REFLECTIONS ON CO-INVESTIGATION THROUGH PEER RESEARCH WITH YOUNG PEOPLE AND OLDER PEOPLE IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Abstract

This paper reflects on a series of collaborative studies led by the author where co-investigation with peer-researchers has played a central role. The first concerns work with young people, trained to enable them to participate as peer-researchers in a child mobility study in Ghana, Malawi and South Africa; the second a research project on youth and mobile phones, in which some of those young peer-researchers have a continued involvement; the third a study of older people's mobility in Tanzania, conducted in collaboration with an international NGO. Experience in these projects illustrates the complexities of co-investigation, not least the ethical concerns which have to be addressed when working with commonly marginalized people, whatever their age, but it also highlights the potential rewards which such collaborations can bring to individual peer-researchers, to academic research quality and, in the longer term, towards better policy and practice.

Introduction

Co-production of knowledge with research participants is now widely acknowledged as key to sound, inclusive academic studies in the social sciences, especially in contexts where those research participants are relatively 'powerless' by comparison with the researcher(s). Calls for reflexive and relational research (Haraway 1991, Radcliffe 1994, Rose 1997) have taken root over the years and although, at the turn of this century, Nagar (2002) observed an 'impasse' in feminist research where fears of (mis)representation and (in)authenticity actually led to some withdrawal from fieldwork in the Global South, the adoption of more politically engaged, materially grounded, and institutionally sensitive approaches to research have gathered pace, as feminist scholars have grappled with their place in grids of power relations, their methods and their interpretations (Kobayashi, 2003; Sultana, 2007). Reflexive research ethics now encourage regular engagement with complex questions of reciprocity, control over and access to research data, and research integrity in partnerships, all of which are recognised as critical in trust-building (e.g. Meloni et al. 2015; Riano, 2015, this issue). However, as

Noxolo et al. (2012) suggest, in their discussion of responsibility as practice, working towards such a stable, morally-mediated space and associated agency is by no means simple, given the messiness and uncertainties of negotiating power and practice in a postcolonial world.

This paper is concerned with efforts at making further (albeit hesitant) steps along the continuum of engagement with less powerful participants: moving from the participation and dialogue which characterises co-*production* of knowledge, to co-*investigation* where such partners are actively engaged in the research process, as peer-researchers. It involves outsiders building new and complex relationships with research participants which will not necessarily eradicate the massive power asymmetries in which global relations are embedded, but may at least offer an improved route into local understandings (even if one that has the potential to move us, as academic researchers, well outside our comfort zone). While co-production of knowledge in research in the Global South has arguably reached centre stage, co-investigation with research participants is still relatively rare, though interest in the potential of this approach, whereby socially-excluded groups are brought into the research process, not simply as respondents but as researchers with unique community access and novel insights, appears to be growing[i].

The three short, Africa-based case studies which follow offer insights into the significant responsibilities involved in helping to create new spaces of inclusion for vulnerable groups that are often excluded from participant consultations, and then sharing those spaces. The first concerns work with young people (most aged between 10 and 18 years when they first joined the project), trained to enable them to participate confidently as peer-researchers in a child mobility study; the second an ongoing project on young people and mobile phones, in which some of those young peer-researchers have a continued involvement; the third, a research study with peer-researchers aged 59-69, aimed at understanding the mobility constraints faced by older people in accessing health services and livelihoods. Working with different age-groups is helpful in assessing the value of the co-investigation approach. Studies 1 and 2 were conducted in collaboration with another UK-based colleague, in-country university staff and their research assistants, study 3 in collaboration with international and in-country NGOs and an in-country research organisation[ii].

Case 1: Co-investigation with young people in a child mobility study

This first case study revolves around a project I led to investigate children's mobility and access to services in Ghana, Malawi and South Africa (focused on understanding the mobility patterns of 9 to18-year-olds). It is still relatively rare for children or young people to take the role of researchers, as opposed to the "researched", both in the Global North and the Global South - and there are important ethical issues to address. However, interest in collaborative work with children is growing, because of concerns to redress the power imbalance between adults and children in the research process, to protect them from exploitative research, and to give adequate recognition to their rights: part of a 'wider political struggle for recognition, representation and equality' (Jones, 2004:114).

