Abigail Shabtay is an Assistant Professor in the Children, Childhood and Youth programme at York University in Toronto, Canada. An award-winning researcher and educator, her work focusses on children's rights, youth theatre, child-centred research methods, youth activism, digital performance and drama-based participatory action research.

Melody Smith is an Associate Professor in the School of Nursing, University of Auckland. Her research aspires to inform the development of neighbourhoods where people move around safely by walking and cycling, and where social and physical wellbeing are prioritised. Her work involves integrating objective behavioural measurements with person-centred methods.

Grace Spencer is a Ruskin Fellow at Anglia Ruskin University. Her work focusses on young people's health and wellbeing. She has widely published on concepts of risk and empowerment as they relate to young people; including the ethical and methodological complexities of conducting research with children and young people.

Jill Thompson is a Senior Lecturer in the Health Sciences School, University of Sheffield. She has a background in qualitative and participatory health research. She is committed to the active involvement of children in influencing contexts of relevance to their health and wellbeing.

Kathryn Underwood is a Professor in the School of Early Childhood Studies, Ryerson University, Toronto, Canada. Her research focusses on care, childhood and disability and institutions, with growing emphasis on the divide between public and private relationships that work to organise children and families. She is the Director of the Inclusive Early Childhood Service System project.

Chikezie E. Uzuegbunam is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at HUMA – Institute for Humanities in Africa, University of Cape Town, South Africa. His research interests focus on digital media culture, youth studies, cultural studies and political/health communication in Africa. He was a 2019 fellow of Oxford Media Policy Institute, Oxford University.

Gunjan Wadhwa is an Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Postdoctoral Fellow at the Department of Education, Brunel University London, leading a research project on 'Rural youth identities in India'. Her research interests involve sociology of education and international development, with a focus on identities, youth, gender and citizenship in post-colonial Global South contexts.

Karen Witten is a Professor of Public Health at the SHORE and Whariki Research Center, Massey University. Her research is focussed on the way streets, neighbourhoods and cities are designed and used to promote or inhibit health and wellbeing.

This page intentionally left blank

SERIES/VOLUME EDITORS' BIOGRAPHIES

Volume Editor, *Ethics and Integrity in Research with Children and Young People*

Grace Spencer is a Ruskin Fellow at the Faculty of Health, Education, Medicine and Social Care, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge, UK. Her research focusses on children and young people's health and their health-related practices with reference to concepts of risk, agency and empowerment theory in health promotion. She is the author of *Empowerment, Health Promotion and Young People: A Critical Approach*. She is recognised globally for her expertise in qualitative research methods and the ethics of childhood and youth-centred research, and has published widely on the ethical aspects of research with children and young people.

Series Editor, *Advances in Research Ethics in Integrity*

Ron Iphofen, FAcSS, is Executive Editor for this Emerald book series. He is an Independent Consultant, a Fellow of the UK Academy of Social Sciences, the Higher Education Academy and the Royal Society of Medicine. Since retiring as Director of Postgraduate Studies in the School of Healthcare Sciences, Bangor University, his major activity has been as an adviser to the European Commission (EC) and its executive agencies, and the European Research Council (ERC) on both the seventh Framework Programme (FP7) and Horizon 2020. His consultancy work has covered a range of research agencies (in government and independent) across Europe. He was vice chair of the UK Social Research Association (SRA), updated their ethics guidelines and now convenes the SRA's Research Ethics Forum. He has acted as scientific and ethics advisor for several EC Projects and has advised the UK Research Integrity Office, the National Disability Authority of the Irish Ministry of Justice, the UK Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, the Scottish Executive, the Food Standards Agency, the Ministry of Justice, Agence Nationale de la Recherche (the French research funding agency), the Social Science Research Council Canada amongst many others. He was founding Executive Editor of the Emerald gerontology journal *Quality in Ageing and Older Adults*, published *Ethical Decision Making in Social Research: A Practical Guide* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2009/2011), coedited with Martin Tolich *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research Ethics* (2018) and edited the *Handbook of Research Ethics and Scientific Integrity* for Springer Nature (2020). He is currently leading a European Commission-funded project (PRO-RES) that aims at promoting ethics and integrity in all non-medical research.

