

## RESEARCH REPORTS

---

# *Researching children: Studying agents or victims? Methodological and ethical difficulties in a study among children and young people in South Africa*

Diana van Dijk

*Centre for International Development Issues Nijmegen (CIDIN)*

*Radboud University Nijmegen*

*E-mail: d.vandijk@maw.ru.nl*

### **Introduction**

All research has to deal with professional codes of conduct, but research among children raises some particular issues (James et al. 1998: 187), which stem from the way childhood is perceived and understood. Until the 1970s, a developmental approach to childhood was dominant (James & Prout, 1990: 10) in which development was seen as a linear progression, with each stage being more complex than the previous one (Archard, 1993: 33). Childhood was considered as a stage to adulthood and marked by incompetence and innocence. This social-development discourse was embedded in practices and institutions, and stemmed from psychology.

From the 1970s, sociologists started to move away from these rather psycho-biological explanations of childhood. There was a growing awareness of the various constructions of 'childhood' in different periods of history and in different parts of the world (James & James, 1999: 190). The dominant perspective in contemporary sociology is that childhood is socially constructed, that children are social actors in shaping their childhood experiences, and that there is diversity in childhoods. Childhood is no longer seen as 'becoming' but as 'being' (James et al., 1998: 207). This means that childhood is not understood as merely a stage to adulthood. Rather, children are seen as social actors who can be valued in their own right.

Little research has been done into the needs of children from their own perspectives. Children have not often been the unit of analysis in social research, but have usually been addressed in terms of their relationship to social institutions such as households or families (Prout, 2002: 69). However, there is a growing awareness of the importance of listening to children, as demonstrated by the many children's forums that have been established. Many organisations dealing with children refer to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC, 1989). According to the UNCRC (1989),

children have the right to participate as full members of society and their voices should be heard (article 12). Participation of children has been identified as one of the crucial principles essential to achieving the rights set out in the Convention, because when children are asked about what matters to them they will often highlight other issues than those emphasised by adults.

Various authors have written about new research techniques to study children and childhood inspired by these new views. However, most of this research has been conducted in the western world. As I will discuss in this paper, some of these research techniques did not suit the context of my research. Besides, some authors argue that childhood researchers need not adopt different research techniques per se (Christensen, 2004; James et al., 1998) but rather need to reflect on what it means to be an adult or a child (*ibid*).

Ethical issues following from this new view on childhood have received less attention and existing ethical guidelines for conducting research with children are based on developmental discourses. A number of authors, therefore, argue that ethics should be the focus of new studies of childhood (Christensen & Prout, 2002). Christensen and Prout (2002) argue that ethical issues in studying children as agents should depart from conceptions of ‘ethical symmetry’ between children and adults in which ‘the researcher takes as his or her starting point the view that the ethical relationship between researcher and informant is the same whether he or she conducts research with adults or with children’ (*Ibid*: 482). In this paper, I discuss ethical difficulties that arise when one conducts research informed by the view that children are capable actors, a view that often clashes with existing ethical guidelines in childhood research. Also, local perceptions of childhood and contextual factors, such as poverty, can cause further ethical and methodological difficulties. In this paper, I focus on ethical issues but also briefly discuss methodological matters, as these are intertwined. I start with background information on my research and my role as a researcher.

## **Background to the research**

The research dealt with coping strategies and characteristics of child-headed households in one of the ‘black townships’ in Port Elizabeth, South Africa. Port Elizabeth is the fourth largest city in South Africa, and is situated in the Eastern Cape where the majority of black people are Xhosa. The number of HIV-infections is highest among the black population in South Africa, and results in many deaths, especially in the 25 to 35 age group. Many people in that age group have children, many of whom consequently are orphaned. Many orphaned children are taken care of by grandmothers and other family members, but the capacity and willingness of the extended family is lessening, with the result that children form households on their own. Children and young people living in child-headed households (CHHs) were the main informants in

