

Challenging barriers to participation:

Doing research with migrant children and young people

**Daniela Sime, Senior Lecturer, School of Social Work & Social Policy,
University of Strathclyde**

daniela.sime@strath.ac.uk

Abstract

The methodological and ethical aspects of conducting research with children and young people have been a significant area of debate across disciplines over the last few decades, with two broad issues emerging in relation to children's involvement in the research process: (i) children should be seen as competent agents, who have the right to participate in research at all stages; (ii) researchers must ensure that children's participation is fair, inclusive and ethical, and uses appropriate techniques for children to be able to contribute. Drawing on recent studies with first generation migrant children for whom English is a second language and the more general literature on conducting research with children and young people, this chapter examines the ethical and methodological challenges one needs to consider when aiming to include migrant children in research, with a focus on Eastern European groups. The chapter explores questions such as: What are the main practical challenges in getting access to migrant children and securing informed consent? What are the advantages and disadvantages of existing methods and techniques in eliciting migrant children's views? How important is ethnic and language matching between the researchers, interpreters and families, and how do spaces such as children's homes or schools affect the research process? The chapter reflects upon the way in which the researchers' structural position, in terms of age, ethnicity and class, can influence power relationships in the research process and affect issues of access, consent, data collection, analysis and dissemination. It concludes with the observation that child-centred, qualitative research has clear advantages in giving migrant children a voice and inform current policy, practice and debates on global migration and social justice. However, researchers need to be mindful of migrant children's position within their families and society overall and think of their participation as often hedged around by constraints and controls.

Introduction

Over the past two decades, research with children has seen a significant shift, with an emphasis on the 'competent child' now prevalent, as inspired by the new sociology of childhood (James, Jenks and Prout, 1998; Corsaro, 2011). Researchers are now expected to consider children's rights to participate in research that affects them, reflecting more substantial shifts in international policy and practice, such as family legal procedures or consultation with children on public places and services they access. Prout (2001) argued that taking notice of children's voices should be a matter of priority because 'it speaks to questions of flexibility and responsiveness in welfare and service provision and to debates about young people's engagement with key institutions such as schools' (p.193). Children's rights to participate have been enshrined in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) since 1989, however, it is only recently that children's views have been acknowledged as valid in their own right. This shift is often attributed to developments in the rise of constructivist and interpretive theoretical perspectives in sociology (James *et al.*, 1998; Prout, 2005), which aimed to re-frame views of childhood as experienced, debated and defined in processes of social action which have children as central actors.

Articles 12 and 13 of the UNCRC explicitly address the right of children to be informed, involved and consulted in decisions that affect their lives, although the rights are expressed with several caveats, which have been criticised for the difficulties they pose for implementation (Bell, 2008; Spyrou, 2011). For example, Article 12 limits the right of participation to children who are 'capable of forming their own view', putting the responsibility on adults to decide on individual children's capability. This logically leads to questions around how capability should be established and by what measures and puts again adults in a position of power, as they make the judgement. In terms of research and consultation, although Article 12 **makes clear** the adults' responsibility to include children's views, it gives very little guidance on how this could be achieved. Similarly, Article 3, which discusses the best interest of the child as a key priority in any matters involving children, implies that adults need to prioritise children's protection and well-being. Nevertheless, these statements are not straight-forward in their application, as adults need clearer mechanisms to identify children who might be vulnerable and consider the ways in which ideas such as right to participation, protection and vulnerability are constructed across times, social groups and cultures (Rogoff, 2003). Despite these caveats, the Convention provides a critical framework and a mechanism for empowering children in research and the shift in childhood studies has also been matched by a shift in wider policies on the inclusion of children's voice in governance at various levels. In the UK, for example, recent policies such as the *Children and Families Bill 2013* in England (Department of Education, 2013), and the *Children and*

Young People (Scotland) Bill 2013 (Scottish Parliament, 2013), in line with the provisions of the Convention, emphasise the importance of giving children an active role in decisions which concern their lives, for example, through contributing to improvement of local services, and place responsibility on services to create opportunities for consultation.

This chapter explores the ways in which current developments in policy and practice in relation to including children's voices have direct relevance for research with migrant children, with a particular focus on **Eastern European groups in a Western context**, and the implications for the whole research process, from initial access, to methods which encourage genuine participation, and involvement of children in analysis and dissemination. It starts by giving an overview of current views of the child and childhood and makes an argument for children's rights to participate in research, especially when they belong to marginalised groups. It then considers the complexities associated with issues such as access and consent, before reflecting on the value of some popular research methods in research with newly migrated children. The chapter pays particular attention to the conditions under which children are more likely to engage with the researcher on a more equal basis, for example when being visited at home or when sharing their language and culture. It also discusses the dilemmas around the researcher's own positionality in work with migrant groups and the ethics of dissemination of data. The argument evolves by drawing on the author's own experiences in the field and current evidence from relevant studies.

Views of the child and their influence on research with migrant children

Societies over time and across cultures differ in their perceptions of childhood and children's place in them. These perceptions are not static; they undergo constant changes and are subject to a range of global influences. The interest in children as social actors and their socialisation has been seen by some as sociology's 'rediscovery of childhood' (Corsaro, 2011). Early theories of childhood, which adopted a deterministic model, often reflected an appropriation of children by society, seen as mainly passive, and who would eventually become competent participants through internalising adults' input. These views were based on biological and philosophical theories of the nineteenth century, assuming a sequence of ordered stages through which all children would progress with age. The linking of stage development to age (often attributed to Piaget) helped promote the vision of children as 'incomplete' biological creatures, with little intentionality or agency. These views meant that for many children, across various cultures, the dominant feature of childhood had been, and in many respects still remains, their powerlessness and lack of control over things that happen to them.

More recent theoretical angles on childhood have adopted a sociological perspective of children's development, which regards socialisation as not just a process of adoption and internalisation of adults' knowledge and understandings. Social theories of childhood (Jenks, 1996; James *et al.*, 1998; James and Prout, 1997) conceptualise children as social actors, active in their engagement with adults, institutions, ideologies, which they interpret, reproduce, reinvent or negotiate in their own ways. Corsaro calls this process 'interpretive reproduction' (2011:21), to reflect the creative aspects of children's participation in society and their active contribution to cultural production and change. This approach has prompted researchers to think of the 'competent child' (James *et al.*, 1998), whose perspective on society, although possibly different from that of adults, needs to be heard and considered in equal manner. Many authors have argued that children's voice cannot **genuinely** be heard unless adults change the ways in which they see children and their competence. In this sense, Punch (2002) concludes that research with children is potentially different because of children's marginalised position in society, rather than because children are inherently different from adults. As research with children moves into new realms which tackle the long-standing issues around children's lack of representation and power, childhood remains a highly contentious topic, as different historical, spatial, social, political and moral positions are conjured to discuss it.