This page intentionally left blank

SERIES PREFACE

By

Ron Iphofen (Series Editor)

This book series, *Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity*, grew out of foundational work with a group of Fellows of the UK Academy of Social Sciences (AcSS) who were all concerned to ensure that lessons learned from previous work were built upon and improved in the interests of the production of robust research practices of high quality. Duplication or unnecessary repetitions of earlier research and ignorance of existing work were seen as hindrances to research progress. Individual researchers, research professions and society all suffer in having to pay the costs in time, energy and money of delayed progress and superfluous repetitions. There is little excuse for failure to build on existing knowledge and practice given modern search technologies unless selfish 'domain protectionism' leads researchers to ignore existing work and seek credit for innovations already accomplished. Our concern was to aid well-motivated researchers to quickly discover existing progress made in ethical research in terms of topic, method and/or discipline and to move on with their own work more productively and to discover the best, most effective means to disseminate their own findings so that other researchers could, in turn, contribute to research progress.

It is true that there is a plethora of ethics codes and guidelines with researchers left to themselves to judge those more appropriate to their proposed activity. The same questions are repeatedly asked on discussion forums about how to proceed when similar longstanding problems in the field are being confronted afresh by novice researchers. Researchers and members of ethics review boards alike are faced with selecting the most appropriate codes or guidelines for their current purpose, eliding differences and similarities in a labyrinth of uncertainty. It is no wonder that novice researchers can despair in their search for guidance and experienced researchers may be tempted by the 'checklist mentality' that appears to characterise a meeting of formalised ethics requirements and permit their conscience-free pursuit of a cherished programme of research.

If risks of harm to the public and to researchers are to be kept to a minimum and if professional standards in the conduct of scientific research are to be maintained, the more that fundamental understandings of ethical behaviour in research are shared the better. If progress is made in one sphere everyone gains from it being generally acknowledged and understood. If foundational work is conducted everyone gains from being able to build on and develop further that work.

Nor can it be assumed that formal ethics review committees are able to resolve the dilemmas or meet the challenges involved. Enough has been written about such review bodies to make their limitations clear. Crucially, they cannot follow researchers into the field to monitor their every action; they cannot anticipate all of the emergent ethical dilemmas nor, even, follow through to the publication of findings. There is no adequate penalty for neglect through incompetence, nor worse, for conscious omissions of evidence. We have to rely upon the virtues of the individual researcher alongside the skills of journal reviewers and funding agency evaluators. We need constantly to monitor scientific integrity at the corporate and at the individual level. These are issues of quality as well as morality.

Within the research ethics field new problems, issues and concerns and new ways of collecting data continue to emerge regularly. This should not be surprising as social, economic and technological change necessitate constant re-evaluation of research conduct. Standard approaches to research ethics such as valid informed consent, inclusion/exclusion criteria, vulnerable subjects and covert studies need to be reconsidered as developing social contexts and methodological innovation, interdisciplinary research and economic pressures pose new challenges to convention. Innovations in technology and method challenge our understanding of 'the public' and 'the private'. Researchers need to think even more clearly about the balance of harm and benefit to their subjects, to themselves and to society. This series proposes to address such new and continuing challenges for both funders, research managers, research ethics committees and researchers in the field as they emerge. The concerns and interests are global and well recognised by researchers and commissioners alike around the world but with varying commitments at both the procedural and the practical levels. This series is designed to suggest realistic solutions to these challenges – this practical angle is the *unique selling proposition* (USP) for the series. Each volume will raise and address the key issues in the debates, but also strive to suggest ways forward that maintain the key ethical concerns of respect for human rights and dignity, while sustaining pragmatic guidance for future research developments. A series such as this aims to offer practical help and guidance in actual research engagements as well as meeting the often varied and challenging demands of research ethics review. The approach will not be one of abstract moral philosophy; instead it will seek to help researchers think through the potential harms and benefits of their work in the proposal stage and assist their reflection of the big ethical moments that they face in the field often when there may be no one to advise them in terms of their societal impact and acceptance.