Much so-called child-centred research would probably be more accurately termed 'child-focused': adult researchers work in a participatory way with child respondents, who are consulted to ascertain their views, but children do not participate as full research partners (Porter and Abane, 2008). When developing plans for a major research study of children's mobility across diverse sites in sub-Saharan Africa, we might have followed similarly conventional lines, had it not been for a chance discussion with an Indian activist NGO, which was developing very innovative approaches to action research involving children's active participation (Lolichen, 2002). These appeared to offer considerable opportunities for developing a grounded understanding of children's perspectives on their own lives and with potentially significant advantages in redressing conventional power imbalances between adults and children (Alderson, 2000; James, 2007; Jones, 2004; Meloni et al. 2015): their likely value in building a strong understanding of children's mobility issues, which had been very little researched in Africa up to that time, was evident. Together with Ghanaian and South African research collaborators, we conducted a field trial in India in 2004 involving 29 children (9-18 years) who were introduced to various data collection methods which they refined and tested through discussion and role play, explored modes of analysis and discussed ethical issues. Subsequently, 12 Ghanaian schoolchildren took part in a pilot in Ghana, led by the Ghanaian academic team. Small teams from India and South Africa (including child researchers from both countries) then came to Ghana to review data collection methods, analytical tools and children's perceptions of their value and ease of use. At the end of this meeting, the children presented their research at a workshop attended by the Minister of Roads and Highways.

These pilots confirmed the potential of the child-centred approach for exploring children's transport and mobility issues across Africa. However, they also highlighted its time consuming and labour intensive nature, both for the schoolchildren and the adult facilitators. This led to the conclusion that, while it was essential to put co-investigation at the heart of the study, it would also be necessary to build in additional academic-led research (since data collection was needed in numerous sites to achieve adequate coverage of different transport contexts). The decision was also, to some extent, shaped by the particular challenges faced by social science researchers who wish to influence the male/civil engineering-dominated transport sector in Africa, among whom dismissive attitudes to qualitative and user-focused research are common (Porter and Abane, 2008). All of this suggested the value of a mixed-methods plan, centred on qualitative studies by the young researchers, but complemented by more conventional academic-led qualitative research, followed by a large survey (to produce the extensive data set and associated comprehensive statistical analyses necessary for our information to have credence in the transport sector)[iii].

The main study commenced in 2006 with recruitment (following parental and school approvals) and training of 70 young people (mostly 10 to 18-year-olds) in the three selected study countries (now including Malawi). Following a training week (supported by local academic researchers) they conducted their own independent studies, but with sustained support from the local collaborators and RAs. Working over a period of up to two months, their research contributed significantly to the larger project. Young people interviewing their peers[iv] were able to uncover issues which children did not raise directly with adult academic researchers, either because of embarrassment, or because they thought adults would perceive the problems raised as insignificant and unimportant. Such findings ranged from widespread fear of dogs and snakes on pedestrian journeys to severe teacher punishments for late arrival at school, and sanctions imposed by carers when children arrived home late at night. All of this work fed into and helped shape questions in the wider academic research programme (Porter et al. 2010).

By this means, we were able to bring together a massive data-set on children's transport issues which have since been presented to diverse in-country and international organisations. Our numbers satisfied the transport agencies, but we were also satisfied that our survey had asked the necessary key questions, because it was firmly based in prior co-investigation with young people. Nineteen of the 'young researchers' (they no longer liked the title 'child

researcher') then worked on their own data analysis and book of findings. This led to a debate around naming, since the academic researchers had some concerns about anonymity and confidentiality, but the young researchers, understandably, wanted recognition of their contribution. It was resolved by naming all 70 contributors, but not attributing any element to individual authors. The finished booklet was one of the most satisfying products of our collaboration: 4,000 copies went to communities, schools, libraries and other institutions in Ghana and Malawi. Many of the young researchers, reporting the sense of personal worth they have achieved through their work, pointed to the booklet (available at www.dur.ac.uk/child.mobility) as especially rewarding.

Case 2: Co-investigation with young people in a study of young people and mobile phones
In 2012 a follow-on study commenced, focused now on virtual rather than physical mobility, in the same 24 research sites. Its rationale was the remarkably rapid expansion in young people's access to mobile phones, and the impact this appeared to be having on their lives. This study (focused on 9 to 25-year-olds) follows a very similar pattern to the child mobility research: academic-led qualitative studies followed by a substantial survey, but both informed by young researchers' prior investigations. We worked with those young people - female and male- we had trained in 2006, who were still available and keen to continue working with the team[v]. Their work in the preliminary stages, as in the child mobility study, helped in shaping the academic-led research. Their input was also invaluable because of their familiarity with the research approach and their knowledge of the research sites. A few have subsequently worked alongside the university-based RAs, contributing full interview transcripts, running focus groups and/or helping to administer the survey questionnaires.