Research with migrant children has also been significantly influenced by developments in the sociology of childhood. Earlier studies often framed migrant children as vulnerable victims of migration in need of protection, victims of exploitation, without significant agency or competence to contribute to the migration process or their families' life post-migration. Studies have thus highlighted the significant hardship faced by migrant children facing detention or deportation due to illegal border crossing (Watters, 2008) or when victims of trafficking (Rigby, 2011). Substantial research with unaccompanied asylum seeking children has also been conducted to highlight their significant needs (Crawley, 2009; Rutter, 2003, 2006; Kohli, 2006) and campaign for policies and practice to address the injustices that unaccompanied minors suffer due to punitive laws, which deny them basic rights and reinforce their marginalisation. While the discourse of vulnerability has been adopted by some of these studies, in order to make the case stronger in arguing for more humanitarian treatment of children (Eastmond and Ascher, 2011), a new, emerging discourse has centred around migrant children's resilience even during extreme hardship, such as detention and deportation (Hess and Shandy, 2008; Watters, 2008).

The need for a shift in migration research with children to a more in-depth understanding of the competent child and their views of the migration experience has now been stressed by research across disciplines, beginning to fill the gap. This has been done by studies which

explore children's agency in a range of migrant situations, such as return migration (Knörr, 2005; Ní Laoire, 2011), transnational migration (Parreñas, 2005; Punch, 2012; Tyrell *et al.*, 2013), children migrating in search of work (Yaqub, 2007) and or as part of the family unit (Bushin, 2009; Sime and Fox, 2014 a, b). Two special issues in the *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (*Transnational Migration and Childhood*, 2011, issue 37, and *Transnational Migration and the Study of Children*, 2012, issue 38) have also showcased some of the recent developments in investigating children as active agents in the global political economy. Many of these recent studies look at children's own engagement in places and spaces they access, configuring thus new interests in theorising migration in relation to locality, as well as focussing on children's own views. These current trends in research on childhood and migration clearly see children as active agents in the processes of global migration, with their own experiences and views which need to be explored further in order to enhance current understandings of children's role in contemporary societies.

Involving Eastern European migrant children in research

Research on post-war migrants to Western Europe has mainly constructed the adult, male migrant as the prototype, with women and children rarely acknowledged or merely mentioned as dependants. Migrant children have traditionally been portrayed as 'luggage' in migration research (Orellana, 2009) and as victimised by the significant structures of inequality which force them to follow their parents abroad and as part of the adult-dominated relations within their families and communities. As migration has become now a global phenomenon, issues of integration, social cohesion and national identity have moved to the fore of current policy debates. The emphasis in current policies on integration is on communities, locality, interactions between cultures, participation and identity of migrants, although the responsibility for this agenda seems to be particularly on migrants to adapt, rather than receiving societies to facilitate their integration (Spencer, 2011). These structural factors contribute to migrant children's particular positioning, within an adult-focussed international climate of regulating migration, as often marginalised or ignored by policies and provision aimed at the successful incorporation of migrants into their new societies.

Migrant parents however often say that children are central to their decisions to migrate and many leave their countries with the aim of giving their children a 'better future' (Orellana, 2009). Children's diverse active roles in family migration are also well documented, from influencing the timing of family migration, to the choice of a destination country and decisions to stay or return (Orellana, 2009; Ryan and Sales, 2011; White, 2011). Despite this, there has been little research on migrant children's own experiences of migration. Family migration is a particularly difficult matter for children. Existing research has acknowledged the

significant challenges they have to cope with, including disrupted relationships with friends (Haikkola, 2011; Reynolds, 2007; Sime and Fox, 2014a), changed family structures after migration (Salazar Parreñas, 2005; White, 2011), hostility and segregation at school (Devine, 2009), as well as challenges to identity and sense of belonging (Ní Laoire *et al.*, 2011). Migrant children's educational attainment is poorer than that of 'indigenous' groups (OECD, 2012a and 2012b) and differences in academic performance, as well as access to good quality services, are strongly associated with socio-economic disadvantage and geographical segregation (Sime and Fox, 2014 b). Nevertheless, in the last decade, research on migrant children has concentrated on challenging assumptions of migrant children as problematic and permanently 'trapped in a miserable structural conflict of living between two cultures' (Mannitz, 2005: 23) and has started to focus on their resilience, agency and voice.

While research on migrant children coming from other continents to Europe has been more developed, research which focuses on European children has been rather more limited, perhaps because European children migrate with their parents and are not subject to strict migration controls. After the enlargement of the European Union in 2004, citizens from the so-called Accession Countries were given unrestricted access to work in many Member States, which has made migration a major cause of family separation in Central and Eastern Europe since. The disintegration of the Communist regimes and the ongoing political transformations since the late 1980s brought new challenges in relation to the social, economic and family policies. Despite the establishment of major democratic freedoms, many families were faced with anxieties about their future, fuelled by economic turmoil and high unemployment (Robila, 2009). Aspirations towards Western values and living standards have thus driven many families in the Eastern Europe to migrate to the alluring 'West'.

One important aspect of planning research with Eastern European families is the researcher's own familiarity with the social, political and economic contexts that migrants have left behind. Certain social and cultural aspects characteristic of family life during the Communist regimes, when people often relied on informal networks of support to access resources and compensate for inadequate state provision, can translate into patterns of interaction between **Eastern European families** and individuals and institutions they come in contact with post-migration. As a result of state violations and abuses of rights in the ex-Communist countries, family and friendship networks were highly trusted, while representatives of the state institutions and services were not (Bukowski, 1996). In the post-Communist transition, lack of trust in state institutions, combined with high unemployment and perceived corruption and nepotism, have acted as 'push' factors, motivating many to leave in search of better opportunities. Studies have shown how years of reliance **on**

informal networks have influenced people's strategies for migration, relying on friends already migrated to find jobs or accommodation (Ryan, 2011), or on family networks, to help with looking after children or older parents left behind. However, among those migrated, competition as well as collaboration was shown to affect diaspora relationships (Robila, 2010), where conflicts between and among ethnic groups are not uncommon. There is little evidence on how Eastern Europeans' limited trust in state institutions affects their involvement with research. Migrant children, although many were born in the post-Communist era, are likely to have experienced the poor access to resources available to their families pre-migration and the beliefs that the state and official institutions are not to be trusted. They may also be aware of the cultural expectations of their parents to 'keep the face' and present a favourable image of their family to 'outsiders', such as researchers. Identity constructions of migrant children are likely thus to be mapped on wider cultural and social conventions of talking to others about experience and collective identities.

