




# Deepening collaborative research with children and young people: A co-edited and co-written special issue

Childhood  
2024, Vol. 0(0) 1–11  
© The Author(s) 2024  
Article reuse guidelines:  
[sagepub.com/journals-permissions](https://sagepub.com/journals-permissions)  
DOI: 10.1177/09075682241267094  
[journals.sagepub.com/home/chd](https://journals.sagepub.com/home/chd)  


## Introduction

Welcome to the editorial of this special issue of *Childhood*. We are very glad that you are interested in the fabulous work of teams of children, young people and adults who have been collaborating to cowrite the articles in this collection. This guest editorial collective has been written by young researchers (Bea, Dan, Evie, Thomas, Victor) and two academic allies (Ali and Cath) at The Centre for Children and Young People's Participation.

Collaborative research with children, young people and adults involves people of different ages working together to improve understanding of an issue through relationships of trust and communication, with each person adding something to the team. It can be a beacon of inclusivity and empowerment, deeply rooted in the ethos of collaboration and co-creation and a way to raise awareness of an important cause. To do it well means to involve a range of different young people, including disabled young people. This is about how to do collaborative research that can amplify the voices of marginalised communities and catalyse meaningful change. We care about the ways that power is shared and about the ways of listening, hearing and taking action that we create together.

In this editorial, we explain how we worked together as an editorial collective, and we reflect on insights into the relationships of care that are at the heart of the collaborative research reported in this special issue. We write about what we see as new and important in the articles in this special issue. Finally, we reflect on our collaboration as an editorial collective and the editorial itself. Each of the papers in this special issue, including this editorial, is accompanied by an accessible summary which is located on <https://www.ucanmakechange2.org>, a website set up and run by a young researcher group and a resource bank to support children and young people's participation in research. We invite you, as readers, to submit summaries of your own work to that repository.

Papers are referred to throughout this editorial by team rather than the first-named author (e.g., Team C). We have chosen to do this to reflect the shared endeavour at the heart of this work. A full list of papers is provided at the end of this editorial.

## *How have we collaborated in the editorial collective?*

We started working on this editorial in March 2023. Cath and Ali had the idea, and they invited young people from two young researcher groups working with the Centre to discuss what a special issue could be about. Ten people came to the first meeting. After a

few months, a few people left and we became a group of seven. We met online every month for 18 months, and in the last 2 months, we met every week.

We wrote two versions of a call for papers – one accessible, and one for academics. These invited ideas for coauthored articles about deepening collaborative research. Lots of teams submitted proposals, which was really exciting. We all wrote a list of the people who we could think of who were experts in this area of work and we asked if in principle they would be reviewers. When draft papers were submitted, we used the summary paragraph (abstract) to start matching papers to reviewers and we chose people from the *Childhood* automated suggestions list. When comments came back from reviewers, we discussed these and we made shared decisions. We knew that we could only include 11 papers and we spent a lot of time making really difficult decisions about which ones to include. We have tried to be as inclusive and sensitive as possible in providing feedback. Sometimes, when decisions were difficult, we asked academic and young researchers to read the draft paper again, to feel confident in our decision and we extended timescales. As some of the author teams have reminded us along the way, ‘this obviously isn’t the sort of thing that young people usually do in participatory research’.

Once we had accepted a paper, we discussed what struck us as new. We looked at accessible summaries and some of us read the full papers. When no accessible summary was available, Cath or Ali found ways to summarise it, often developing a short story. We recorded our discussions, put transcriptions of these into a shared document, and then identified the themes. We used those themes as a structure for this editorial. We started by pasting quotes from ourselves and from the articles into this structure, then we added things by writing into the document ourselves, or we discussed the themes together in the meetings and pasted our quotes back into the document.

We ‘spiced up,’ shortened and combined quotes from our own discussions to create the coauthored parts of this editorial. Sometimes, when one of us said something significant, we have included a direct quote from our discussions, making it clear who said it (sometimes using our names in brackets). Once we had all of that content we read the full articles again and wrote more detail about these into the structure. Everyone read the draft and made comments, and then we added these into the final document.

