Discussion paper: using QuIP with children and young people[1]

Introduction

How old do you need to be in order to participate in a QuIP study? Bath SDR has been asked this question repeatedly over the last few years. We don't think it can be answered with a single number, but we would like to have a clear and helpful answer. Since we can now cite a few examples of QuIP studies with adolescents we felt this was a good time to reflect on the topic, so this is our first attempt to answer the question. As we explore new contexts and consider the possibility of interviewing even younger people, we would welcome learning from the experience and ideas of others.

The paper first provides an overview of key considerations and challenges in interviewing children and young people in general. It then turns to considering involving them specifically in QuIP interviews and focus groups, with reference to experience to date with adolescents. Finally, it provides a brief overview of other and potentially complementary approaches to learning from children. We suggest that these methods should be utilised flexibly and adapted to the individual participants according to age, abilities, preferences, and cultural context.

Children's voices matter: The involvement of children in research and in evaluation[2] has increased over the past few decades (Angell *et al,* 2015). Following the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) (1989) there is greater recognition of children's rights to be actively involved in all activities and issues that affect their lives, and this includes children's rights to participate in research. (Angell *et al*, 2015; O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017). There has also been a shift in emphasis from doing research *on* or *about* children, to doing research *with* children which has led to interviews with children and young people becoming more commonplace (Angell *et al,* 2015; O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017; Vogl, 2015)[3].

Defining a 'child': The UNCRC defines a child as being under the age of 18; the UN and WHO define adolescence as the period between 10-19 years of age. However, it is important to recognise that there are variations in the meaning of childhood and what children can and should do at different ages in different social and cultural contexts (Boyden and Ennew, 1997). In many countries children as seen as dependent until well into their teens although in some countries children are expected to be independent from an early age (*ibid*).

---

[1] This paper was originally prepared by Becky Huovinen of Bath SDR, with input from Rebekah Avard, Fiona Remnant, Hannah Mishan and James Copestake. Last updated January 2025.

[2] See https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/themes/evaluation_and_children for further information about evaluation *for* children, evaluation *with* children (engaging them in the process of gathering and interpreting data), and evaluation *by* children (engaging children in the decision making about the evaluation and in using findings from the evaluation).

[3] Although Wikenden and Elphick (2016) argue that disabled children's perspectives are missing in this trend towards asking children for their opinions on matters affecting them, and this is particularly the case in the global south and in contexts of poverty. In 2010, Vennam *et al* argued that in developing country contexts it remained relatively rare to consult children directly in relation to their views and explanations of poverty and economic change.

Interviews with young people: challenges and key considerations

Interviews with children and young people (as with adults) allow the researcher "to explore in depth the interests, opinions, views, experiences and feelings of children and young people" (O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017: 13). It is important that the researcher fits into the child's world rather than expect the child to understand the researcher's world (Christensen 2004 in O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017). In this section we explore some of the key issues highlighted in the literature relating to interviews with children and young people.

Influence of age and development stage: The age of children and young people will shape and direct the style, content and trajectory of the interview (O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017: 15). It is important to recognise that there is considerable variation in skills and abilities not only within different age categories but also at differing stages of development (O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017; Teachman and Gibson, 2013; Vogl, 2015). In general, as a broad guideline, age **10-12** years is seen as the age from which 'standardised' interviews can be used, and from age 16 when the same questionnaire used for adults could be applied (Scott 1997 in Vogl, 2015) [4]. Vogl (2015), in her semi-structured interviews with children aged 5-11 years from a rural area of Germany, found a particular turning point around the age of 9; from the age of 9 explanations provided by children were more comprehensible and structured and they showed the ability of perspective-taking. Similarly, in relation to monitoring and evaluation, Zaveri (2014) has found that children aged 9 years are usually able to understand why you're involving them in evaluations and what their role is, and are able to express their knowledge, feelings, and explain their actions. Zaveri suggests that after 11 years the evaluator can start using 'Why?' questions.

Ethical considerations: The key ethical issues to consider when carrying out research with children and young people include the power differential between adult researchers and child respondents/participants[5], gaining informed consent, assuring confidentiality and anonymity, and protecting children from harm.