While the research community can be highly imaginative both in the fields of study and methodological innovation, the structures of management and funding, and the pressure to publish to fulfil league table quotas can pressure researchers into errors of judgment that have personal and professional consequences. The series aims to adopt an approach that promotes good practice and sets principles, values and standards that serve as models to aid successful research outcomes. There is clear international appeal as commissioners and researchers alike share a vested interest in the global promotion of professional virtues that lead to the public acceptability of good research. In an increasingly global world

in research terms, there is little point in applying too localised a morality, nor one that implies a solely Western hegemony of values. If standards 'matter', it seems evident that they should 'matter' to and for all. Only then can the growth of interdisciplinary and multi-national projects be accomplished effectively and with a shared concern for potential harms and benefits. While a diversity of experience and local interests is acknowledged, there are existing, proven models of good practice which can help research practitioners in emergent nations build their policies and processes to suit their own circumstances. We need to see that consensus positions effectively guide the work of scientists across the globe and secure minimal participant harm and maximum societal benefit – and, additionally, that instances of fraudulence, corruption and dishonesty in science decrease as a consequence.

Perhaps some forms of truly independent formal ethics scrutiny can help maintain the integrity of research professions in an era of enhanced concerns over data security, privacy and human rights legislation. But it is essential to guard against rigid conformity to what can become administrative procedures. The consistency we seek to assist researchers in understanding what constitutes 'proper behaviour' does not imply uniformity. Having principles does not lead inexorably to an adherence to principlism. Indeed, sincerely held principles can be in conflict in differing contexts. No one practice is necessarily the best approach in all circumstances. But if researchers are aware of the range of possible ways in which their work can be accomplished ethically and with integrity, they can be free to apply the approach that works or is necessary in their setting. Guides to 'good' ways of doing things should not be taken as the 'only' way of proceeding. A rigidity in outlook does no favours to methodological innovation, nor to the research subjects or participants that they are supposed to protect. If there were to be any principles that should be rigidly adhered to they should include flexibility, open-mindedness, the recognition of the range of challenging situations to be met in the field – principles that in essence amount to a sense of proportionality. And these principles should apply equally to researchers and ethics reviewers alike. To accomplish that requires ethics reviewers to think afresh about each new research proposal, to detach from pre-formed opinions and prejudices, while still learning from and applying the lessons of the past. Principles such as these must also apply to funding and commissioning agencies, to research institutions and to professional associations and their learned societies. Our integrity as researchers demands that we recognise that the rights of our funders and research participants and/or subjects are to be valued alongside our cherished research goals and seek to embody such principles in the research process from the outset. This series will strive to seek just how that might be accomplished in the best interests of all.

This page intentionally left blank

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a number of people that have made this volume possible and I am grateful for their support and ongoing commitment to the book. First, I would like to thank Ron Iphofen, Series Editor for Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity, for inviting me to be Editor for this important volume on ethics and integrity in research with children and young people. I am immensely grateful for Ron's timely guidance and support throughout the process of preparing the manuscript and its final publication. I would like to thank the full team at Emerald Publishing for their assistance and meticulous work on preparing the final volume. I am especially thankful to all the authors of the book for their considered and critical engagement with the volume and ethical issues. Their contributions and hard work have resulted in an exciting addition to the field of research ethics with children and young people. I am also hugely appreciative to all of those who participated in the peer review process. I am grateful to all my colleagues at Anglia Ruskin University in Cambridge, particularly Roxana Anghel, and Jill Thompson from the University of Sheffield, for their ongoing support and review of the final manuscript. Finally, warm appreciation goes to my close friends and family who have supported me unreservedly from afar during the preparation of the volume and at the exceptional time of the COVID-19 pandemic.