### *How do we take care of different people in collaborative research?*

A lot of articles have addressed ideas about how to take care of each other in collaborative research, and we reflect on some of this here as caring relationships are an essential part of enhancing the relevance, ethical soundness, and social impact of research.

Most articles included questions of diversity (things like age, age range, neurodiversity, disability, gender, race and ethnicity). We recognise that no two individuals are the same, and care is shown through creative adaptations to learning styles and preferred ways of doing things, and strengthened commitments. It is difficult to represent diversity in a small young researcher group, and there is also a lack of diversity in academic staff teams (Team E). To make true to the maxim “Nothing about us without us” and to engage in effective research collaboration, including with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, attention to contexts and resources is vital (Team H). As we noted in the call for papers, alongside encouragement to decentre childhood (Spyrou 2017), new materialist

and posthuman approaches to childhood have emerged in recent years (Krafft, 2020; Krafft et al., 2021) that are offering ways of trying to understand contexts. These theories can also provide a route into unpicking academics' own assumptions about who can take what role in research (Team H). This can mean caring about diversity by channelling resources, debunking forms of misinformation, and educating people.

Canosa et al. (2018) argue that recognising the relational nature of participatory research requires deeper forms of reflexivity. In this Special Issue, authors have reflected on how to give individualised attention, have clear boundaries but flexible roles and strengthening bonds between peers. And presumptions about who expresses care to whom were challenged. For example, describing how young researchers show care towards academics and express care for children and young people who are participants, and also the eventual audience or beneficiaries.

Trust in research relationships and communication helps create the safety that helps people feel independent and integrated. Trusting relationships and communication rely on making sure the right, reliable, resources are available, for example by organisations including individual academics and universities maintaining long-term commitments to collaborative relationships. Through these long-term commitments, research friendships can grow that enable further collaborative studies and care. For example, the academic in Team A mentions the offer from a young researcher to an academic to help them move house. And in our editorial team, Evie really valued international opportunities to “*get to know other young researchers properly*”. The challenge is to find the right boundaries and to prepare the academy for what this means, something which requires deep reflection as well as activism (Kennelley, Larkins and Roy 2023), sharing our personal but not private selves – including, as we write today, sharing congratulations about Bea's job success.

Rosen (2021) has highlighted the need to think about time and timescales within participatory studies and time to build research relationships and to truly collaborate was seen as essential in many of the papers in this Special Issue. As one young person put it, not replying to emails or texts does not mean not wanting to be involved, it can be a request for space and time (Team F). So, academics need to be curious enough to slow things down and put their own interests aside, to know young people long enough to be able to give the right information that can enable independent decision making, as well as attending carefully to systems and structures.

Many author teams referred to creative approaches to enabling communication. This can mean ‘acknowledgement’ and ‘accommodation’ to enable communication across different age ranges, and through digital connectivity which can mean that people “zoom in” from different places in their busy lives (Team K) or from different countries with young people speaking different languages (Team D). Or they may participate through interpreters and other communication supporters, including parents (Team H). The interweaving of human and digital supports echoes our own experience of creatively responding to challenges by using a translation app during in-person meetings, after many months online, in which we communicated in sign and in Japanese. Collaborative communication, we suggest, is about unlearning some of the established ways of communicating or adult-child relationship dynamics that we have brought with us from other spaces.

### *What strikes us as important and new?*

In this section, we highlight the themes that we use to structure this special issue. These arise from our collective discussions about what strikes us as most important and/or new in what we have learned from the author teams. The five themes show how the relationships of care that we have just described were expressed to make sure collaboration was authentic, to encourage children and young people's leadership, to work on sensitive topics, and find appropriate ways of listening and co-authoring.