This chapter aims to make a contribution to a shift in the methodological and theoretical underpinnings of research that values children's self-representations and views of their lives, by focussing on existing studies with Eastern European migrant children who have migrated within Europe, a group relatively under-researched. Involving ethnic minority children in research raises complex epistemological and ontological questions, about their position as individual subjects, members of their family and peer networks, and as collective subjects, members of particular ethnic, religious and social class groups. Such attempts to give migrant children a voice in the current debates on migration and on children's rights are based on an epistemological shift that prioritises children's knowledge, experiences and understandings of their lives post-migration. Rather than privileging policy-driven, adult-centred approaches and deficit-based views of migrant children as unknowing and vulnerable, the chapter examines approaches to research which prioritise children's own perspectives. In this sense, the intersections between migrant children's aged, gendered, ethnicised and classed positions are particularly significant when considering their involvement. When planning research, it is important to understand how migrant children's position is configured by aspects such as their influence within families, culture-specific understandings about the role of children in relationships with adults and the constraints on the type of experiences they can share about their childhoods.

Issues of access

One of the first challenges in doing research with migrant children is identifying them in the communities in which they live and securing access to involve them in research. Data on migrant groups is still scarce and due to the increasing mobility and repeat migration, families may be difficult to locate. Researchers rely on national statistical data collected on

adult migrants, such as data on registrations for work permits, National Insurance numbers or migration statistics, which rarely include information on children. The national census data or school-based statistics on children's home languages may give researchers a better source of information on local areas where migrants of various ethnicities settle. However, statistical information on migrants is notoriously unreliable, due to limitations in data collection (often, conducted in English and through written forms which may be inaccessible to some families) and delayed reporting of data by months or even years. At the same time, changes to local demographics are a constant feature of areas of high mobility, as new groups arrive or families move on to other areas in the same country or abroad.

A second issue of consideration in accessing migrant children is the issue of overpassing adult gatekeepers, such as teachers and parents. Masson (2004) points out that not all adult gatekeepers have a legal right to control children's decisions to participate, but they control the spaces that children access. This means that, initially, researchers interested need to negotiate access with adults at multiple levels (e.g. local authority- school management - teacher - parents) before they can discuss the research directly with children. This is clearly a reflection of the society's view of the 'innocent child' (James *et al.*, 1998) in need of protection and a denial of children's consent as valid in itself. Most researchers conducting work with European children have recruited participants through schools (for example, Devine, 2011, Sime and Fox, 2014 a and b), but also through more informal settings, like children's clubs or diaspora community organisations (Tereshchenko and Grau Cárdenas, 2013). **White and Tyrrell (2015, this volume) report on research conducted with migrant children in an accommodation centre for asylum seeking families.** Researchers can use existing geographical data as a general indicator of the areas in which migrant children are likely to reside in order to identify schools and services which may act as gatekeepers.

Negotiating access to migrant children is further complicated by discourses on migration, often negative and stigmatising of migrants. A key aspect on the debate on migration is the added pressure the migrants may put on local services, including schools (Spencer, 2011). Service managers may feel uncomfortable to facilitate access to migrant children, either because of fear that their provision may come to scrutiny through the research, or simply because migration is a controversial topic. Additionally, some may think that newly arrived children do not have the relevant language skills or understanding to take part (adopting the 'incompetent child' view) or that participation in research may be too stressful or even damaging for the child (adopting the 'innocent child, in need of protection' view). In planning to access migrants through schools, required permission from school managers poses thus an immediate selection of the children who can potentially take part. **In the author's research** (Sime and Fox, 2014 a, b), managers often decided that given the curriculum constraints and other activities, such as forthcoming inspections or school festivities, the research would

add an extra strain on teachers and pupils and **they** therefore refused access. Experience also shows that when schools give permission for research, often only a limited group of children are invited to participate, again based on decisions made by adults.

A second level of adult-controlled scrutiny takes place through children's parents, as schools and researchers often require parents' consent for children to take part. Researchers need to consider the best ways of engaging parents, as well as children, and getting them enthusiastic about the project. In our experience, materials presented in a simple, visual and user-friendly leaflet, ideally translated into families' own home languages, are successful in getting parents and children to talk about the research and consider their involvement. However, parents are not immune to negative discourses on migration and given the historical aspects of Eastern Europeans' difficult relationships with statutory services and lack of trust, parents may resist requests to participate and actively forbid children to take part for fear of stigma or unpredictable consequences. Response rates among migrant parents can be as low as 10-20%, reflecting culturally different understandings of the value of research and what it entails, or possible insecurities about engaging with research which might make their children 'stand out'. Eastern European parents **in the author's research** (Sime and Fox, 2014 a, b), especially those of a Roma background, expressed fear of social workers and **viewed requests** for 'interviewing' children as potentially threatening, due to families' precarious living conditions, low levels of literacy and inherent cultural barriers, where interviewing is often associated with family assessment by social workers. Adopting a more direct, face-to-face or over the phone approach, is often more successful when recruiting families, as parents have the chance to ask questions about required involvement and seek reassurances on aspects of concern. **When phoning homes, mothers were most likely to make the decision on a child's participation**, possibly reflecting the dominant involvement of mothers in children's education (Lopez-Rodriguez, 2010). However, women often sought their husbands' permission to receive researchers at home, possibly reflecting more patriarchal family structures when it comes to making domestic spaces accessible to others.

Issues of consent

There has been extensive discussion in the research literature about children's consent and the best ways to elicit this (Alderson and Morrow, 2011; Morrow, 2008). Informed consent requires that children decide on their participation in the full understanding of the nature of the study, expectations of their involvement and any potential risks, and do this voluntarily. Also, they should understand the purposes of the research, what will happen to the data and how the results will be used. Hill (2005) observes that 'having an opportunity to give consent

is not only a right in relation to research which children share with adults, but also contributes to their well-being, through giving respect for their sense of control' (2005:68). The fact that access to wider groups of children is considerably reduced by adult gatekeepers has direct implications for the ways in which researchers elicit consent from children. While introductions to families can be facilitated by trusted professionals, such as teachers or youth workers, if professionals decide against children's participation, researchers can do little to get in touch with the same children. Also, cultural and linguistic barriers may pose additional challenges in interacting directly with parents and children when negotiating consent (Edwards, 2013).