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION: ETHICS AND INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH WITH CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

Grace Spencer

The expansion of research with children and young people in recent times has offered important opportunities for researchers, practitioners and policy-makers to understand better children's perspectives and everyday lived experiences. In line with Article 12 of the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN, 1989), young people's meaningful participation in research signals an important step towards their rights to participate in matters that affect their lives. Examples of research conducted with children and young people can be found across many academic disciplines including the health and social sciences, psychology, arts and humanities, international development and economics. Children's views on areas such as health and education, family life and friendships, and broader global and political challenges including climate change and more recently, the COVID-19 pandemic are now frequently sought as part of enhanced efforts to inform policy and practice areas directly relevant to young lives (Alderson & Morrow, 2020). Crucially, the growth of research with, on and for children and young people acknowledges that children may have different ideas and experiences from adults and are, thus, the best informants on their own lives.

The development of childhood and youth-focussed research has called for new ways of thinking about and doing research with young people. Maximising children's engagement in research, and in ethically sensitive ways, has sparked new debates about the range of 'appropriate' methodologies and methods best suited to the investigation of young lives (Christensen & James, 2008; Fargas-Malet, McSherry, Larkin, & Robinson, 2010; Green & Hill, 2005; Punch, 2002). Traditional research methods such as interviews, focus groups and observation techniques offer particular ways to generate insights into young lives and have

Ethics and Integrity in Research with Children and Young People
Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity, Volume 7, 1–9

ISSN: 2398-6018/doi:10.1108/S2398-601820210000007004

been championed (to varying degrees) for their abilities to support the building of research relationships and rapport with young participants. Yet, such approaches are also used cautiously because of the 'dangers' of exacerbating the inherent power disparities that exist between adult researchers and younger participants (Davidson, 2017; Holland, Renold, Ross, & Hillman, 2020; James, 2007; Spencer & Doull, 2015) – and as many of the proceeding chapters illustrate. Indeed, children's participation in research is often mediated via adult gatekeepers including parents, carers and teachers who make decisions on children's behalf.

Efforts to minimise the impacts of adult/child power relations have, thus, prompted new methods of enquiry. A range of child and youth-centred methods now exist, which aim to foreground children as active social agents and knowledge producers. Often informed by contributions from the sociology of children (James & Prout, 2015), these approaches seek to challenge dominant deficit discourses that typically privilege ideas about children's (im)maturity and (lack of) competence, thereby readily overlooking young people's views as legitimate ways of knowing and experiencing the world. Examples of such methods are featured in the contributing chapters and include photo-elicitation, creative and arts-based methods, online platforms and digital technologies, and performative and participatory methods. These methodological tools can enhance the opportunities for young people to participate in research and (in part) counter the adult-centric focus of much research.

Despite the methodological advances afforded by these, and other approaches, conducting research with children and young people presents a range of tricky ethical complexities and sensitivities. The ethics and integrity of research with children and young people is now receiving greater critical attention and a growing body of literature explores the ethical difficulties researchers encounter (see Alderson & Morrow 2020, and Ethical Research Involving Children available at www.childethics.com). Research ethics frameworks and related guidance provide useful toolkits to help researchers with their ethical decision-making (see Graham, Powell, Taylor, Anderson, & Fitzgerald, 2013; INVOLVE, 2016; Nuffield Council on Bioethics, 2015). In line with these guidelines and perspectives, Research Ethics Committees (RECs) and Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) typically foreground key ethical principles such as informed consent and assent, confidentiality, privacy and anonymity, and the minimisation of any possible harms or risks stemming from the research. In childhood research, RECs take a particular focus on safeguarding concerns, calling upon researchers to identify and put in place 'appropriate' measures to protect the wellbeing of children as part of ethics approval processes.