In order to address the unequal power relationship in the interview, the researcher should give young children some control in the interview, encourage them to lead the interview and tell their stories (O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017). Participatory visual and written methods (see below) can help reduce the power imbalance between adult researcher and child participant(s), enabling children to influence the agenda, flow and content of discussions (Angell *et al,* 2015; Lansdown and O'Kane, 2014; Punch 2002). The interview setting is also an important consideration. Many research environments are adult spaces where children have less control, for example, in school settings (Punch, 2002a). Home interviewing can help address power differentials (Teachman and Gibson, 2013). In addition, the researcher should consider ways to help children feel comfortable and relaxed e.g. sitting on the floor or on bean bags, enabling interviewer and child to be level to enable eye contact (O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017).

---

[4] See O'Reilly and Dogra (2017) for a useful discussion of the challenges of conducting interviews with different age groups. They consider the following age groups: under 5 year olds, 5-11 year olds, and 12-18 year olds.

[5] It is important to recognise that it is not only generational difference that creates power differentials in the interview situation. Jabeen (2009) explains how, in her research with street children in Lahore, Pakistan, she found the Pakistani cultural context to be characterised by rigid hierarchies of age, gender and class; the subordinate position of children in this context puts them in an increasingly vulnerable position in the adult-centred research process.

A further step in addressing power is to ensure that the child is really willing to participate in the research. Children and their parents/care givers should be well informed about what the interview is about, what it will entail, and what to expect (O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017). In cases where the child is not legally competent (in the UK those under the age of 16 years), parental consent is required, and when parents have given written permission/consent, it is ethical practice to gain children's verbal 'assent' – approval by the child of the consent given by their parents/carers (O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017; Angell *et al,* 2015)[6]. Informed *dissent* is also important because children are less able than adults to exercise or recognise their right to refuse to take part (Boyden and Ennew, 1997). In particular, if research is being conducted in a school or institutional setting or if parents are also taking part in the research, children might not feel they can decline to participate (Angell *et al,* 2015; Boyden and Ennew, 1997). The researcher should provide children with the opportunity to withdraw or to stop the interview at regular intervals (O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017). It can be useful to offer children strategies for refusing, including rehearsing with children what they could say or how they could signal if they wanted a break or for the interview to stop or to refrain from answering a question (Angell *et al,* 2015; Teachman and Gibson, 2013). The interviewer also has responsibility to respond to how the child seems in the interview, to be sensitive to cues that may indicate misunderstanding, insecurity or boredom (Teachman and Gibson, 2013; Vogl, 2015).

Researchers are responsible for assuring confidentiality and anonymity to children participating in research and ensuring children do not suffer any harm throughout the research (Boyden and Ennew, 1997). Researchers should be familiar with the safeguarding legislation and local policies/frameworks in the context where they are doing their research (O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017).

Time: Time is an important resource when undertaking research with children and young people. It is recommended in the literature for the researcher to spend time with the children prior to the interview or focus group discussion to build rapport. Investing time to form a relationship with children and gain their trust can help reduce the unequal power relationship between child respondents and adult researchers (Punch, 2002a). It also helps the researcher familiarise themselves with the child's vocabulary (O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017). Collaboration with parents before an interview to learn about the child's preferences and to identify strategies that might help the child feel comfortable in the interview can be beneficial (Teachman and Gibson, 2013). It also takes considerable time with adults and children to explain why the research/evaluation is being conducted and why it is important to get the child's point of view (Zaveri, 2014). Carrying out warm-up activities and ice-breakers can help children feel comfortable, build rapport, and encourage equal involvement (Crivello *et al* 2009), again, these add time to the research activity.

Skills of researchers/facilitators: The experience and ability of researchers to engage meaningfully, attentively and sensitively with children is key (Vogl, 2015). It is important to only use researchers with experience of working with children, or who can be trained by a specialist.

---

[6] Jabeen (2009) explains that she gained informed oral consent from children rather than using written 'consent forms' because many children could not read or write and others did not want to sign any piece of paper, even if they could read and understand it, and that this is a common fear in Pakistani society.