With migrant children, issues of consent might become problematic for several other reasons. Firstly, children and parents' unfamiliarity with the concept of 'research' in a **Western European context**, especially if recently arrived in their new country, may require much more time in clarifying the issues for potential participants. Robila (2010) writes about Eastern European families' respect for the authority of teachers in schools and equally, their lack of complete trust in services. While parents and children may feel an obligation to respond positively to requests coming from schools, they could be deeply suspicious of research which targets migrant children, especially in a social climate generally negative to migrants. In the author's research (Sime and Fox, 2014 a,b) parents often said they would not oppose children's participation, but they were concerned that participation might 'single out' children or findings may be somehow detrimental to children, the school or their ethnic group. In a study on Roma families (Sime *et al.*, 2014), parents were concerned that any findings may be reported to social services, which would put children at risk of being removed. Giving parents time to voice these concerns and seek reassurance about the nature of the involvement expected, confidentiality and anonymity plans and the expected use of data are steps that researchers can take to reassure parents. However, when parents do not respond or refuse consent, researchers can do very little to involve children, given parents' legal authority, even if children wish to participate.

Negotiating consent with Eastern European children has also its own challenges. Children will have various life experiences, depending on their age, education, social and cultural background. It is likely though that Eastern European children's experiences of authority before migration will differ from **Western European patterns**, with many Eastern European cultures still perpetuating significant gender inequalities and patriarchal values (Shiraev and Gradskova, 2005; Robila, 2009; White, 2011). As a result, children new to **Western European** cultures may feel an obligation to agree to take part, in order to please teachers, parents or researchers, given an expectation in many **Eastern European** cultures that children will respond to adults' requests without asking questions or negotiating. Equally, as research with children is not extensive in Eastern European and may not require informed

consent, children may be unclear about the full meaning of concepts such as 'consent', 'confidentiality' and 'right to withdraw'. **If the child and the researcher cannot converse in a shared mother tongue or second language**, the researcher will also depend on the interpreter's skill to communicate effectively the meanings of these words and to reassure children that non-participation does not have repercussions. These complex issues require the researcher to plan additional time to clearly explain all relevant aspects to children and families and to ensure that children are not coerced or influenced by others in their decisions. While it is usually difficult to give children a sense of what participation will be like, especially if they have not been involved in research before, researchers can clearly outline expectations of participation, type of activities, plans for the use and dissemination of data, and give children reassurances over anonymity and confidentiality. Although these processes may take significant time, they are a necessary step in ensuring children's and parents' meaningful consent.

The importance of social contexts as frames for children's participation

Research on childhood from various fields such as sociology, geography, anthropology and education, has offered valuable insights about the importance of space and place in children's everyday lives, with direct implications for using these spaces as locations for generating research data (Skelton and Valentine, 1998). Schools, homes and community spaces pose very different ethical and methodological challenges. Despite the fact that many of these spaces are populated by children and play a key role in children's development, generational issues and aspects of power underlie the complex dynamics that researchers need to be aware of when entering schools, homes or communities with research in mind.

Schools have been traditionally used as research sites in work with children, including migrant groups, for ease of access and the relative flexibility they offer researchers to engage children of various ages, religions, ethnicities and classes. However, in schools, children will react to the researcher's requests depending on issues such as where they meet in the school, their overall experiences of school and other people present during the research interaction (Pyer and Campbell, 2013). Researchers often have little choice in terms of spaces offered to them by the school staff, furniture arrangement and time allocated for meeting with children, and these aspects add an additional layer of constraints. For migrant children, there might be cultural differences in terms of previous experiences of interacting with adults as authority figures in a school, where more restrictive rules of interaction would previously apply. As a result, migrant children may often appear inhibited or less willing to share their views in schools, especially when engaged individually.

Nevertheless, schools are convenient settings for involving migrant children (Devine, 2009; Ní Laoire *et al.*, 2011; Nestor and Regan, 2011), although researchers need to consider the significant power issues mentioned.

By contrast, research taking place in public places, such as youth clubs, streets, parks or playgrounds, may put the adult researcher 'out of place' and give children more control over the research exchange. Researching children's lives in communities has been a feature of recent research, encouraged also by policies aimed at making neighbourhoods better places for children and families. Morrow (2003), among others, has emphasised the importance of taking a holistic approach to children's social relationships within different contexts. In research with migrant children, studies have shown the key role of social relationships in constructing a sense of community and belonging for children (Sime and Fox, 2014 a). Others have also shown how migrant children 'infuse a place with identity' through their experienced social relationships, mainly through the presence of kin (Bak and Brömssen, 2010). Research with migrant children conducted in more public places has ranged from observing and interviewing children through diaspora organisations (Tereshchenko and Grau Cárdenas, 2013), engaging them in community-based media-making projects (De Block and Buckingham, 2010) or organizing neighbourhood-based activities guided by children, such as walking tours or photographic activities (Christensen and O'Brien, 2003).

Homes are complex spaces to study children and they often offer a richness of information that participants might not express in words because of the normalised nature of their everyday lives. Very little has been written about the construction of home as a research site and the ethical and methodological implications that arise from this (see however Mayall, 1994; Bushin, 2007; Nilsen and Rogers, 2005; Sime, 2008). Carrying out research in children's homes has increased advantages in terms of empowering children, as the home may be perceived as a personal and familiar space where the researcher is a guest. However, although homes may offer a less formal setting, they are not free from ethical dilemmas. Children share their homes with siblings, parents or carers and other adult relatives. Homes are thus shared spaces, where children often do not control access and have little power over the others' roles during the research (Pyer and Campbell, 2013). While some children have their own bedrooms as more separate and private spaces, other children share these with siblings and parents. Equally, entering children's bedrooms may be seen as parents as inappropriate for researchers and is often discouraged by ethical guidelines as a 'risk' to researchers, who may find themselves accused of misconduct. Mitchell and Reid-Wash (2002) argue that children's bedrooms are more conducive sites, as these are spaces children have more control over and are often repositories of objects which reflect individual tastes, hobbies and interests. In the author's research (Sime and Fox, 2014

a, b), families quite often invited the researcher to a more public space first, like the living room or the kitchen and wanted to be present during the first visit. As trust develops over subsequent visits, researchers gained more access to children's spaces and were often allowed to engage with them without supervision. Home-based research also means that, by being regular visitors, researchers develop a close relationship not only with the child, but also with the family. In the author's work, withdrawing research became subsequently more difficult, as newly arrived migrant families, who often had limited ties with other people locally, relied on the researchers' visits for socialising and emotional support.