Whilst offering important and necessary ethical safeguards and standards, formal ethics review processes are usually informed by adult views and ways of thinking about research and research ethics. Rarely have children and young people's views on research ethics and related processes been sought (an exception includes Spencer, Boddy, & Rees 2014). Children and young people's views on research ethics and the implications of their participation may well differ from adults, reflecting the different priorities or frames of reference children might have and may highlight alternative or unforeseen ethical consequences. Tolich (2016)

reminds us about the difficulties of pre-empting the full range of ethical issues that can and do arise in the field. In contrast to a focus on procedural research ethics, Tolich (2016) and others (Ebrahim, 2010; Guillemin & Gillam, 2004), call for a closer and critical engagement with the everyday ethical moments that emerge in practice. This situated approach highlights the importance of developing a critical ethical reflexivity to aid ethical deliberations and decision-making in context. By drawing close attention to the (unforeseen) issues that can and do arise in the field, researchers can better expose how they managed such tricky moments and the subsequent impacts on the research and participants.

In response to these calls for developing an enhanced ethical reflexivity, this multidisciplinary volume offers a series of critical accounts on some of the everyday ethical issues that can and do emerge in research with children and young people. Drawing on research from across the globe, the chapters that follow expose some of the delicate ethical moments and deliberations the contributing authors have experienced and grappled with in their day-to-day research practice. The volume brings together international examples of research with children and young people of different ages, backgrounds and experiences – reflecting the diversity of young lives and the multiple socio-cultural positions children and young people occupy (Lundy, 2007). The studies reported in the proceeding chapters make use of different methodologies and techniques (questionnaires, interviews, focus groups, observation, visual and creative methods) to support children and young people's engagement in research, each of which come with their own ethical challenges and considerations. Despite contextual and methodological variations, each chapter shares a common commitment to the meaningful and ethical engagement of children and young people in research and the authors offer helpful guidance, suggestions and critical questions to aid researchers with their own ethical deliberations and decision-making.

The volume is set out in three main parts to reflect the different ways and stages ethics enter into our research intentions, processes and outcomes. Part One of the volume tackles some of the everyday ethical issues in research with children and young people including the processes of informed consent, minimising harms and vulnerabilities, and conducting research on 'sensitive' topics and with marginalised or 'hard to reach' children. Part Two takes-up a focus on the researcher's positionality to highlight how adult/child power dynamics impact on the ethics and integrity of research, including the role of emotions and trust in building research relationships with young participants. Part Three of the volume unpacks issues of representation, including how the active involvement of children as co-researchers and research dissemination methods trigger complex issues about children's expertise and how they become defined and represented through, and in, differing research processes and outputs.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH – NAVIGATING TRICKY ETHICAL MOMENTS

In Chapter One, Arlinkasari and colleagues explore the issue of children's informed consent. Drawing on a study with children living in a low-income

context in Indonesia, the authors reflect on their use of story and story-telling methods to engage children in consent processes. Arlinkasari et al. highlight the importance of understanding cultural variations and nuances that shift the meaning and use of commonly used terms such as confidentiality, privacy and rights to withdraw from research. The authors highlight the need for researchers to move beyond imparting study information and instead, offer alternative and creative opportunities for children to explore what their participation might mean for them. This includes developing techniques for children to express their rights *not* to participate and withdraw from research – areas that can be overlooked in efforts primarily aimed at encouraging their participation.

Barley takes forward the issue of consent and opportunities for children's dissent in Chapter Two. Drawing on a longitudinal ethnographic study with young school children in the UK, Barley highlights the importance of viewing children's consent as an ongoing, dynamic process (Morrow, 2008). In this chapter, informed consent processes extend from the planning and data collection stages through to data analysis and data protection and dissemination activities. Barley offers useful examples of the ongoing negotiations held with children, and using a range of techniques over a period of several years. Recognising children's expressions of dissent necessitated the careful 'reading of' children's cues, which reflected their decisions to (temporarily) withdraw from the study, or particular research activities at a given time. By viewing consent (and dissent) as an ongoing process, Barley highlights how children's participation in research must be continuously negotiated and decided by them.