Individual or group interviews? A further consideration is whether individual interviews or group interviews (or interviews in pairs) are more effective with children and young people[7]. For example, children may have more confidence being with a number of children talking to a single adult than being interviewed alone, children in a group also interact with each other, correcting each other's statements and adding additional information (Boyden and Ennew, 1997: 126). Jabeen (2009) carried out group conversations (which were different to focus group discussions in that she did not introduce a topic to discuss or try to steer discussion in any specific direction), children chose the topics of conversation, and sometimes just started chatting and gossiping. Jabeen gave children the opportunity to choose the type of interview, one-to-one or group, and the location of the interview. Punch (2002b) carried out individual and group interviews (3-6 young people) with 13-14 year olds in Scotland, and similarly emphasises that different young people prefer different techniques, the appropriateness of a group or individual interview for conducting research with children depends on the individual child themselves[8]. Adapting research tools and methods to the children and young people participating in the research is a theme which we will return to later in the paper.

Using QuIP with young people: challenges and recommendations

When considering using QuIP with children and young people you need to be aware that the ethical stakes and risks are higher than even for a 'normal' QuIP with adults. QuIP with adults involves a degree of 'blindfolding' to avoid the risk of biased responses (e.g., confirmation bias), so the researchers themselves are completely independent and often not aware of the organisation responsible for the programme being evaluated. Given the additional sensibilities associated with interviewing children we think that informed consent required from parents, care givers, and/or teachers in school settings, should generally not entail any blindfolding. Explaining the background to the interviews to the young respondents themselves is also important but will need to be adjusted (with the consent of parents, care givers and/or teachers) to reflect their likely level of understanding. What form confirmation bias might take among children and young people is itself an interesting issue, that also needs to be factored into the explanation they are given for the activity prior to seeking their verbal assent.

Researching change with children: Whilst children are used to telling stories about their lives, it is a natural way in which they convey their experiences (O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017), QuIP relies on people providing reasons for changes that have happened, which entails asking 'why' questions. Arguably, such questions are more appropriate for older children who may have a better understanding of contribution. QuIP style interviewing involves people putting together stories about how change has happened, particularly using the idea that something may be different to how it was before - 'before and after'. For younger children, this can be very difficult for them to judge as their lives are continuously changing as they grow up and move through different life stages. Also of concern would be the extent to which they understand the origin of any change. Children tend to take their environment somewhat for granted and tend not to question the way things happen around them until they are a little older. They may not be able to pin-point the drivers of particular changes which is key to the QuIP methodology. A key issue here is the extent to which children have acquired the ability to go beyond making associations between actions, and learning how actions have

---

[7] Although it is generally recommended that both individual and collective methods are used and results compared.

[8] "Young people are not an homogenous group and they have different preferences so it cannot be said that a group or individual interview is more appropriate for conducting research with children" (Punch, 2002b: 49).

consequences, to being able to imagine alternative scenarios. This is what Pearl and Mackenzie (2018: 28) refers to as the 'ladder of causation' (the ladder of causal understanding). It is unclear how or how quickly we acquire this capacity for cognitive reasoning as we grow up. Many children quickly develop vivid imaginations, but that is different from imagining plausible counter-factual scenarios in order to make causal claims. Clearly this is a skill that we acquire at different ages and to differing extents. An interesting study of relevance to the issue of recall and researching change with children is Crivello *et al's* (2009) *Young Lives* pilot study with children aged 6/7 and 12/13 years in Ethiopia, Peru, Andhra Pradesh (India) and Vietnam to explore aspects of child wellbeing. One of three core methods piloted in this study was Life-course Timelines which explore "children's life experiences, focusing on what they remember as the important moments of their past (both happy and sad) and why these were memorable" (p.64). Timelines enabled children "to reflect on how important moments and markers of change in their past impacted on their wellbeing" (p.67). They found that few children used calendar years to indicate the passing of time, whereas age was a more useful marker. However, children found it difficult to remember the first 5 years of life, and few children could recall the year or age they were when events happened. In Vietnam and Ethiopia the researchers found that it worked better to ask children about the things they **remember the most**, rather than 'important' or 'major' events. They also found that it was more suitable to carry out the life-course timelines as a one-to-one activity with individual children rather than as a group method. These findings are important to consider when exploring children's perspectives and experiences of changes in their lives.