Two of these peer-researchers from Ghana and another from Malawi, joined the project review meeting at the University of Cape Town in November 2014. Here they made formal presentations of findings on behalf of their country groups at the concluding stakeholder workshop. The confidence with which they talked and handled questions from representatives of South Africa's ministries of basic education and telecommunications and major NGOs was remarkable. Their reflections on the impact of participating in the projects are also encouraging:

> *'I joined the research team…in my second year at secondary school… I did not know the processes involved in conducting research. (In the initial training week in 2006 I) learnt how to organise and present research findings. My presentation skills improved*

and this reflected during my study in the university. Now, I am able to make ...presentations before any audience with confidence...Professionally, I learnt a lot of things that are very useful to an innovative engineer....Participating in these research activities has also improved my social life. Previously, I found it very difficult to interact with people; I was very shy. I decided to use the opportunity to correct this. Through interactions with respondents in the field, young and adult researchers, I succeeded. I made new friends...I got moral, academic and career advice from the adult researchers I worked with. I learnt to think analytically by engaging adults and peers in constructive discussions...(and this visit to South Africa) has triggered my focus on innovative ideas that would develop Ghana...Allowances earned from the research were used to pay part of my school fees in the university'.
(Male Ghanaian, former child/young researcher)

'The studies...have helped me to develop knowledge and skills on how to approach elders in the villages...My job requires me to go to the village alone and introduce myself to the District Agriculture Development Officer, Agriculture Extension Development Coordinator and Group Village Heads...The projects have helped me to acquire skills and experience in using mixed methods, in terms of data collection, data entry, data analysis and interpretation. I also acquire excellent skills in report writing and presentation. For instance, my current work...requires me to conduct interviews (both individual and focus group discussions) and observations among farmers as well as buyers...generate reports and respond to inquiries...analyse and interpret the observations and results of monitoring...As a result of being involved...I have managed to get jobs elsewhere involved in research... because of the good networks I had with (local university collaborator)...Through the skills I obtained from the projects, I aspire to pursue a career in research...because the projects have given me confidence that I can handle any kind of research work'. (Female Malawian, former child/young researcher)

The statements show the extent to which training and work-experience within the two projects has helped these two young researchers grow since they joined as schoolchildren in 2006/7, but they also give some indication of the wider potential of co-investigation for supporting young people's empowerment (for which, see also Robson et al. 2009, Hampshire et al., 2012).

Case 3: Co-investigation with Older People in a study of their mobility and transport constraints

Positive experience with peer research in the child mobility study encouraged me to explore the approach further, when researching mobility issues with older people aged 60+, in collaboration with the NGO HelpAge International. Field investigations took place in rural Tanzania, where the older people's groups with which HelpAge were working had already identified the high cost, unsuitability, scarcity and unreliability of public transport as significant issues limiting their access to key services. We selected 10 settlements of varying accessibility for detailed research. The project – one of the first to explore older people's transport, mobility and access to services in Africa - was designed to incorporate three key strands, as in the child mobility research: (1) co-investigation as the first phase, to establish key issues for further investigation and analysis, (2) qualitative studies (in-depth interviews using check-lists), conducted with older people and other key informants, followed by (3) a survey questionnaire to older people.

As in the child mobility study, we provided training for a small group of older people in some basic participatory research methods over a one week period. In recruiting peer-researchers, we hoped to include women and men, 60 years and over, along the spectrum of able-bodied to severely disabled. In the event, we were able to recruit 12 men and women aged 59-69, mostly farmers, all from the same village, and with only minor disabilities (poor eyesight, stiff joints). Recruitment was difficult, in part, because we had made an early decision that literacy would be a valuable attribute: the older researchers would then be able to record their own field research. Unsurprisingly, finding literate older women was a greater challenge than finding literate older men. Meanwhile, five young RAs in their 20s (two women, three men) had also been recruited to work with, support and learn from the older researchers throughout the training phase, in preparation for their role as data-gatherers in the academic-led component.