### *Authentic collaboration*

The authenticity of the collaboration between some author teams came across vividly in how they wrote papers, as well as how they created accessible summaries together. We came back to this theme several times in finishing this editorial. Victor said *"It's important not to have a tokenistic approach. Sometimes collaboration is not authentic but more like a tick box exercise, where collaboration is only being done because it is a requirement."*

Many papers describe how developing authentic collaborations can prove tricky due to ongoing differences in power, knowledge, and access to systems and structures. Adult allies often experienced anxieties and disappointments about limiting aspects of their own practices, but in many cases, child and youth coauthors were keen to defend the projects and the processes. For example, in Team A one author introduced a debate about 'fake' participatory research where university researchers act like they are making shared decisions, but actually keep the power themselves. Several people said this didn't apply in their project, with one author in that team saying...*Definitely, it's not fake; otherwise, I wouldn't be here for this long. In different projects I've been involved with, obviously not as a researcher, but I felt like they didn't really consider the participants. ... Here, we feel like it's all about us and it's a group decision.*

Teams reached for different resolutions but most involved commitments to transparency, listening, as well as the need for explicit recognition of differences and of people's changing needs and capacities over time. This need to find ways to bring different knowledges together was nicely summed up by a young person in Team A who said

*"Because you haven't experienced what we've experienced. This is why I think this group works well. We combine your academic knowledge about how to do the actual research and our experiences of the system. We put our different knowledge into the project and collectively analyse what we find."*

Authentic collaboration was central for Team B as well, who describe the need to act in resistance to the dominant norms when working in a school setting. They describe a child-led collective problem solving and action inquiry, and they draw comparisons with Freire-inspired Participatory Action Research. This is not formal research but rather a response to the concerns that a group of girls have raised to a youth worker. This team shows how this relationships-based approach allows more freedom to follow young people and enables

greater authenticity in collaboration, as long as sufficient time is allowed to create a context for dialogue. They note that if such collaboration is to be possible, funders and the academy must more fully recognise young people's own ways of identifying, explaining and communicating knowledge.

## Leadership

A central concern in our call for papers was that intergenerational relations of production in social research tend to position children and young people as labourers, sometimes unpaid (Kiili and Larkins 2018), rather than commissioners or directors of research studies. Adults often underestimate the power dimensions at play in participatory research, but more complex, fluid and multi-layered understandings of intergenerational processes are emerging (Crook 2021; Horgan 2017). We are delighted that the articles in this special issue all addresses questions of leadership in one way or another and we discussed this theme a lot in our Editorial Collective. We discussed continuing misconceptions about whether and how young people can lead research, as well as concerns about over-confident adults holding onto power. However, we really enjoyed the afterword to Team A, in which the adult ally points out the need to beware of how the self-critique of adult allies (such as "I did not enable child/youth leadership") can inadvertently minimise the contributions of child and youth collaborators.

Team C and D are each concerned to provide pockets of participation (Franks, 2011) describing the struggle to promote young people's leadership in decision making without overburdening anyone with delivery pressure. Team D draw attention to the need for forward planning if young people's leadership is to be achieved in more pockets and young researchers wrote about the value of using their own local connections with decision-makers (such as local community, local government and leaders) in order to effectively advocate on the issues they were concerned with.

## Sensitive topics

We were pleased that several teams collaborated on research which explored sensitive topics including sexual, family and systemic violence, because, as Team F point out, "*there still is not enough evidence on children and young people's own views and experiences of participating in 'sensitive' research.*" When we discussed these articles, we were impressed with what people have achieved. Bea described how these articles have "*changed my whole perspective on everything, they've involved young people, even knowing there are risks, but still putting young people at the heart of it all*". We have experience of managing risks, including for example, researching violence in communities and assessing our own ability to deal with unfamiliar situations. And, to review these studies collaboratively, we conducted risk assessment and safety planning, ensuring that the articles were only read where risks could be mitigated. So, we empathised when adult allies in Team's E and F talked about the need to balance risk (e.g., of resurfacing difficult memories) and paternalism (which can emerge from adults operating to the view that upset equals harm).

Team E describes a conceptual model, Participation as Protection, which has grown from their shared experiences of working together. One young person said, “*some professionals ... Just seem to think, “...we’re not going to involve you because you’re ... still not healed or recovered from it.” But ... ‘this isn’t okay’, ... ‘I want to use my experience to make sure that nobody else goes through it again’.* The Participation as Protection model encourages us to be honest about the challenges but to avoid unconsciously giving in to protectionist reflexes. This team points out that rights to participate are immutable, that is they exist for everyone including for children who have experienced violence, and there is a responsibility to engage in resourcing and safety planning to realise this right.