Results from another *Young Lives* qualitative study in Andhra Pradesh, India suggest that a recall period of one year might be appropriate with older children in eliciting their perspectives on changes in their lives (Vennam *et al*, 2010). Children aged 12 to 13 participated in group and individual discussions to elicit their perspectives on and experiences of changes in their lives, households and communities over the past year. Children identified negative and positive changes in their households, communities, and wider issues (e.g. rising food prices) and shared their lived experiences related to the implementation of various programmes, both positive and negative. Researchers found children's participation was active and engaged and the findings reinforce "*the need for and importance of children's participation/consultation in issues that concern them.*" (Vennam *et al*, 2010: 6). We would suggest that a recall period of one year would be a good starting point when involving children in a QuIP study. In many contexts birthdays are significant events and self-identity emerges around being in a particular year group at school, so these could be useful anchor points when asking children about change.

Focus group discussions

Focus group discussions can be particularly useful for younger age groups. Focus group discussions allow narratives to emerge that respondents may not feel comfortable sharing with the interviewer one-on-one, or that might be prompted through group discussion. FGDs with children are also one way of addressing unequal power relationships between adults and children as children outnumber adult researchers (Boyden and Ennew, 1997). In a QuIP study with adolescents in Kenya (on behalf of Rutgers International) the researchers noted the usefulness of focus group discussions for the younger age group especially (aged 15-17 years).

 "*The focus group discussions for this project also had the positive outcome of creating a space where young people were able to discuss issues which are often difficult to broach as well as to hear more about each other's experiences; indeed, the group of young women asked how*

often it would be possible to have such discussions. This is interesting in itself and indicates that young people embrace opportunities to come together to discuss issues that affect them"

Vogl (2019) argues that focus groups are especially suitable for researching the perceptions of children. Analysis of five focus groups with children aged 6-15 years revealed that the younger aged children (6-7 year olds) only wanted to impose their own views on others, there was no consensus or compromise amongst participants. However, older children (from aged 10) showed the necessary argumentative skills for discussions and seemed to enjoy the focus group more. Vogl (2019) held a preliminary meeting a few days before the focus group which was important in avoiding a sense of strangeness among participants and towards the moderator.

Experiences of using QuIP with young people

Feed the Children, Kenya conducted an independent QuIP study in late 2020 to evaluate an adolescent girls' nutrition programme in Kenya. Rosemary Nyaga, M&E Manager at Feed the Children reflected on carrying out interviews with 10–19-year-old females.
(See a presentation about the study here: https://t.co/DjFi3d6PZH)

- It was important to understand the **socio-cultural context** when planning the research approach. In the Maasai community, outsiders engaging with adolescent girls privately are met with suspicion by the community because of the government child protection policies that may have been broken. In cases where the respondents were married and were still not of marriageable age, we knew there would be suspicion that the researchers were government agents. Researchers made sure to reassure them that the purpose of the research was purely to listen to stories of change from young girls.
- Having young researchers who were close to the age of group of the girls helped them connect and have a good conversation because they understand their perspectives. It also removed the parent' figure that would have made them less expressive[9]. It was important to have **same-sex and similar age researchers** to help build more trust. The researchers were the right age and background to be able to ask the interview questions in language that younger people understood.
- **Obtaining informed consent** involved multiple layers as often the case with young people; including the respondents themselves, their parents and other significant adults. In the Maasai community, where the respondents were drawn, it is not unusual to find adolescent girls who are married, pregnant, or already mothers. A further layer of consent included the spouses and parents-in-law in cases of married adolescents.
- Interviews with young people required **more time** compared to interviews with adults. More time was needed before undertaking the interview for the researchers to build trust with the girls, to help them feel relaxed and comfortable with the researcher and confident to share their stories.

---

[9] The effectiveness of children and young people interviewing their peers is also highlighted in the literature (Lansdown and O'Kane, 2014). Boyden and Ennew (1997: 125) argue "children and youth often find it easier to interview each other than to be interviewed by an outsider. This can be especially true when dealing with sensitive subjects or issues that children normally like to keep secret from adults. Interviews by children can provide very high-quality data".