Choosing between methods in research with migrant children

Given the increased interest in engaging children and young people in research, there is now a plethora of methods and techniques available to researchers doing work with migrant children. Punch (2002) suggests a combination of traditional 'adult' methods, such as participant observations and interviews, with techniques that are more suitable for children, in order not to patronise children with special 'child-friendly' techniques. The advantages and disadvantages of a range of methods and techniques suitable for research with children and young people have been examined in detail by several authors (Lewis and Lindsay, 2000; Greene and Hogan, 2005; Christensen and James, 2008; Tisdall *et al.*, 2008; Thomson, 2008; O'Reilly *et al.*, 2013). Researchers have become interested in the potential that various methods offer to allow children, and in particular those from marginalised groups (Truman *et al.*, 2000), to speak for themselves. Some have argued for involving children as co-researchers (Kellet, 2005), in order to promote more balanced power relationships between researcher and researched. Although debates on whether there is scope for children and young people to become co-researchers are ongoing, Lather (2007) warns against the risks of romanticizing what research informants say and how they may realistically contribute to the research process and advocates for 'complexity, partial truths and multiple subjectivities', in which children's and adults' voices combine to reflect on experience. Given the specific characteristics of newly migrated children, mainly in terms of likely language and cultural barriers, this section aims to examine the advantages and disadvantages of various methods available and their relevance to research with this particular group.

- *Observational approaches*

Observational approaches involve the researcher spending considerable time with children in the 'field', in order to build rapport and establish trust first, before being accepted by them and becoming sensitive to the complexities of children's everyday experiences (O'Reilly *et al.*, 2013; White and Tyrrell, 2015). The data collected may include children's behaviours,

reactions to certain events, or interactions with others, as well as verbalisations. In research with newly arrived migrant children, researchers could observe children's use of school/home spaces (Devine, 2009, 2011), their interactions with other children in school or clubs or multi-sited interactions with adults (Punch, 2012). While providing the researcher with naturalistic evidence, the analysis of observational records requires a certain level of inference, which is minimised if children are asked to report directly on their experiences. Also, depending on cultural expectations, parents may not be comfortable with children being observed in schools or visited at home and consent needs to be an ongoing matter (Alderson and Morrow, 2011). Observational approaches can also make use of modern technologies, for example, by videotaping interactions in homes between family members or when observing children's interactions. **This form of observation will require consent from all those involved and careful consideration on how data will be stored and used, as anonymity of participants cannot be assured if video material is showed in dissemination.**

- *Group and individual interviews*

Group and individual interviews have been used extensively in research with migrant children. These involve the interviewer asking children questions (standardised or for prompting) to gain children's views on the migration experience, from their involvement in family decisions to migrate (Bushin, 2009), to their journey and experiences post-migration (Knörr, 2005; **White and Tyrrell, 2015**), in relation to schools (Devine, 2009, 2011; Nestor and Regan, 2011), services (Sime and Fox, 2014 b), involvement in friendships and other networks (Haikkola, 2011; Sime and Fox, 2014 a) and sense of belonging (Bak and Brömssen, 2010). Researchers have also combined interviewing with other methods, such as task-based activities for children. While interviews are considered useful in generating rich data, researchers need to be mindful of the significant power imbalance in adults interviewing children, increased when using an interpreter, and the impact of the research space and cultural rules of engagement with adults (as discussed above). Also, the analysis may require the researcher's extensive interpretation of children's input and a culturally competent researcher (see below).

- *Self-reports (diaries, vignettes, questionnaires, children's commentaries etc.)*

Self-reporting methods, such as those involving children in writing or recording themselves in audio/video format to express views or feelings without the direct involvement of the researcher, have the advantage of offering children some control over the production of the data, in terms of where, when and how much they say. Nevertheless, if these are materials produced for the purposes of the research, children will be aware that the researchers are the main 'audience' and may aim for socially desirable responses (Greene and Hogan,

2005). Written tasks such as asking children to comment on certain vignettes, complete sentences or fill in short questionnaires (alone, or helped by a researcher) may also elicit interesting data (Due *et al.*, 2014), but their effectiveness will depend on children's writing skills in the language in which materials are presented to them, their age and often their interests.

- *Use of visual prompts (mapping, graphical methods, life story charts, dolls, toys, lego, pictures or videos as prompts)*

Given that many migrant children may have limited language skills in the language of their destination country, using non-language based methods can be a useful approach to engage them in research. Visual research methods (Pink, 2007), such as asking children to draw images of their experiences or feelings, map an area, act out experiences through the use of dolls or toys, use toys such as Lego characters to illustrate a situation etc. are not only suitable for a more child-centred research process, but they are a key route to overcoming literacy and language barriers. In the author's research, photographs and prompts were used to gain children's views on services (Sime and Fox, 2014 b). Visuals used in this way helped make abstract concepts more accessible. **However, in White and Tyrrell's study (2015) children were not always willing to share the visuals they produced with the researchers, as the materials became precious personal possessions they wanted to protect.**

- *Creative methods (drawing, painting, photographs, videos, films, drama, role play)*

Methods which rely on children's imagination, to develop creative stories (told or written), as opposed to talking about real events or factual accounts of past experiences, have often been used with children who may have complex experiences of trauma, such as asylum seeking children or children who have suffered abuse. Depending on the purpose of the research, engaging children in these can produce very revealing data (Veale, 2005), although the researcher will be faced with the challenge of separating facts from fiction. Other visuals, such as photographs and videos taken by children (de Block and Buckingham, 2010), children's drawing about their families or life-story books (Evans, 2011) or drama activities produced by children on a given theme can be useful tools in giving children more agency and independence in the research process. Children can also be given cameras to take photographs or videos of the area in which they live (Orellana, 2009), which can be then used as prompts for further conversations with the researcher or for dissemination, for example through art exhibitions (Sime *et al.*, 2014 a,b). Due *et al.* (2014) emphasise the need to ensure that aspects of the research design, such as the use of creative methods, are not minimised by children's desire to give socially acceptable

responses, given that the researchers (and potentially other adults) see their final products. White and Tyrrell (2015) have also emphasised the important role of children's silences when talking about visuals they produced, often reflecting children's position as marginalised in society more generally.

Given the plethora of methods and techniques available, the researcher interested in migrant children's experiences is often faced with the dilemma of choosing between these. Hill (2006) summarises the evidence on children's views about the main research methods. He concludes that children show a diversity of preferences, although they seem to choose methods that are fun and take up less of their time. However, children's decisions in taking part in research depended not only on their preference for methods, but also on the importance they gave to their collective input and impact, showing their social and moral commitment when taking part. In choosing between methods, researchers need therefore to prioritise aspects such as appropriateness to the nature and purpose of the research (i.e. 'Will the methods produce the right data for the questions asked?') and the appropriateness of the methods or techniques chosen for those taking part (i.e. 'Will the method/technique be suitable for the child's gender, age, language skills, interests etc.'). Some authors (Punch, 2002; Due *et al.*, 2014) have also suggested using a 'toolkit' of approaches, which allows the researchers to give children options in terms of research activities, to suit their preferred communication channels, engage them in diverse ways and allow some comparisons between different sets of data. Evans (2011) warns researchers that not all children will show an interest in participatory methods and might prefer to take part in more conventional ways, such as talking about their experiences. Greene and Hogan (2005) emphasise that choice of methods is one of the many methodological considerations a researcher needs to make, such as sampling, replicability and reliability, applicability of findings. Ultimately, rigour and credibility of the research should remain paramount, as in the case of research with adults.