In Chapter Three, Uzuegbunam takes us through a number of tricky ethical issues encountered in a study on young people's use of digital technology in Nigeria. The difficulties of conducting school-based research and using group based methods with young people are especially pronounced in contexts were young people occupy subordinate positions to adults, such as the school setting (Allen, 2008; David, Edwards, & Alldred, 2001; Spencer, 2016) – and, in this case, in Nigerian society. Negotiating access to school-based participants via adult gatekeepers, and encouraging their participation, without any undue adult influence reflects how power relations often impact on young people's decisions to take part in research (Allen, 2008; David et al., 2001; Spencer, 2016). In low-income contexts, the ethical sensitivities surrounding financial reimbursements for participation can be heightened and may further contribute to some young people's discomfort and feelings of shame or embarrassment because of their lack of access to material resources. The latter is particularly problematic when research takes a focus on young people's use of, and access to, material assents such as digital technologies and mobile phones.

Price continues in Chapter Four with a focus on the difficulties of negotiating access to young people via adult gatekeepers. Her research in the prison context highlights the ethical challenges of conducting research with marginalised young people deemed to be 'doubly vulnerable' – including the range of emotions this can trigger for both the researcher and participants. The careful navigation of informed consent in a highly controlled environment such as youth offenders' institutions highlights how the research context can inadvertently contribute to

the reproduction of dominant power relations. Price illustrates how issues of privacy and confidentiality are particularly pronounced in contexts where young people have little control or autonomy, and where adults make decisions on young people's behalf.

In Chapter Five, Parekh and colleagues extend the discussion of 'doubly vulnerable' children through an exploration of the ethics of research with disabled children. Children with disabilities are often 'left out' of studies because of the assumed complexities of involving these children in research (Alderson & Morrow, 2020, p. 2) – or are otherwise characterised or depicted in a particular way that contributes further to their disablement. This critical chapter exposes how particular definitions of disability, and related research methods and techniques, can exacerbate the stigmatisation and marginalisation of disabled children. Parekh et al. highlight the importance of methodological flexibility and the building of relationships with families and children to enable their full inclusion and representation in, and through, research.

ADULT/CHILD POWER RELATIONS AND POSITIONALITY – ETHICS, EMOTIONS AND THE BUILDING OF TRUST

Part Two of the volume unpacks some of emergent ethical challenges that come from the researcher's positionality and specifically, the navigation of adult/child power relations. By engaging with the effects of power, the chapters in this part of the volume each offer a critical reflection on some of the unintended consequences of our research processes, including the difficulties of building trusting relationships with children and young people and the related emotional responses.

In Chapter Six, Wadhwa reflects on her positionality in research with Adivasi youth in India. Reflecting on her own background and position of power, Wadhwa exposes the ways in which deficit discourses about young people are (re)produced through procedural ethics processes. The chapter highlights how our language and research practices can support particular representations of young people and, in this context, uphold dominant discourses about young people's assumed vulnerabilities and deficits. Caution and criticality are thus needed when examining the effects of the researcher's positionality and power on young people's involvement in research.

Davidson and McMellon offer an honest and critical account of the role of emotions in ethnographic research with young people in Chapter Seven. The authors share how their own emotions shaped their research processes and experiences and triggered a number of ethically sensitive moments. Drawing on two contrasting research projects in the UK and Laos, the chapter highlights how the building of research relationships cannot be readily untangled from the emotional aspects of research with young people. The authors call for greater transparency and reflexivity when reporting on the tricky ethical moments and deliberations that arise in practice, including how these shape research relationships and power dynamics with young people.

Similarly in Chapter Nine, Burch and Osaiyuwu highlight how the researcher's positionality and emotions can yield ethical consequences. Osaiyuwu's former position as a trade worker offered a shared understanding about the everyday experiences of child traders in Nigeria and aided the building of trust with participants. Yet, such commonality and trusting relationships also revealed the ethical dangers of 'being too close' to participants (Spencer, 2016). The assumption that informed adults can readily 'step into' children's live worlds, without due attention to issues of power and positionality, reminds us of the need to proceed cautiously when developing trusting relationships. Burch and Osaiyuwu illustrate the importance of acknowledging that adult/child power disparities cannot be entirely eradicated.