Girl Effect, Rwanda undertook a QuIP study amongst adolescent girls who were members of a programme called Ni Nyampinga (see a summary of the findings here). The programme addresses multiple thematic areas including self-esteem, education, and sexual and reproductive health. The interventions included school-based clubs, so the interviews were carried out in schools with the permission of teachers. The teachers were informed of the purpose of the interviews, but the girls weren't to try to keep the conversations as open-ended as possible. The study yielded some interesting insights into different drivers for girls of this age, but there were limitations.

- Young women who were experienced with the programme and conversations about these sensitive issues undertook the interviews and made sure to spend time **building a rapport** and putting the girls at ease with general conversation before starting the interviews.
- Around half the interviews were successful in uncovering richer stories, whereas the other half were less open about their experiences and less able to reflect causally. This success rate perhaps indicates that **a larger number of interviews** may need to be carried out to ensure a sufficient response level overall.
- The young women primarily made **simple connections** - rarely more than one or two connections long. The coded data yielded few long 'causal chains', which is typical of responses from young people.

Rutgers International have also used QuIP in a few countries, some of which have involved work with younger people. In Indonesia interviews were conducted with children aged 12-15 years in a school setting. Interviews were carried out by researchers experienced at working with young people and were already known to the schools and pupils. Some reflections from Bath SDR studies which may be pertinent to planning similar work:

- Challenges during data collection revealed the importance of choosing an appropriate **setting**. The data collection period fell during the schools' end-of-year sports competitions which added extra challenges, schools were noisy and there were interruptions and distractions during the interviews. In some schools it was difficult to get a room to conduct interviews.
- It was important to consider **gender dynamics** in this cultural setting, researchers found that where a male researcher interviewed girls, or female researcher interviewed boys, these respondents tended to be more private and less talkative, whereas when researchers and respondents were the same sex, respondents were more open.
- In situations where girls and boys were reluctant to talk, the researchers found the use of paper helped, to get the students to **write down changes** over the past year.

UNICEF Innocenti worked alongside Young Lives India on an exploratory QuIP study into child work, labour and schooling in Bihar and Telangana. The project examined the links between child labour and school attendance to identify appropriate and relevant education-related policies and programmes that can contribute to improved engagement with education and ending child labour. The exploratory nature of the research and challenging context they worked within resulted in interesting insights:

- Following pilot interviews with children aged 6-10, Young Lives **adapted** its sampling strategy to focus on children aged 10-17. The research team found that children under

10 had difficulty understanding and articulating causation in the detail necessary for the research.

- Interviewers found that using Diwali, a national holiday, as a **milestone** for children helped them better understand the year-long recall period.
- Researchers employed **visual props** to help engage the children and clearly explain the closed question around the number of hours spent on work, labour and education. Children were asked to allocate 24 pebbles to the different activities they undertook throughout a 24 hour period such as sleeping, working and playing. The team found this an effective way to help children visualise and explain their daily routines.
- Interviewing <u>children and their parents/guardians</u> provided an interesting **comparison of perspectives**. By asking similar questions of both, Young Lives discovered that children frequently reported spending more time working than their parents said they did. While additional research would be needed to fully understand this discrepancy, the findings demonstrated the importance of triangulation and of including the views of children within research.

For more information on the study findings please see <u>the video summary and report here.</u>

Other visual, participatory, and creative tools for research with young people

We recognise the importance of engaging with children's and young people's experiences in matters that affect their lives; these perspectives can be used to inform more effective and integrated interventions (Crivello *et al*, 2009). To include the voices of children we recommend that you draw on the range of more visual, creative and participatory methods and tools[10] where you can collate information about their experiences, without relying on child participants building causal chains about changes in their lives. These can act as a point of triangulation with the QuIP data you collect from adults, combining and cross-checking perspectives of children and adults[11]. A particular benefit of using these participatory methods with children is that they allow children time and space to consider and build up their ideas rather than needing to offer an immediate response (Angell *et al*, 2015). This is important where children may not have developed the strategies for recall or structured thought that adults generally possess (Smith *et al* 2003, in Angell *et al*, 2015). These creative tools can be considered 'mediums for expression' (Samaranayake and Zaveri, 2014) and can also be used as warm-up activities prior to the interview or focus group discussions. Incorporating participatory methods in interviews with children and young people can "facilitate engagement, put the participants at ease, and encourage more in-depth responses" (O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017: 95). Researchers should be careful that techniques (e.g. participatory methods) used in interviews with older children (young people) aged 12 to 18 years should be utilised in a way that does not come across as childish or patronising to them (*ibid*).