this study. CHHs are a relatively new phenomenon and are mostly regarded as deviant living arrangements for children and young people because they clash with dominant beliefs about what childhood should be like. Children and young people have to take over ‘adult’ roles and responsibilities, such as caring for younger siblings. The ages of children and young people in my study ranged from 13 to 18. A non-governmental organisation (NGO), based in one of the townships of Port Elizabeth, helped me to gain access to orphaned or abandoned children. The NGO is a South African and USA collaboration, which will be referred to as SAU. Young adults from the community work as counsellors for children in need of emotional support. Three of their counsellors participated in my research. They worked as interpreters and helped me find CHHs. The research involved ethnographic fieldwork for one year, and the children involved were visited twice a week. The purpose of the visits was to interview the children about their daily lives, who they visited, what and where they had eaten, what they had done over the weekend, and what their worries were. I always visited the children with the same interpreter, in order to encourage a relationship of trust.

### **My role as researcher**

When doing research with children one needs to reflect on one’s role as researcher and one’s conceptions about childhood. From earlier research, I was aware that Xhosa culture is very hierarchically organised, especially when it comes to age differences (van Dijk, 2002). Traditionally, children cannot directly confront an older person. They have to do as they are told, and also show respect to older women or men by calling them ‘mama’ or ‘tata’. In my research, I viewed children and young people as social actors, both influenced by and influencing their environment. During my fieldwork I tried as much as possible to have the children and young people wield their power, as will be discussed in a later section. Nevertheless, I discovered that there were large differences in authority between older and younger people, which made it difficult for younger people to wield their power.

It is sometimes suggested that fieldworkers should adopt the role of ‘the least adult’, which means complete involvement in the children’s world (James et al., 1998: 183; Christensen, 2004: 166). However, according to James et al., (1998: 183) it is not possible for adults ‘to pass unnoticed’ in the company of children as differences in age, size and authority always intervene. Moreover, there may be benefits to maintaining differences between the child and the researcher (James et al., 1998: 183). The researcher can behave in a non-child like way and ask ignorant questions. Hence, researchers need not pretend to be children to argue from their point of view (ibid).

During my fieldwork, I always introduced myself as a research student from abroad in order not to raise high expectations of support. Moreover, I explained

that because I was from a different culture I might ask silly questions, or say something inappropriate. I asked them to always explain these to me, so I could learn from them. My whiteness influenced how people perceived me. Often community members mistook me for a social worker when I visited children. Many people also perceived me as wealthy. This resulted in neighbours visiting the children after I had left to ask what they had received from me, or neighbouring children coming to the house asking for food.

In what follows, I will discuss ethical principles based on dominant views of children as powerless and vulnerable, and ethics that depart from seeing children as not necessarily needing a different ethical approach than adults.

### **Dominant and Alternative Ethical Principles in the Study of Childhood**

All research involves observing ethical standards. However, in researching children and young people it is argued that extra precautions are needed (Schenk & Williamson, 2005). It is argued the most important principle when doing research is always to put the best interest of the child first (*ibid*). The problem with this, of course, is who decides what the best interests of the child are. Ethical considerations in research with children depart from the assumption that children are more or less powerless in relation to adults. Schenk et al., suggest three fundamental duties or responsibilities that the researcher has in addressing power differences: to seek individual informed consent, to protect participants from harm and increase possible benefits, and to ensure that the benefits and burdens of research are distributed (Schenk & Williamson, 2005: 4).

There is always the need to get informed consent from respondents or participants when doing research. The concept of informed consent has both a moral/ethical component and a juridical one (van Gog & Reysoo, 2005: 4). The juridical component represents the formalised form of morals and is based on principles related to rights. These rights are protection of integrity, safeguarding of privacy, openness, and right of self-determination (*ibid*: 8). The moral/ethical component of informed consent is mainly based on two principles: autonomy of a person and beneficence (van Gog & Reysoo, 2005; Schenk et al., 2005). The latter principle means the researcher must ensure that participants receive maximum benefit from the research while being sure to do no harm (Schenk, 2005). Autonomy of the participant means that he or she has free will to participate, not participate or stop participating.