The training workshop (led by an experienced HelpAge facilitator) was planned to help our Older People research team develop suitable, age-adjusted research methods and then conduct qualitative research in their home settlement with their peers. A code of conduct was developed between all participants and various research methods then introduced (techniques of interviewing, visual mobility mapping techniques, seasonal calendars, timelines, mobile interviews). Each technique was first introduced in the classroom, its likely relevance

discussed, then trialled by our Older People researchers in their home village. Mobile interviews (which had proved very successful in the child mobility study) were dropped, because of the practical difficulties of arranging walks at the same time as the community visits, especially given the age of both researchers and respondents. Instead, the Older People researchers kept a journal of their own journeys for two weeks. However, these lacked the thickness of description that a mobile ethnography with its careful recording (of conversation, silences and broader observations) can provide.

Feedback on methods was reviewed throughout the training week, while at the same time much initial information was gathered about the transport and mobility issues faced by older people: the whole team engaged in regular discussion and synthesis. Key questions thus established were then incorporated into the design of the qualitative check sheets and survey questionnaires applied in phases 2 and 3. Interestingly, over the training week, the relations between the Older People being trained and the young RAs in their 20s changed, as the Older People grew in confidence as researchers and repositories of significant local knowledge. Some gradually moved to the position of advisors of their young urban-educated colleagues, showing them how to approach, pace and fully comprehend interviews with older people in the field (Porter et al., 2014).

By the end of the workshop, the Older People researchers were so fully engaged in the study that they decided to continue their work across all ten study villages. Subsequently, at the national workshop, where the project findings were presented to government and NGO staff, the Older People team participated with great enthusiasm. One of the most memorable moments occurred when one of the peer-researchers, having listened to an address by the country's Chief Medical Officer, moved to the lectern and, drawing confidently on his team's evidence, observed courteously, but firmly, the urgent needs of older people. The success of the project was sufficient to encourage HelpAge Tanzania to undertake further studies using this approach.

Some concluding reflections on ethics, positionality and responsibility as practice

The three cases presented demonstrate the potential of co-investigation to create new spaces of inclusion for vulnerable groups – all were conducted in collaboration with age-groups rarely consulted in international development research and each of the projects has enabled

these groups to speak directly about their mobility issues and associated constraints to key national and international players (government, International NGOs). Genuinely participatory processes which not only provide clear insider knowledge, but can also help bring their issues to wider public attention, with potential impact on policy and practice, arguably have a substantial role to play in improving social justice in Africa. However, there are complex ethics and responsibilities involved in deploying such practices with commonly marginalized (and sometimes time-poor) people working in insider situations, creating new spaces of (insider-insider and insider-outsider) collaboration, and then operating within these shared spaces.

Reflections on issues of reciprocity, control over and access to data, and research integrity, are of particular significance for the cases discussed above, since each project involved large teams of collaborators, in addition to the peer-research teams, and depended on external (UK) funding. Firstly, the composition and positionalities of the research teams requires comment. I (European, white, female, resident for a decade in an African country and with African field experience extending over 40 years) led the research in each study but could only work in the field for short periods in each country. The in-country teams (each comprising around 10 individuals of both genders) were mostly composed of young (20s to 30s) urban-based graduates. My input included academic/RA team training and field monitoring in each country, with support from other UK and in-country staff (academic staff in the child mobility study, NGO staff in the HelpAge project), and participation in some of the peer-research training. The in-country staff worked with (a mix of in-country and European) trained facilitators of both genders in the initial peer-research training and subsequently provided day-to-day support to the peer-researchers while also working on the academic research strand. While the involvement of foreigners, clearly implicated in the arrival of funds, may have encouraged initial local interest in these projects, I assess the impressive, sustained commitment of the in-country teams as far more crucial in building trust with peer-researchers and the associated overwhelmingly positive experiences reported by peer-researchers across all three projects.

Nonetheless, there is an ample literature which demonstrates how external manipulation (local, national and international), elite capture, erasure and double-speak can all feasibly creep into these spaces of interaction: the dangers of a rhetoric of partnership and rituals of collaboration which mask ventriloquism (James, 2007; Mosse, 2003). Despite my efforts to chart and understand the diverse elements which shaped each project (through field

observation and individual confidential interviews with peer-researcher and academic team members), can I hope to have learned a fraction of the complete story? Even the preliminary recruitment of young peer-researchers (by in-country collaborators), seemingly entirely voluntary, could have been shaped in part by pressures from parents and teachers, perceiving wider potential benefits from association with local and European university staff. Black (2004:11) has observed 'children manipulated by adults to 'say their piece' or appear on public platforms in a tokenistic role', while Bourdillon (2005), raised concerns about facilitators in child-centred programmes in Zimbabwe. It is also not unrealistic to imagine that similar, behind-the-scenes stage management could happen with older people's co-research work though, as noted in Case 3, once the Older People peer-researchers had started to gain confidence in their activities, the power balance between them and the young (better-educated, urbanite) RAs shifted.