Below are some examples of the variety of creative methods, a toolkit of methods, available to draw upon (adapted from O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017; Teachman and Gibson, 2013).

---

[10] There is a wealth of material available detailing these different child-focused, participatory methods (for example, see Boyden and Ennew 1997; Crivello *et al* 2009; Lansdown and O'Kane, 2014; and O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017). See Punch (2002a) for a useful discussion of some the disadvantages as well as advantages of using 5 task-based methods (drawings, photographs, Participatory Rural Appraisal techniques, diaries and worksheets).

[11] Please note that Causal Map is only suitable for text files (not images or videos).

Draw, write & tell[12] Children guide the research through painting, drawing, creating pictures and are encouraged to write and talk about them. It is important that the child's explanation/narrative (written and verbal) accompanies the drawing/picture and that the researcher does not impose their own interpretation on the drawings. Children's interpretations are regarded as a central part of the data collection, it is important to 'marry up' the child's interpretation with the content of their drawing and text (Angell *et al,* 2015). Punch (2002) recommends asking children openly to explain what their drawing means to them and why they decided to draw those images (rather than asking 'what have you drawn' i.e. when it is obvious they have drawn a tree for example, which could feel insulting to the child). An important ethical consideration is there may be difficulties maintaining confidentiality in the publication of visual work (Angell *et al,* 2015), consent should be obtained from children to scan/copy their work (children keep original) (Angell *et al,* 2015).

Photography A child is given a digital camera and is asked to take photographs around a particular theme, the photos are then used a basis for asking questions[13].

Videos Children either watch a video as a basis for discussion or a child films aspects of their life and this forms a platform for questions in the interview.

Vignettes Use of hypothetical scenarios to give children the opportunity of talking in the third person.

Cartoon captioning Participants are presented with a cartoon drawing and are asked to suggest ways they might fill in empty speech bubbles.

Puppetry Children share their views through the perspective of a puppet during a role play activity; "by talking through the puppets, children are more able to say things that they would not feel confident to say as themselves" (Lansdown and O'Kane, 2014: 39).

Ranking Children are asked what they have benefited from as a result of the project intervention and to rank these in order of importance to them (Samaranayake, 2014).

Brainstorming and priority-ranking Children are asked to identify needs (e.g. in their schools) and to identify solutions (Samaranayake, 2014).

Diaries Children are asked to write a daily activity diary (Crivello *et al*, 2009).

Body mapping Crivello *et al* (2009) used this method to explore child wellbeing. A large piece of paper is used to draw an outline around a child (or facilitator if child not willing to do this), children are asked to think about what makes them feel good or bad, where these feelings are located on their bodies, how they make themselves feel better and who, if anyone, helps them with this (p.66).

'Secret box' tool Punch (2002b) in her research with 13-14 year olds about young people's problems and coping strategies in central Scotland details the 'secret box' tool. Young people could write down on a piece of paper any current or recent problems they had experienced and post it into a small hole at the top of the sealed box, recording only their gender to assure complete anonymity and confidentiality. This tool is particularly useful for research on sensitive topics and for providing young people with an opportunity at the end of the interview to add something they felt was relevant/important but did not wish to discuss during the interview (Punch 2002b).

---

[12] see Angell *et al* (2015) on the importance of including 'tell' with the 'draw & write' method.
[13] see Sime (2008) for more on the use of photographs in research with young people.

Reflections from Crivello *et al* (2009) on their piloting of wellbeing exercises, lifecourse timelines and body mapping to research child wellbeing point to the challenges of carrying out these methods with young children (6/7 years age group) compared with the older age group (12/13 years). In all countries the facilitators found it challenging to implement the wellbeing exercise method with young children in the same way as it was being carried out with older children (p.61) (neither group discussion nor individual drawings seemed to be very effective techniques). However, the method was engaging and relatively easy to use with older children. Similarly, body mapping was also easier to use with older children. They found that involving the 6 year-old group in the research was challenging, and how they needed to incorporate significant 'scaffolding' into the activities for this age group compared with older children, this included allowing more 'guiding' and supporting questions, also more fieldworkers were involved in the activities to assist individual children.