Ethnic and language matching and issues in working with interpreters

Assumptions are often made that a shared language and ethnic identity are desirable in research with ethnic minority groups, to allow the participants to share their experiences, feelings and views with someone who understands their cultural background and stance. Ethnic matching (Grewal and Ritchie, 2006), where the researcher and researched share factors such as homeland, cultural values, common language and religion, presents advantages in terms of accessing participants and establishing rapport, and providing cultural expertise for fieldwork and data analysis. A shared ethnicity may also make the researcher more sensitive to the best ways of engaging a community in research, with an

assumed awareness of cultural aspects, customs, taboos and subtleties in behaviour and language during fieldwork, which can also make them more sensitive to details in the analysis (Edwards, 2013). Equally, a shared language can be central to capturing complex issues and building rapport. However, ethnic and language matching should not be assumed simply because the researcher and researched come from the same homeland. For example, Roma migrants may come from Slovakia, although their first language will likely be Romani and they will often perceive non-Roma researchers speaking Slovak as 'outsiders' and identify them with the oppressive majority in the societies they emigrated from. In such situations, aspects such as gender, class and race are significant dimensions at play, with significant impact on rapport and trust. Papadopolous (2002) argues that ethnic and linguistic matching is rarely possible, due to practical issues, and a 'culturally competent' researcher, who is culturally knowledgeable, sensitive and reflexive of their own position is a more realistic approach.

The author has highlighted elsewhere the useful perspective of the perceived 'outsider' in research with children (Sime, 2008). Adults do not have to share children's experiences in order to be able to reflect them accurately, provided they show empathy and sensitivity to children's views, and ensure accuracy in reporting. In the case of migrant children, children's sense that a researcher might see them as representatives of a particular culture, somehow lacking originality or agency, may put pressure on children's self-representation. They may feel they represent their ethnic group first and foremost, before their own individuality. The researcher's emphasis on the non-judgemental nature of the research, as well as clarity over plans for data collection, dissemination and issues of anonymity, are key to making children relaxed and willing to share their views, without any pressure of having to 'do well' in terms of re-presenting their family or community.

As ethnic and language matching is rarely possible, researchers working with migrant families should consider the use of interpreters, especially if participants have not reached advanced levels of competence in the majority language. Edwards (2013) discusses at length the complex power relationships involved between researcher-interpreter and interpreter-participants, where interpreters can be used as gatekeepers to identify participants as they are likely to be more trusted. This however means that researchers depend on the interpreter's own position within the community (in terms of their gender, social class, ethnic and language matching) and the interpreter's skill in establishing rapport. Interpreters should be asked to interpret both ways in first person direct speech, giving the full meaning of what was said, and actively providing the researcher with guidance on culturally appropriate ways of interacting or asking questions. Researchers need to maintain control over the interaction, by keeping eye contact with the participant (not the interpreter)

and addressing them directly, to ensure that the participant is fully engaged. In research with migrant children, interpreters must understand the central role of children as participants, and asked to adapt their words and behaviour to be supportive of children taking a lead in the interaction. Equally, the researcher needs to debrief interpreters on the purpose of the research, the ways in which they plan to conduct the interview/interaction with the children and particular aspects of interest to explore. Researchers may notice incompatibilities between interpreters-interviewee by paying close attention to body language and children's enthusiasm in taking part. Issues of class clashes are common with marginalised groups such as Roma, for example, where interpreters may be non-Roma, of a different social class and have their own negative views about the communities researched.

The existing literature emphasises the importance of the constructed nature of children's knowledge and voice, often coupled with an emphasis on the central importance of the researcher's reflexivity in the process. A reflexive approach in conducting research with migrant children recognises the researcher's own subjectivity in the production and representation of the data elicited from children and young people. This includes an awareness of how elements such as researcher's gender, age, ethnicity, class and race intersect to affect not only the research relationship, but also how the researcher empathises with children's views and interprets their data. Pink (2007) writes that a researcher's own subjectivity could not and should not be avoided or eradicated, especially when conducting ethnographic work. Instead, the researcher's own subjectivity needs to be seen as a central aspect of the process of knowledge interpretation and representation.

Ethics of data analysis and dissemination and children's involvement in these

So far, this chapter has discussed a range of ways that children and young people can become involved in, and subsequently impact on the research findings through the experiences and views they share with the researchers. However, while techniques for involving children in research at the design and data collection stages have progressed, there is still considerable scope for further advances in the involvement of children in the processes of data analysis and dissemination. Interpreting data in ways that might not be in line with children's views or experiences is a significant risk in working with children, given the adults and children's different perspectives on the same experiences (Hill, 2005). This section focusses on some of the options available to researchers who plan to involve children in research after the data collection has taken place.

When considering children's involvement in data analysis, challenges facing researchers relate to three issues: time, training and resources. Coad and Evans (2008) suggest a pragmatic framework to facilitate the involvement of children in the data analysis process.

They identify a scale from adult-only involvement in design, data collection and analysis, to partial involvement of children through advisory groups and help to interpret the findings, and more child-centred approaches, such as involvement of children as peer or co-researchers and child and young person-led research teams. These latter approaches involve children actively in data coding, verification and interpretation, while adults provide training and guidance on an ongoing basis. Such approaches can go some way in reducing the power balance between adult researchers and children, but the time and resources to plan them effectively and allow children meaningful engagement are crucial. In research with migrant children, these may require, for example, additional funds to cover the costs of interpreters being present at training or when conducting the analysis.

A key part of the 'politics' of researching with migrant children is **the extent to which findings can be used** to enable children's voices to be heard and to make their experiences valuable for other children's benefit and society overall. In research with migrant children, the issue of dissemination is given further weight by the controversial nature of the migration debate and migrants' position in society in an increasingly mobile world. Alderson and Morrow (2011) highlight the researcher's ethical responsibility when it comes to dissemination, by ensuring that children are not misrepresented or disadvantaged by the research findings. This includes protecting children from any negative impact that may result from dissemination. In the case of migrant children, a crucial aspect in dissemination is protection of children's anonymity, given the fact that many migrant communities can have relatively small numbers of families who know each other well. Equally, children's views may attract the interest of anti-immigrant groups or media outlets, which may misuse or misrepresent children. If these situations are anticipated, researchers may need to place a moratorium on the research for an agreed period of time or present findings with less detail than usual, to protect participants.