Are these principles of informed consent usable with research with children? Christensen and Prout (2002) argue that research should depart from the view that the same ethical standards should be used with adults and children. However, children are often legal minors with little decision-making power. This means in practice firstly that consent is needed from their parents or guardians. However, obtaining consent from parents or caregivers seems

contradictory to the right of children to participate. Also, if consent from adults is required first, certainty of choice from the children cannot always be guaranteed because children are subject to sets of power relations, such as in school or at home (James et al., 1998: 187). Hence, it is possible that the child consents because of fear of sanction.

The second issue in ethics is that of protection. Children should be protected from harm caused by research. Harmful results are, for example, distress caused by emotional questions or children disclosing sensitive information. A possible dilemma, following from this, is whether or not to intervene when a child discloses that he or she is at some sort of risk. Some argue that adult researchers have a moral obligation to protect children and should thus intervene, even if this causes losing access to or the trust of the children (James et al., 1998: 188). James (*ibid*) warns that overemphasis on protection can result in excluding children from research altogether. The researcher should also maximise possible benefits. However, in most social research, the outcomes will not directly benefit participants. In my study for example, the possible benefits would be the eventual design of support structures that correspond to the needs and strengths of children living in CHHs. However, it is unlikely that children participating in my study will benefit.

The meanings of childhood are contextual and therefore differences between children and adults also vary. Christensen and Prout (2002: 482) argue that research practices should correspond with children's experiences, values and everyday routines. Also, the researcher has to take into account the local perceptions of childhood. During my fieldwork, I struggled with ethical principles and local perceptions of childhood as they often clashed with my intention of viewing the children and young people as social agents. My research relationship with Mona serves as an illustration of how things can go wrong.

### **Ethical difficulties: Mona's story**

Mona is 16 years old and has lived alone since her father died four years ago. After her father's death, family members wanted to sell the house in which she had been living with her father. With a neighbour's help, the councillor, who represents the community in city management structures dealt with the matter and helped to prevent that from happening. As a result, her family told her not to expect any support from them.

When I first met Mona, she had been sleeping with a neighbouring family for a few weeks as she did not feel safe in her own house at night. According to her, some men knew that she was a child living alone and 'wanted to rape' her. The family started adoption procedures so they could receive a foster grant to support Mona. After I met Mona for the first time, I went to the family she was staying with to introduce myself and explain the research. I did not ask their

permission as Mona had already agreed to participate in the research. I always, at Mona's request, met her at her own house or at my interpreter's house.

I interviewed Mona a few times after she started talking less and seeming upset, but she did not want to talk about it. My interpreter, whom I refer to as Leah, thought it had something to do with the family she was staying with. They applied for a foster grant, but the translator thought Mona did not want to stay with them.

Mona never wanted us to talk with the family with whom she was staying and we had only spoken with them on the occasion when we explained the research project. One day we went to their house to talk with Mona. Mona seemed not to want to talk with us, and the family was upset with me. We went into the house to talk with them; they were angry and wanted to know what we were talking about during the interviews. I explained that I did not want to talk with them about the interviews without Mona's permission. They insisted, however, that they wanted to know exactly what we were talking about or they would not let Mona talk to us anymore. Mona was upset as well and I asked Mona to talk with us and the family to explain the interviews but she did not want that. I suggested that we stop the interviews as they had created problems for her and she agreed.

I talked with Leah who thought that Mona was not happy about staying with the family and suggested that they must have something to hide. After a few weeks, Mona wanted to meet us at the office of the NGO where Leah worked. She seemed happy to see us and started to apologise for the last time we had seen her: 'the way I talked to you, I didn't mean, I was under pressure, they insult me, use vulgar language, and ask me what we talk about... I like what we are doing, because I think the thing we were doing, in the long run it's going to help me... they always talk funny to me so I regret living with them now...' After a while, Mona was crying. She wanted to continue seeing us, but was not allowed to. She did not want to stay with the family any more, but if she left who would help her then?