Being flexible, adaptive and recognising variation *among* children

The diversity of techniques outlined briefly above should be utilised to support a dynamic and individualised interview or research process, tools should be adapted according to each individual's preferences, abilities, and comfort during the interview (Teachman and Gibson, 2013). The interviewer or researcher should be responsive to participants' "unique experiences, contexts, abilities, and ways of communicating, as well as the evolving interactions within an interview." (Teachman and Gibson, 2013: 272). It is this adaptation of methods to individual differences and contexts that is important rather than solely basing particular methods on a child's age or ability (Teachman and Gibson, 2013). Equally, the researcher should be mindful that a child may engage fully and communicate effectively without additional techniques/participatory methods (O'Reilly and Dogra, 2017). Jabeen (2009) found in her research with children aged 10-14 years in Pakistan that children were more interested in talking and sharing their stories than mapping and drawing exercises. She considers a range of possible explanations for this including "It may have been that these children simply liked to talk, or that most had never been to school and were not familiar with or interested in marker pens, drawing sheets and colourful thumb pins." (p. 412). Children's exercise of choice over the methods used is important and can address the power imbalances between adult researchers and child respondents.

References that we found helpful in compiling this briefing:

Angell, C., Alexander, J. and Hunt, J.A. (2015) 'Draw, write and tell': A literature review and methodological development on the 'draw and write' research method *Journal of Early Childhood Research* Vol. 13(1) 17-28.

Boyden, J. and Ennew, J. (eds) (1997) *Children in Focus – a Manual for Participatory Research with Children*, Sweden: Save the Children.
https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/5412/pdf/5412.pdf

Crivello, G., Camfield, L. and Woodhead, M. (2009) How can children tell us about their wellbeing? Exploring the potential of participatory research approaches within *Young Lives*. *Social Indicators Research* 90:51-72

Jabeen, T, 2009 'But I've never been asked!' Research with children in Pakistan *Children's Geographies* Vol.7, No. 4: 405-419

Lansdown, G., O'Kane, C. (2014) A toolkit for monitoring and evaluating children's participation: Booklet 5 Tools for monitoring and evaluating children's participation. London: Save the Children.
https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/8106/pdf/me_toolkit_booklet_5.pdf

O'Reilly, M. and Dogra, N. (2017) *Interviewing Children and Young People for Research*, London: Sage.

Pearl, J. and Mackenzie, D. (2018) *The Book of Why: The new science of cause and effect*. Harlow, UK: Penguin books.

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

Punch, S. (2002b) 'Interviewing Strategies with Young People: The 'Secret Box', Stimulus Material and Task-based Activities', *Children & Society* Vol 16: 45-56.

Sime, D. (2008) Ethical and methodological issues in engaging young people living in poverty with participatory research methods *Children's Geographies*, Vol.6 Issue 1: 63-78

Samaranayake, M. and Zaveri, S. (2014) Children and Evaluation: A webinar from Better Evaluation and Community of Evaluators *(South Asia),* 5th February https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/blog/Q%26A_children_evaluation [includes Q&A summary; Betterevaluation.org has thematic page on evaluation and children]

Teachman, G. and Gibson, B.E. (2013) Children and youth with disabilities: Innovative methods for single qualitative interviews, *Qualitative Health Research*, 23(2), 264-274.

Vennam, U., Crivello, G., and Kongara, H. (2010) Children's perspectives on risk and vulnerability in contexts of poverty and change: findings from Andhra Pradesh, India. *Young Lives Working Paper No. 64*, Oxford: University of Oxford. https://tinyurl.com/5n83cr8p

Vogl, S. (2015) Children's verbal, interactive and cognitive skills and implications for interviews *Qual Quant* Vol 49: 319-338

Vogl, S. (2019) Integrating and consolidating data in mixed methods data analysis: examples from focus group data with children *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* Vol.13(4): 536-554.

Wickenden, M. and Elphick, J. (2016) 'Don't forget us, we are here too! Listening to disabled children and their families living in poverty' in Grech, S., Soldatic, K. (eds) *Disability in the Global South. International perspectives on social policy, administration and practice.* Springer, Cham.