A key aspect of the dissemination process is ensuring that participating children and their families are kept informed of the project findings. Traditionally, this is done through research reports, often written a while after the data collection has taken place, to the point that children and their families lose interest in the project or almost forget they have taken part. A more practical and user-friendly approach involves **an** informal sharing of findings as they develop, through newsletters or through modern media, via blogs or websites, to give families a sense of ongoing achievement and valuable participation. In the case of migrant children, the considerations around data collection (in terms of linguistic and cultural barriers), need to be revisited in dissemination, for example, by ensuring the materials are translated in participants' home language. Projects have also used arts and exhibitions to make research findings more accessible to wider groups. While co-presenting and co-

authoring research reports with children are clearly effective approaches of involving children throughout the project, in practice, researchers need to balance aspects such as children's willingness to devote extensive time to the project and the need to protect their anonymity (and by extension, the anonymity of their communities) with the desire to involve children directly in dissemination.

Concluding remarks

This chapter has provided an overview of some of the key ethical and methodological issues researchers are likely to encounter when doing research with migrant children and young people, with a focus on Eastern European migrants in Western Europe. By reviewing the existing methodological literature on research with children, including migrants, the chapter provides further evidence that child-centred, qualitative research has clear advantages in giving migrant children a voice and inform current policy, practice and debates on global migration and social justice. However, it is crucial that ethical and methodological issues are considered carefully throughout the research process and researchers consider the specific challenges that newly arrived migrant children and their families may need to overcome in order to take part.

Researchers need to be mindful of aspects such as cultural and linguistic barriers and how these might be overcome, but also of migrant children's position within their families and communities overall. Children's participation is often limited by constraints and controls imposed by adult gatekeepers, who may restrict children's participation out of their own sense of duty towards children. We have discussed the range of challenges that the researchers may be faced with in recruiting participants and deciding on research sites, as well as the advantages and disadvantages of various methods and techniques available. Researchers who have a 'toolkit' of techniques at their disposal are more likely to ensure meaningful participation of children and young people at the data collection stage. There are also practical ways in which researchers can ensure that young people are involved in analysis and dissemination, although issues around the protection of the participants need to be carefully considered. Finally, we would like to suggest that it is crucial for researchers to consider critically their own position and power in research and how children's past and current experiences of interacting with adults may impact on the process. By taking into account and reviewing regularly these methodological considerations, researchers should be better placed to include children of migrant background in research in an ethical and meaningful way.

References

- Alderson, P. and Morrow, V. (2011) *The ethics of research with children and young people: A practical handbook*, London: Sage.
- Bak, M. and Brömssen, K.V. (2010) Interrogating childhood and diaspora through the voices of children in Sweden, *Childhood*, 17 (1), 113-128.
- Bell, N. (2008) Ethics in child research: rights, reason and responsibilities, *Children's Geographies*, 6(1), 7-20.
- Bushin, N. (2007) 'Interviewing Children in their Homes: Developing Flexible Techniques and Putting Ethical Principles into Practice', *Children's Geographies* 5(3): 235-251.
- Bushin, N. (2009) Researching family migration decision-making: a children-in-families approach, *Population, Space and Place*, 15, 429-443.
- Christensen, P. and James, A. (eds.) (2008). *Researching with children: Perspectives and practices*, London: Falmer Press.
- Christensen, P. and O'Brien, M. (eds.) (2003) *Children in the city: Home, neighbourhood and community*, London: Routledge.
- Coad, J. and Evans, R. (2008) Reflections on practical approaches to involving children and young people in the data analysis process, *Children & Society*, 22 (1), 41-52.
- Corsaro, W.A. (2011) *The sociology of childhood*, 3rd edition, London: Sage.
- Crawley, H. (2009) 'No one gives you a chance to say what you are thinking': finding space for children's agency in the UK asylum system, *Area*, 42(2), 162-169.
- De Block, L. and Buckingham, D. (2010) *Global children, global media: Migration, media and childhood*, Palgrave.
- Department of Education (2013) *Children and Families Bill 2013*, London: DfE.
- Devine, D. (2009). Mobilising capitals? Migrant children's negotiations of their everyday lives in the primary school, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30 (5), 521-535.
- Devine, D. (2011) *Immigration and schooling in the republic of Ireland: Making a difference?*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Due, C., Riggd, D. and Augoustinos, M. (2014) Research with children of migrant and refugee backgrounds: A review of child-centred research methods, *Child Indicators Research*, 7, 200-227.

- Eastmond, M. and Ascher, H. (2011) In the best interest of the child?: The politics of vulnerability and negotiations for asylum in Sweden, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37 (8), 1185-1200.
- Evans, R. (2011) Young caregiving and HIV in the UK: Caring relationships and mobilities in African migrant families, *Population, Space and Place*, 17, 338-360.
- Edwards, R. (2013) Power and trust: An academic researcher's perspective on working with interpreters as gatekeepers, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 16(6).
- Greene, S. and Hogan, D. (eds) (2005). *Researching children's experience*, London: Sage.
- Grewal, I. and Ritchie, J. (2006) Ethnic and language matching of the researcher and the research group during design, fieldwork and analysis, in Nazroo, J.Y. (ed.) *Health and social research in multi-ethnic societies*, Abington: Routledge, pp. 65-82.
- Haikkola, L. (2011). 'Making Connections: Second Generation Children and the Transnational Field of Relations', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(8), 1201-1217.
- Hess, J.M. and Shandy, D. (2008) Kids at crossroads: Global childhoods and the state, *Anthropological Quarterly*, 71 (2), 51-62.
- Hill, M. (2005) Ethical considerations in researching children's experiences, in S. Greene and D. Hogan (eds.) *Researching children's experiences: Approaches and methods*, London: Sage.
- James, A. and Prout, A. (1997). *Constructing and reconstructing childhood*, London: Falmer.
- James, A.; Jenks, C. and Prout, A. (1998). *Theorising childhood*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jenks, C. (1996) *Childhood*, London: Routledge.
- Kellett, M. (2005) *How to develop children as researchers: A step by step guide to teaching the research process*, London: Paul Chapman.
- Knörr, J. (ed.) (2005) *Childhood and migration: From experience to agency*, Piscataway, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Kohli, R. (2006) *Social work with unaccompanied asylum seeking children*, Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillian.
- Lather, P. (2007) *Getting lost. Feminist efforts toward a double(d) science*, New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Lopez-Rodriguez, M. (2010) 'Migration and the quest for normalcy: Polish migrant mothers and the quest for meritocratic opportunities in the UK', *Social Identities*, 16(3): 339-358.
- Lewis, A. and Lindsay, G. (2000). (eds.) *Researching children's perspectives*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Mannitz, S. (2005). 'Coming of Age as "The Thirs Generation": Children of immigrants in Berlin', in J. Knörr (ed.) *Childhood and Migration: From experience to agency*, Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Masson, J. (2004) The Legal Context, In S. Fraser, V. Lewis, S. Ding, M. Kellett and C. Robinson (eds.) *Doing Research with Children and Young People*, London: Thousand Oaks, pp. 43-59.
- Mayall, B. (1994) Children in action at home and school, In B. Mayall (ed.) *Children's Childhoods: Observed and experienced*, London: Falmer Press, pp. 114-127.
- Mitchell, C. and Reid-Wash, J. (2002) *Researching children's popular culture*, London: Routledge.
- Morrow, V. (2008) Ethical dilemmas in research with children and young people about their social environments, *Children's Geographies*, 6(1), 49-61.
- Nestor, N. and Regan, V. (2011) The new kid on the block: A case study of young poles, language and identity, in Darmody, M.; Tyrell, N. and Song, S. (eds.) *The Changing faces of Ireland: Exploring the lives of immigrant and ethnic minority children*, Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pages 35-53.
- Nielsen, R.D. & Rogers, B. (2005) 'That's not a good idea, mom': Negotiating children's subjectivity while constructing 'home' as a research site, *Children's Geographies*, 3(3), pp. 345-362.
- Ní Laoire, C., Carpena-Mendez, F., Tyrell, N. and White, A. (2011). *Childhood and Migration in Europe: Portraits of Mobility, Identity and Belonging in Contemporary Ireland*, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.
- OECD (2012). *Untapped Skills: Realising the potential of immigrant students*, Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD (2012b). *PISA 2009 Technical Report*, Paris: OECD Publishing.
- O'Reilly, M.; Ronzoni, P. and Dogra, N. (2013) *Research with children: Theory and practice*, London: Sage.
- Orellana, M.F. 2009. *Translating childhoods: Immigrant youth, language and culture*, Rutgers University Press.