The positionality of peer-researchers also requires careful reflection. The studies reported here involved small, arguably already privileged groups in peer research - albeit also relatively vulnerable by virtue of their poverty and youth or age. In particular, in all three cases, the peer-researchers already had the privilege of some formal education. Moreover, through their involvement in the projects, they have gained further benefits – paid travel to major cities and interactions with urban-based elites, including government ministers and senior NGO staff (which, in the case of young people, may have furthered their careers); payment for work (which has enabled some young people to continue their education, as in Case 2 above); and increased status in their home communities because of those external connections and money. As one 12 year-old boy in the Ghana pilot succinctly observed, '*I have been taught many things that will put me ahead of my friends in school and at home'*.

This then poses the question, can members of these favoured groups adequately engage with and re-present all their age cohort? If not, how can we widen the opportunities offered by such projects to a wider cohort? The fuller engagement of non-literate people is an element that requires particular attention. Although basic literacy shaped peer-researcher selection in these mobility studies (because of our limited resources and time constraints), it is certainly not essential for co-investigation– the NGO from which I initially learned about co-investigation has worked successfully with non-literate groups of working children. Clearly, we need to develop robust methods which will enable analphabets to participate more centrally. The increasingly accessible audio and pictorial facilities available on low-cost mobile phones now have great potential in this respect, as is already being demonstrated in

diverse contexts, especially since phone usage is already remarkably widespread in Africa, including among the very young and very old of both genders (Skouby and Idongesit, 2014).

It is also important to consider how peer-researchers' insider status within their communities may have implications for the research process. Contextual understanding is doubtless crucial – in particular, the impact of local social relations on the co-construction of knowledge. In the case studies there were occasional instances where (I suspect) older peer-researchers, in particular, were able to extract potentially sensitive information from community respondents, precisely because they were friends, relations or neighbours; even cases where respondents may not have realised that the activities they described (and peer-researchers recorded) were illegal. Sometimes young peer-researchers forgot about the importance of obtaining consent for photographs (albeit much stressed in the training workshops), and consequently found themselves in the midst of heated argument. Even if they carefully followed training guidelines to the letter, field hazards were very occasionally encountered by young people– refusals, insults, demands for money. To what extent can (and should) outsiders protect peer-researchers from these hazards, especially given that they may well remain resident in their communities long after we, the external researchers, have left the field?

This leads on to some reflections regarding working with peer-researchers of different ages. Their positionality within the wider community setting is clearly relevant and this commonly varies with age in Africa. Young people's position in family and community hierarchies (especially girls') is typically very low – they are expected to be seen and not heard. Consequently in the initial child mobility study it took time for academic collaborators to gain their trust, but their voices gradually emerged as our interactions deepened and their confidence grew: this probably helps explain why some young peer-researchers are still working with us nearly decade later. By contrast, in the older people's peer-research team there were a few men and women who still commanded considerable local respect and authority (for instance, a woman former agricultural extension officer) and, as discussed, their voices emerged rapidly and increasingly confidently. Perhaps the fact that I was an older woman was helpful in this setting. Nonetheless, overall day-to-day differences between working with the child researchers and with older people as peer-researchers have been, in many respects, surprisingly small: I have sometimes observed individual personality and associated social and emotional abilities seemingly playing almost as significant a role as age in shaping the process of field research and the production of knowledge (Moser 2008).

Temporality also comes into play, as people's ideas and relationships change in the typically fairly lengthy period over which encounters take place during a study involving co-investigation. This is especially the case when working with young people since, as they grow older, their relations with adults alter. It is essential to continually interrogate the inter- and intra-generational relationships within which knowledge is co-produced, reproduced and represented, especially where international actors and funding hover on the sidelines (Porter et al. 2012). It is also important to bear in mind that the inter-connectivities of local, national and international scales of operation in the research process are deepening and may only fully reveal themselves over time. With increasing access to mobile phones, even the remotest communities are becoming globally connected and peer-researchers' post-field interactions with myself and other team members now continue far more intensively than would have been feasible a decade ago: we receive requests for career advice and occasionally for help with training funds, but also share news and photographs. Experience gained through co-investigation, moreover, may enable some to build their own studies, without external support, when they require evidence to shape or prevent developmental activities. A small but encouraging instance of this occurred in Case 1, when, after the pilot, some of the Ghanaian pupils involved set up an independent research club at their school to build evidence on other issues which concerned them, including pupils' eating habits, *"so we can then address problems*" (Patience, 18y).