The final chapter in Part Two offers a sensitive account of the researcher's positionality in the highly complex context of family domestic violence. Henze-Pedersen reflects on her positionality (and related decision-making) as an adult researcher participating in children's everyday live worlds at a women's refugee. Navigating trust with children (and their mothers) revealed the ethical complexities tied to the building research relationships, particularly when trust can be compromised or undermined. Henze-Pedersen shares her experiences of managing different research relationships, and how these supported or undermined children's participation, privacy and confidentiality.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE AS KNOWLEDGE PRODUCERS AND THE ETHICS OF REPRESENTATION AND RESEARCH DISSEMINATION

Part Three of the volume draws on examples of children as knowledge producers and co-researchers. The chapters in this final section offer important ethical reflections on issues of representation and the involvement of children in research dissemination activities. The ethics of representation and dissemination activities are often overlooked, with limited critical reflection on how the 'translation' of children's voices, perspectives and experiences may contribute to the silencing and misappropriation of (some) children's perspectives (Spencer, Fairbrother, & Thompson, 2020; Spyrou, 2016). This section highlights some of the ethical and methodological difficulties of representing children and childhood on the basis of age-related categories and assumptions about their (lack of) competence – including the tendency for adults to 'step in' and represent children's perspectives on their behalf.

Chapter Ten draws on a participatory study involving children as co-researchers and knowledge producers about their school journeys in Switzerland. Moody et al. question the notion of 'expertise' in research to demonstrate how children's contributions can hold effective influence. The authors highlight the range of tensions that can emerge when seeking to uphold children's contributions to the design and delivery of research design, along with academic conventions and 'scientific' knowledge about how best to conduct research. Developing co-expertise is ethically challenging and necessitates critical reflection on what gets counted as 'expertise' in research.

In Chapter Eleven, Carroll and colleagues synthesise the ethical and methodological insights drawn from a series of quantitative and qualitative studies seeking to engage children and young people in policy processes in New Zealand. This chapter usefully highlights the importance of flexibility and adaptation of methods and approaches to ensure children's meaningful and ethical engagement in research that specifically aims to inform policy. The authors remind us of the need to attend to the ways in which children are differentially represented through different research processes and methods – including our final dissemination and impact activities.

Spencer et al. continue the focus on the ethics of representation in Chapter Twelve and through a critical reflection on how differing socio-cultural constructions of age and childhood status can trigger complex issues around consent and assumed vulnerabilities of migrant children in Ghana. The chapter illustrates the ambiguities of these children's 'adult-like' status as they independently navigate their lives and livelihoods, and in highly precarious circumstances. Migrant children often display their autonomy in the absence of parental or adult figures, yet their participation in research remains mediated by adult gatekeepers largely unknown to them. Spencer et al. illustrate the difficulties of establishing the exact ages of young migrants and what this means for their participation. The tricky issue of financial compensation for young participants comes to the fore when children take on 'adult-like' roles and responsibilities.

Chapter Thirteen explores some of the ethical issues that emerge with the use of drama-based methods with children and young people. Performative methods are increasingly being used for data collection and dissemination activities and offer an opportunity for young people to participate directly in the generation and sharing of research data and findings. Yet, performance requires particular skills and interpretive work to convey messages to an audience and can expose the identities of young people involved. Shabtay carefully charts some of the opportunities afforded to young people through drama-based approaches and how they can take ownership of the process and outcomes, all the whilst drawing our attention to the possibilities for these young people to be exposed to stigmatisation because of the limits to anonymity. Carefully navigating young people's consent in drama-based research thus necessitates an open discussion of the implications of, and risks involved with, (limits to) confidentiality and anonymity.