- Papadopolous, I. (2006) *Culturally competent research: A model for its development*, in Nazroo, J.Y. (ed.) *Health and social research in multi-ethnic societies*, Abington: Routledge, pp. 82-94.
- Parreñas, R.S. (2005) *Children of Global Migration: Transnational Families and Gendered Woes*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Penn, R. and Lambert, P. (2009) *Children of International Migrants in Europe: Comparative Perspectives*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pink, S. (2007) *Doing visual ethnography*, 2nd ed, London: Sage.
- Prout, A. (2001). Representing children: Reflections on the Children 5-16 Programme, *Children & Society*, 15, 193-201.
- Prout, A. (2005). *The future of childhood*, London: Routledge.
- Punch, S. (2002). Research with children: The same or different from research with adults?, *Childhood*, 9(3), 321-341.
- Punch, S. (2012). Studying Transnational Children: A Multi-sited, Longitudinal, Ethnographic Approach, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38 (6), 1007-1023.
- Pyer, M. and Campbell, J. (2013) The 'other participant' in the room: The effect of significant adults in research with children. *Research Ethics*, 9(4), pp. 153-165
- Reynolds. (2007). Friendship Networks, Social Capital and Ethnic Identity: Researching the Perspectives of Caribbean Young People in Britain, *Journal of Youth Studies*, 10 (4): 383-398.
- Rigby, P. (2011) *Separated and trafficked children: The challenges for child protection professionals*, 20 (5), *Child abuse review*, 324-340.
- Robila, M. (2010). *Eastern European Immigrant Families*, London: Routledge.
- Rogoff, B. (2003) *The cultural nature of human development*, Open University Press.
- Rutter, J. (2003) *Supporting refugee children in 21st century Britain*, Stoke on Trent: Trentham.
- Rutter, J. (2006) *Refugee children in the UK: their migration, urban ecologies and education policy*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ryan, L. and Sales, R. (2011). Family Migration: the role of children and education in family migration decision-making, *International Migration*.
- Salazar Parreñas, R. (2005). *Children of global migration: Transnational families and gender woes*, California: Stanford University Press.
- Scottish Parliament (2013) *Children and Young People (Scotland) Bill*, Edinburgh.

- Sime, D. (2008). Ethical and methodological issues in engaging young people living in poverty with participatory research methods, *Children's Geographies*, 6(1), 1-16.
- Sime, D. and Fox, R. (2014 a) Eastern European children's family and peer relationships after migration, *Childhood*, DOI: 10.1177/0907568214543199.
- Sime, D. and Fox, R. (2014 b) Migrant children, social capital and access to public services: Transitions, negotiations and complex agencies, *Children & Society*, DOI: 10.1111/chso.12092.
- Sime, D.; Fassetta, G.; McClung, M. (2014) *Roma families' engagement with education and other services in Glasgow*, Glasgow: University of Strathclyde.
- Skelton, T. and Valentine, G. (1998) *Cool places: Geographies of youth cultures*, London: Routledge.
- Shiraev, E. and Gradska, J. (2005) The Russian family, in Roopnarine, J.L. and Gielen, U.P. (eds.) *Families in global perspective*, USA: Pearson Education.
- Spencer, S. (2011) *The migration debate*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Spyrou, S. (2011) The limits of children's voices: From authenticity to critical, reflective representation, *Childhood*, 18(2), 151-165.
- Tereshchenko, A. and Grau Cárdenas, V. (2013). Immigration and ethnic schooling: Ukrainian students in Portugal. *Educational Studies*, 39 (4), pp.455-67
- Tisdall, K.; Davis, J. and Gallagher, M. (2008) *Researching with children and young people: Research design, methods and analysis*, London: Sage.
- Thomson, P. (2008) *Doing visual research with children and young people*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Truman, C.; Mertens, D. And Humphries, B. (2000). *Research and Inequality*, London: Routledge.
- Tyrell, N.; White, A.; Ni Laoire, C. and Carpena-Mendez, F. (2013) *Transnational migration and childhood*, London: Routledge.
- United Nations (1989) Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), UN: Geneva.
- Veale, A. (2005) Creative methodologies in participatory research with children, In Greene, S. and Hogan, D. (eds) (2005). *Researching children's experience*, London: Sage, pages 253-271.
- Watters, C. (2008) *Refugee Children: Towards the Next Horizon*. Abingdon: Routledge.

White, A. (2011). *Polish families and migration since EU accession*, Polity Press.

White, A. and Tyrrell, N. (2015) *Research with Children Seeking Asylum: Examining silences and hushed voices*, **Chapter X, this volume**.

Yaqub, S. (2007) *Migrant Unaccompanied or Separated Children: Issues and Knowledge Gaps*, Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.

Key words (5-10)

Migrant children; ethics; methodological issues; children's rights; children's voice; consent; research spaces; ethnic and language matching; using interpreters in research; ethnic minorities; data analysis