Later that week Mona met with the interpreter and told her that she did not want to live with that family any more, and a few days later she moved back to her own house. After Mona moved into her own house, I started meeting her on regular basis again. Problems did not end however. Because Mona was without support now, she started to rely heavily on Leah and me. We tried to convince her to see social workers but she did not want to. Leah told me Mona was lying a great deal during the interviews. For example, Mona repeatedly told me she did not have anything to eat, and did not receive any food from anybody. However, the interpreter lived nearby and often gave her bread. Mona's assumed dishonesty annoyed Leah, and sometimes the interviews resulted in Leah giving her lectures in Xhosa. I could not follow what they were talking about, but from what Leah explained me they had a strong pedagogical character. This did not contribute positively to our relationship. My fieldwork came close to an

end, and in the short time left to us, it was not possible to restore a relationship of trust.

### **Dealing with ethics in a study of child-headed households**

Luckily, the story with Mona is an exception and my other research relationships with children were far less problematic. However, most issues that arose in my relationship with Mona were, at some level, present throughout my fieldwork. They result from contradictory views on childhood. As my study takes its point of departure from the view that children are social actors and capable of making their own decisions, it should be guided by ethical principles based on that view. Nevertheless, local views also need to be considered. In the following, I discuss how I dealt with the main issues in existing ethics in research and local perceptions on childhood during my study.

#### *Informed Consent*

As discussed, according to dominant ethical guidelines, parents or caregivers should give consent first when doing research among children. In a study among CHHs, though, parents or caregivers are absent. As I discussed in the story of Mona, the foster family felt passed over because I did not consult them. They prevented Mona from speaking with us unless I told them what we talked about. Because Mona did not want me to talk with them, we decided to stop the interviewing as the family started to bully her. At first, I thought I had made the mistake of not obtaining their consent before speaking with Mona. However, Mona showed that she wished to participate on her own free will when she decided to meet us at the office.

Neighbours, family members or volunteers are thus involved in the lives of children living in CHHs. Often it was precisely these people who introduced us to the children after they heard about the research. Although I did not ask their permission directly, they did serve as ‘gatekeepers’. It is therefore possible that children agreed to participate in the research because it was introduced by an older person in their community.

In order to make sure participation was voluntary, I viewed consent as a continuous process, and mostly it worked as follows. The first time I met the children I would briefly explain the research and myself to them and ask them to tell me about their living situation and the composition of the household. If the composition of the household was suitable for the research, I would tell them more about it. This entailed explaining that my research was about children in situations like theirs; that I wanted to learn from their experiences about how they dealt with difficulties in their lives; that no help should be expected to come from the research; that participation was and remained voluntary and that they could stop participating if they wanted to; and that information was confidential.<sup>1</sup> I would ask if we could make an appointment for

the first interview. In this way the children had a chance to think and talk with others about it.

At the start of the first and following interviews, I always asked if they still wanted to participate in the research. In the first interview, I asked them to tell me what they thought the research was about. This way I gained some insights in what they understood or not from my earlier explanations, and we discussed it more thoroughly.

The children always decided when and where the next meeting would take place. Each meeting I would ask them if they felt like talking to me, or whether they felt too tired or were occupied with other things. This way, I thought that if they did not feel like talking to me they could say that they were busy with homework, for example. Occasionally children cancelled our appointment for that reason, and we made a new appointment.

### *Protection*

The second ethical issue in research with children is that of protection. It is argued that children need protection in the research relationship. This is based on dominant views of children as vulnerable and powerless (James et al., 1998: 187). Also, contextual factors can make children even more vulnerable. Children possibly reveal sensitive information that puts them at risk. In my study, the information could be sensitive in the sense that it could cause emotional distress. Many children had recently experienced their parent's death or been abandoned by them, and interview questions would relate to that. Mona got into trouble with her foster family because of my research. One could argue that I should have protected her from that by consulting the family. However, I view young people as capable social actors and I had to respect Mona's choice. Nevertheless, my suggestion to Mona that we stop our conversations was also motivated by protection. I wanted to protect her from getting into more trouble with her foster family.