Finally, there are data control and sharing issues to consider. Copies of all (anonymised) data for each case study are held both in UK and in-country lead institutions. However, obtaining informed consent, especially for data archiving in the funding country (increasingly required by major Northern funders), is a growing issue, since how can we be sure that either peer-investigators or their respondents fully recognise its meaning and implications, including the potential reach of information in this internet age (whether the activities and opinions documented are - at the time of data collection- seemingly sensitive or not). These scalar elements interpose considerable complexity and we will have to be prepared to deal with the unexpected predicaments they may present in the future, precisely because the local is constitutively global.

To conclude, there are certainly many potential pitfalls in operationalizing a co-investigation process: it needs to be carried out with very careful attention to the landscapes of power, politics and vested interests in which it is located (Cooke and Kothari eds., 2001). If the perpetuation of colonial landscapes of power in a new guise is to be avoided, the

establishment of ethics agreements and procedures at the start of academic/community collaborations (covering diverse elements, from consent and fair payment, to the availability of adequate emotional support should it be needed) are essential, as is honest and realistic management of expectations about potential impact of the research. Moreover, these are all points which require regular revisiting, since conditions and context may change over time; such iterations may not only be time-consuming but also potentially stressful, for all concerned. And even with careful management of the research teams, giving full attention to the complex ethics of international and intergenerational research encounters, power asymmetries will remain. Throughout, we need to monitor and reflect on *whose* knowledges are being reported and represented – in particular, by whom, from whom and for whom.

The case studies suggest that careful planning and wholehearted, sustained commitment is required, for the long-term, from all involved in co-investigation projects. They don't offer rapid or certain success, and are unlikely to make much of a dent in the massive power imbalances within which global relations are embedded, even when stringent efforts are made towards inclusiveness. Nonetheless, cooperative learning in this fashion offers some possibility of negotiating, in small ways, improved routes into local understanding and trust-building. Potential rewards extend beyond individual peer-researchers, to their wider communities, to academic research quality and, hopefully, in the longer term, towards better policy and practice.

References

Alderson, P. (2001) Research by children. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 4(2): 139-53.

Alderson, P. (2012) Rights respecting research: a commentary on 'the right to be properly researched': research with children in a messy, real world, Children's Geographies, 2009,7,4. *Children's Geographies* 10 (2): 233-239

Black, M. (2004) *Opening minds, opening up opportunities: children's participation in action for working children*. London: International Save the Children Alliance, March 2004.

Cooke, B. and Kothari, U., eds., (2001) *Participation: The new tyranny*? London: Zed Books.

Hampshire, K., Porter, G., Owusu, S., Mariwah, S., Abane, A., Robson, E., Munthali, A., Mashiri, M., Maponya, G., Bourdillon, M. (2012) Taking the long view: temporal considerations in the ethics of children's research activity and knowledge production. *Children's Geographies* 10 (2), 219-232

Haraway, D.J. 1991 *Simians, cyborgs and women: the reinvention of nature.* London: Free Association Books.

James, A. (2007) Giving voice to children's voices: practices and problems, pitfalls and potentials. *American Anthropologist*, 109(2): 261-72.

Jones, A. (2004) Involving children and young people as researchers. In: Fraser, S. et al. (eds) *Doing research with children and young people.* London: Sage, pp. 113-131.

Kobayashi, A. (2003) GPC ten years on: Is self-reflexivity enough? *Gender, Place and Culture* 10 (4): 345-349.

Lolichen, P. (2002) *Children and their research: a process document: the story of how working children decided to improve the lot of their entire community through a massive survey*. Bangalore: CWC.

Meloni, F., Vanthuyne, K., Rousseau, C. (2015) Towards a relational ethics: rethinking ethics, agency and dependency in research with children and youth. *Anthropological Theory* 15(1): 106-123.

Monk, J., Manning, P., Denman, C. (2003) Working Together: Feminist Perspectives on Collaborative Research and Action. *ACME* 2 (1): 91-106.