The final chapter in the volume examines children's roles in academic writing and study outputs. Deszcz-Tryhubczak and Marecki draw on their experiences of co-authorship with child researchers to highlight the ethics of representation and the tendency for adultism to prevail in academic outputs. Through their reflections on co-producing texts with children, the authors illustrate how the rigidity of academic writing can hinder children's participation in the development of research outputs. Whilst the notion of children's voices has been (uncritically) championed in recent times as evidence of children's participation in research, the chapter exposes some of the ways in which children's expressions become sanitised in final reporting or reflect the 'voices' of more articulate or academically inclined children (see James, 2007; Spencer, Fairbrother, & Thompson, 2020; Spyrou 2016). Such processes call into question the meaning of children's

participation in research as knowledge producers, and the ethical responsibilities researchers hold when generating outputs on, with and about children.

The chapters in this edited collection expose some of the everyday challenges and opportunities for enhancing the ethics and integrity in research with children and young people – offering new thinking and techniques to help guide researchers and practitioners with their own ethical reflexivity and decision-making.

REFERENCES

Alderson, P., & Morrow, V. (2020). *The ethics of research with children and young people: A practical handbook* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Allen, L. (2008). Young people's agency in sexuality research using visual methods. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *11*(6), 565–577.

Christensen, P., & James, A. (2008). *Research with children: Perspectives and practices*. Abingdon: Routledge.

David, M., Edwards, R., & Alldred, P. (2001). Children and school-based research: 'Informed consent' or 'educated consent'?. *British Educational Research Journal*, *27*(3), 347–365.

Davidson, E. (2017). Saying it like it is? Power, participation and research involving young people. *Social Inclusion*, *5*(3), 228–239.

Ebrahim, H. (2010). Situated ethics: Possibilities for young children as research participants in the South African context. *Early Child Development and Care*, *180*(4), 289–298.

Fargas-Malet, M., McSherry, D., Larkin, E., & Robinson, C. (2010). Research with children: Methodological issues and innovative techniques. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, *8*(2), 175–192.

Graham, A., Powell, M., Taylor, N., Anderson, D., & Fitzgerald, R. (2013). *Ethical research involving children* (ERIC). Florence: UNICEF Office of Research, Innocenti. Retrieved from https://childethics.com/. Accessed on March 29, 2021.

Greene, S., & Hill, D. (2005). Researching children's experience: Methods and methodological issues. In S. Greene & D. Hogan (Eds.), *Researching children's experience* (pp. 1–21). London: Sage.

Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity and 'ethically important moments' in research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *10*(2), 261–280.

Holland, S., Renold, E., Ross, N. J., & Hillman, A. (2010). Power, agency and participatory agendas: A critical exploration of young people's engagement in participative qualitative research. *Childhood*, *17*(3), 360–375.

INVOLVE. (2016). Involving children and young people in research. Top tips and essential key issues for researchers. Eastleigh: National Institute for Health Research. Retrieved from https://www.invo.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/involvingcyp-tips-keyissues-January2016.pdf. Accessed on March 29, 2021.

James, A. (2007). Giving voice to children's voices: Practices and problems, pitfalls and potentials. *American Anthropologist*, *109*(2), 261–272.

James, A., & Prout, A. (2015). Constructing and reconstructing childhood. In *Contemporary issues in the sociological study of childhood*. London: Routledge.

Lundy, L. (2007). "Voice" is not enough: Conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations convention on the rights of the child. *British Educational Research Journal*, *33*(6), 927–942.

Morrow, V. (2008). Ethical dilemmas in research with children and young people about their social environments. *Children's Geographies*, *6*(1), 49–56.

Nuffield Council on Bioethics. (2015). Children and clinical research: Ethical issues. London: Nuffield Council on Bioethics. Retrieved from https://www.nuffieldbioethics.org/publications/children-and-clinical-research. Accessed on March 29, 2021.

Punch, S. (2002). Research with children: The same or different from research with adults? *Childhood*, *9*(3), 321–341.

Spencer, G. (2016). Schoolyard ethics: Getting close, blending in, keeping distance. In M. Tolich (Ed.), *Qualitative ethics in practice* (pp. 121–131). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, Inc.