Another issue related to this is the ethnographic nature of my research. The research aimed at close interaction with the children involved, over long periods. The relationships expected from these interactions would end at the end of the research. People working at the NGO involved thought the relationships established should not end when I went back to the Netherlands. They felt the children had dealt enough with loss and abandonment, and therefore the relationships should continue. For that reason, I worked with their counsellors. Children who wished could be involved in the counselling programme at the SAU. In this way, a hopefully continuous relationship was established, and children could get counselling in dealing with emotional problems. Moreover, the counsellors were experienced in working with children who had similar problems (poverty, loss of parents), and their views and participation have been helpful during the research.



### *Issues of power*

At the start of the study, I felt the research created high expectations of support in the children. During my fieldwork, this worried me, as I was not able to do much for them. I discussed the issue with SAU, and we agreed the children should receive some incentive when participating in the research. I started by giving small financial and material incentives to the children. The interpreters in my study thought I should bring food instead of money when I visited the children. They felt the children would not spend the money wisely, but, for instance, buy candy with it. In my opinion, children should be able to decide what they needed the most. Nevertheless, at many occasions we also brought food, such as E-pap.<sup>2</sup>

With some children, I became more and more involved in their lives. Because I was working closely with counsellors from an NGO, this meant that we sometimes intervened in children's lives. This always happened with the children's agreement. Examples are going to a hospital with a sick young woman, contacting the Department of Social Work for advice, paying school fees for two children, going to the police station when one child was in trouble, and bringing some children in contact with organisations or people that could help them.

It is sometimes argued that paying respondents to participate in research further widens the power differences. However, in research, relationships of trust require a level of reciprocity (Lammers, 2005: 60-61). In my view, not supporting the children in my research would have been unethical. Besides, I felt that this form of reciprocity lessened the power differences between me and the children.

A second argument used against paying respondents is that people may only participate in research for that reward. However, only after children expressed interest in participating did we talk about incentives. In my experience, also, many children thought reciprocity was necessary in our relationship. This becomes clear in the answer of a young man, David (16), when I asked if he felt more obliged to participate in the study because I was helping him: 'also I am helping you... we are helping each other'. He was aware that he was helping me with the study. In the last conversation we had, he told me that after a while he had become tired of our conversations and therefore did not show up at our appointments any more. However, a friend of him told him that if he did not show up at the meetings, he would not get any help. He decided then to continue participating: '...I said to him I'll hold on, maybe I will find something from them...'

It may not have been clear to the children what I, as a researcher, would achieve from the research. However, it was clear that I would gain something, as David puts it: '... Keep it up, don't get tired [...] when you persevere you will get something at the end...' When I asked him what I would get in the end, he replied: '... you know what you are going to get at the end, you know...'

Supporting the children that participated in the research was also in accordance with the local perception of 'the spirit of ubuntu'. In Xhosa culture, ubuntu is an important part of community life. 'Ubuntu' is derived from the expression 'umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu' [a person is a person because of other people / a person can only be a person through others]. This means that one person's personhood and identity are fulfilled and complemented by the other person's (Mtuzze, 2004: 103). 'Ubuntu' has been translated as 'humanness', 'generosity' or 'philanthropy', but none of these seems to grasp the concept as it involves 'sharing yourself, your humanity with the other person first' (Mtuzze, 2004). In practice having 'ubuntu' means sharing your wealth with poorer members of the community. You are expected to do what is in your power to help a person in need. Being a white person in a black community meant that people saw me as a wealthy person.