Mosavel, M., Ahmed, R., Daniels, D., Simon, C. (2011) Community researchers conducting health disparities research: ethical and other insights from fieldwork journaling. *Social Science and Medicine* 73: 145-152.

Moser, S. (2008) Personality: a new positionality? *Area* 40(3): 383-392.

Mosse, D. (2003) The making and marketing of participatory development. In: Quarles van Ufford, P. and Giri, A.K. (eds) *A moral critique of development: in search of global responsibilities*. London: Routledge, pp. 43-75.

Nagar, Richa (2002) Footloose researchers, 'traveling' theories, and the politics of transnational feminist praxis. *Gender, Place and Culture* 9 (2): 179-186.

Noxolo, P., Raghuram, P., Madge, C. (2012) Unsettling responsibility: postcolonial interventions. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37 (3): 418-429.

Porter, G. and Abane A. (2008) Increasing children's participation in transport planning: reflections on methodology in a child-centred research project. *Children's Geographies* 6 (2): 151-167.

Porter, G., Hampshire, K., Bourdillon, M., Robson, E., Munthali, A., Abane, A., Mashiri, M. (2010) Children as research collaborators: issues and reflections from a mobility study in sub-Saharan Africa. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 46 (1): 215-227.

Porter, G., Townsend, J., Hampshire, K. (2012) Children and young people as producers of knowledge. *Children's Geographies* 10 (2): 131–134.

Porter, G., Heslop,A., Bifandimu, F., Sibale, E., Tewodros, A., Gorman, M. (2014) Exploring intergenerationality and ageing in rural Kibaha Tanzania; methodological innovation through co-investigation with older people. In R. Vanderbeck and N. Worth [eds] *Intergenerational space*, pp. 259-272. London: Routledge.

Pridmore, P. and Stephens, D. (2000) *Children as partners for health: a critical review of the child-to-child approach.* London: Zed books.

Radcliffe, S.A. (1994) (Representing) post-colonial women: authority, difference and feminisms. *Area* 26: 25-32.

Riaño, Y. (2015) "Participatory Minga Workshops with Highly Skilled Migrant Women: Enhancing Spaces of Inclusion. *Qualitative Research, this issue.*

Robson, E., G. Porter, K. Hampshire, M. Bourdillon 2009. 'Doing it right?': working with young researchers in Malawi to investigate children, transport and mobility. *Children's Geographies* 7 (4): 467-480.

Rose, G. (1997) Situating knowledges: positionality, reflexivities and other tactics. *Progress in Human Geography* 21(3): 305-320.

Skouby, K.E. and Idongesit, W. eds. (2014). *The African mobile story.* Aalborg: River Publishers.

Sultana, F. (2007) Reflexivity, Positionality and Participatory Ethics: Negotiating Fieldwork Dilemmas in International Research. *ACME*, 6 (3): 374-385

End Notes

[i] See Monk et al., 2003; Mosavel et al., 2011; Pridmore and Stevens, 2000.

[ii] Kate Hampshire, Durham University, was UK co-investigator in studies 1 and 2; the Ghana team in studies 1 and 2 was led by Albert Abane (Cape Coast University), the Malawi team by Alister Munthali and Elsbeth Robson (University of Malawi), the South Africa team by Mac Mashiri (CSIR, subsequently independent consultant) and latterly Ariane de Lannoy (University of Cape Town, study 2). Mark Gorman, HelpAge International, was the main UK NGO collaborator in study 3; the Tanzania in-country team was led by Amleset Tewodros and Flavian Bifandimu (HelpAge Tanzania). Facilitation of the India pilot in study 1 was led by P. Lolichen (Concerned for Working Children). Michael Bourdillon facilitated some of the main phase co-investigation training in study 1; Amanda Heslop was lead facilitator in study 3.

[iii] Alderson (2012: 237) asks if child-centred researchers are 'too keen to set all processes at a level that young people aged from 12 or 10 or 8 can understand and perform? If so are researchers subtracting vital matters from their work'.

iv While most of the peer researchers were aged between 10 and 18years, the respondents whom they interviewed were sometimes a little younger at 8 or 9 years old. Our stated age focus for respondents in this mobility research was children between 9 and 18 years.

v Some had moved on to full time jobs; a few now had children of their own to care for; many were undertaking further training, including a few studying overseas; some were un-contactable; very sadly, two had died.