Besides the support discussed above, I asked the children if they wanted to meet other children in similar situations to discuss their problems. Most of them liked the idea, and we established a discussion group that met twice a month. One of the counsellors facilitated the group. Although not everybody showed up every meeting, the group has continued to meet until now. The research has thus continued to benefit the respondents.

## **Research techniques**

In my study, I chose to use a range of research methods (one-to-one interviews, focus group discussions and questionnaires), as all children are different and feel comfortable with different techniques. To help children express their ideas, various stimulus material such as vignettes, photo's, and drawings were used. Respondents also took pictures themselves of family, friends, and their neighbourhood. Besides my getting a better representation of the social relationships of the respondents, taking pictures could be an enjoyable element for children involved.

It is argued that with group interviews the adult-child relationship is less influential than in one-to-one interviewing. However, in the context of my research this was very difficult to realise. The first difficulty was in finding an available venue accessible for all the children participating. Children do not have money to take a minibus, and do not want to travel too far. The second issue is presence at meetings. Many times during my fieldwork, children were not present at the time or place where we were supposed to meet for interviews. There were several reasons for this. Most children in this study did not have a diary or a watch; they simply forgot. For adults and children, when there was something more pressing than the interview, they did not show up. For the children, this could range from school duties, being sent somewhere by neighbours, to having the opportunity to go to the swimming pool on a hot day.

To prevent ‘no-show’, I always wrote down the date and time of our next meeting on a piece of paper with my phone number for the participants. Although most participants would be unlikely to have money to call, it was always possible to send a free ‘call me back’ with one of the South African cellular phone services. Also, whenever possible, one of my interpreters would send someone to remind respondents of our appointment a day in advance.

With all the children I had one-to-one interviews with the help of an interpreter. The interviews mostly had a conversational form, meaning that children could discuss the subjects they wanted to discuss. After some children and I got to know each other better, we had fun during the interviews. Because I asked them so many ‘silly’ questions about the how and why of some culturally bounded activities, they also started to ask me questions about my culture.

It was not always easy to talk with young children. I discussed this issue a great deal with the counsellors. According to them it is sometimes difficult because in their culture ‘children are not used to talk about their feelings...they don’t learn that...’ Therefore, I asked children and young people to make drawings, pictures and life maps. Nevertheless, with most children the interviewing worked well. After a couple of meetings, most children seemed comfortable talking with me and often started talking about subjects related to my research without my asking them directly. I often discussed the story or example of another child in a similar situation. From their reaction I could learn if things like that happened more often, and ask them what they would do if something like that happened to them.

During my fieldwork, I realised that not all the intended methods were working for all participants. This suggests that there are no special research methods suitable to the study of children. Christensen (2004) also argues that in research with children different research methods to working with adults are not required. Rather, the researcher needs to adopt practices which resonate with children’s own concerns. Children are individuals, and methods should thus correspond with a child’s own interests and abilities. David, aged 16, for instance, directed most conversations to a more serious level. After the usual small talk, he often started talking about a research related subject. Anika, aged 18, is a young woman who has been interviewed before by a newspaper. Unlike David, Anika liked a more casual approach. At the first interview, she told me she did not like to be interviewed in a conventional manner, where I asked questions and she gave answers. She wanted us to have conversations instead, preferably with some background music. Two brothers (12 and 16), always seem to enjoy our conversations, but they mostly tried to direct the topic to mobile phones, music artists, or TV shows.

The photo interviewing worked the best with the two brothers (12 and 16). They made pictures of important people in their lives, and of favourite items of their deceased mother’s. One young man (18) tried to make pictures twice, with two disposable cameras. Both times the pictures failed. It is possible that the

children had never used a camera before, and therefore this method failed. However, they all did enjoy it, which suggests that I should have made more effort in showing them how to use a camera. Therefore, in the follow up study, I explained how to make pictures thoroughly to all children involved. This time, most pictures worked out quite well. The children presented their pictures in the discussion group. They explained what the pictures were about or who presented the person in the picture. Some pictures realistically showed what life is like in the townships.

Working with local interpreters helped me during my fieldwork. They prevented me from getting lost, and made me feel safer. They translated Xhosa into English when the children did not speak English, but they also often explained cultural phenomena. However, our views on children and childhood, and ideas on possible interventions often differed. In such cases, we would often both compromise. For instance, I wanted to pay participants financial incentives, but the interpreters doubted if the children would spend the money wisely. Therefore, we also sometimes brought them food. When we asked the children what they did with the money they usually said that they had bought food.

## **Conclusions and Discussion**

In this paper, I have shown that existing ethical principles in child research often clash with viewing children as social actors. Therefore, researchers in the study of childhood need new ethical guidelines. Seeing children as capable human beings means respecting their ability to make their own decisions. In many cases it may not be possible for children to participate in research against their parents' or caregivers' will. It is, however, possible to diminish the possibility of children participating because of fear of sanction, through making informed consent continuous.

To reduce possible power differences in research with children, one needs to provide the children with as much autonomy as possible. In my study this meant always letting the children decide where, when and how the interview would take place. By presenting the research with a clear reciprocal character, power differences are also diminished and beneficial to the research.

In my opinion, giving support to children in need is an ethical necessity. Nonetheless, during my fieldwork, I was also aware of the possible negative effects for the children. For instance, the director of SAU warned me of not making the children too dependent on me because I was leaving. By my establishing a discussion group and getting the children involved in the counselling program at SAU, support became more continuous.

Although the effects on the children were of first concern, I also had to take account of the effects it would have on the research. Mostly I was afraid that my assisting these children would make them obliged to participate in the research.

However, as discussed, some children clearly indicated they did not wish to continue. In addition, the children that received most support were the children that were had already been involved in the study for a number of months. Therefore, it is not likely that children felt more obliged to participate when receiving material support from me.

In my study, local perceptions of children and childhood that were different to my own, and contextual factors influenced the research greatly. I had to deal with the perceptions of my interpreters and the perceptions of community members involved in the children's lives. Moreover, most children living in CHHs are extremely poor and have lost their parents and therefore continuous material and emotional support had to be part of the study.

Because all circumstances differ, a set of ethical values should be developed with room for flexibility (Christensen & Prout, 2002). In my view, there should be flexibility that allows for compromise between local perceptions and circumstances and the researcher's own views and ideas.

## Notes

1. It was explained that the information they gave me would be used in a report with pseudonyms for their names and the location.
2. A pre-cooked porridge with a high level of calories and vitamins.

## References

- Archard, R., 1993, *Children, Rights and Childhood*. London: Routledge.
- Christensen, P. H., 2004, 'Children's participation in Ethnographic Research: Issues of Power and Representation', *Children & Society*, vol. 18, pp. 165-176.
- Dijk, D. van, 2002, 'Hulle kan nie hulle hormone in toom hou nie. A study on gender, adolescents and sexual behaviour in relation to HIV in South Africa', Nijmegen: CIDIN.
- James, A. & James, A., 1999, 'Pump up the volume. Listening to children in separation and divorce', *Childhood* (6), 2, pp. 189-206.
- James, A., Jenks, C., & Prout, A., 1998, *Theorizing Childhood*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- James, A. & Prout, A., eds., 1990, *Constructing and reconstructing childhood*. Basingstoke: Falmer Press.
- Lammers, E., 2005, 'Anthropology and the taboo on giving', *Lova* (26), 1, pp. 52-65.
- Prout, A., 2002, 'Introduction to the Children 5-16 programme', *Children & Society*, vol. 16, pp. 97-76.
- Schenk, K. & Williamson, J., 2005, *Ethical Approaches to Gathering Information from Children and Adolescents in International Settings: Guidelines and Resources*. Washington, DC: Population Council.
- Van Gog, J. & Reysoo, F., 2005, 'If you can't beat them, join them. Informed consent in antropologisch veldonderzoek', *Lova*, (26), 1, pp. 4-21.