Team F also links working on sensitive issues to questions of leadership and highlights that authentic collaboration, even on sensitive issues, involves being part of the agenda setting for research, and not being positioned as mere advisors on a study which adults have already designed. For this team, contrary to some views around protecting space, there was a preference for an intergenerational advisory group, rather than young people being off to the side of decision making. One young person said “*Being a victim-survivor of family violence is like being in bushfire. Some things are horrifically burnt and won’t be coming back, but there is new growth that happens*”. The point is that collaborative research *can* provide safe intergenerational space for this regrowth in which power is shared.

These examples remind us that protectionism can result in forms of symbolic and epistemic violence (Roy et al., 2020; Roy, 2016), hence risk needs to be held through a shared, flexible and relational process, which recognises immutable rights, as well as capacities (which can alter over time). So doing sensitive research involves challenging outdated ideologies, recognising that addressing these issues can be a big task and realising that things don’t have to be perfect, in order to start.

### *Ways of listening and hearing in collaborative research*

In collaborative research we need to find ways to listen to and hear each other throughout the work. As Les Back (2007: 8) has argued, ‘social investigations that utilise a ‘democracy of the senses’ are likely to notice more and ask different questions of the world. The ways in which some author teams described conducting their research felt very new. As Ali put it, “*This idea of the different things that people notice, and being able to listen to each other in different ways felt really important in some of the papers*”. For example, in Team I the adult ally worked with children of 4 and 5 years old. In the paper they describe how they became co-inquirers, going on to say that “the word ‘co-inquirers’ means people who find things out together”. The project was predicated on a belief that “adults can learn about things from children and children can learn about things from adults”, but also an understanding articulated by the children that “when we were researching together, we could always decide if we wanted to research or if we just wanted to play”. Their research was conducted by hanging out together in a forest school setting, and by writing and drawing a shared research journal. In Team G the child researchers decided on the digital platform to use for the study by finding an online space that was similar to ones that would be familiar to children through school or through interactions with family. This everyday digital space then became a place in which the research

process could be fun and accessible, and they liked ‘the energisers’ and ‘interactive games’. The authors link to the work of [Wright et al. \(2021\)](#) who suggest that “fun” in building relationships is important but is often deemed not “important enough” to be included in writing about research. In Team H they report on a project with people with lived experience of cerebral palsy that included young people with cerebral palsy as well as parents and family members. Parents talked about the need to represent their own perspective whilst also trying to represent their children. It provides a great example of the fact that if children and young people are to be able to communicate in their chosen ways, then adult allies must often find new ways to listen together and this involves experimentation with the formats, technologies and resources that are accessible and of interest to children and young people.

[bell hooks \(1989\)](#) argued that the problems of speaking cannot be separated from the problems of listening. What we see in these examples, is a careful attention to co-developing specific forms and ways through which the commitment to dialogue and to co-inquiry are staged in practice. As we discussed in our collective, whilst it is important to make sure that we use the right methods, we also like the idea of not just going to the gold standard when it comes to research, especially when the idea is to collaborate with young people. There’s something about remembering that the purpose of methods is to stage a space of dialogue, ‘so it’s not just like a one-way conversation’.

### *Co-authoring*

Co-authoring is central to this special issue. When we sent out the original call for papers we made it clear that we were looking for “coproduced manuscripts” and we asked teams to describe “how young researchers and academics will be writing together”. Writing for an academic journal is a challenge which brings to mind specific forms of expertise that academic adults might be deemed to hold and several teams have pointed out that this isn’t the sort of work they would normally do together. Like [Finch et al. \(2003\)](#) who did not think young people should have to do all the hard work, some teams were concerned about the additional workload that co-authoring an academic paper might impose on children and young people, as well as how young people would feel if their paper were rejected.

Some teams have written about the decisions they made on authorship in terms of idealism versus pragmatism and have developed cowriting processes in which young people write specific sections which build on their own interests and experiences. In these cases, some have pointed to an uneasy balance between different bits of the text. For example, in Team I the adult ally described their discomfort and pleasure when child coauthors challenged how the academics represented their shared process. Other teams have tried to co-produce the whole paper together, including by using arts-based methods, play, or through recording shared discussions. Team K describe how academic allies might have to let go of pre-existing ideas about how to write and “in very practical terms” decide “who is responsible for writing the sentences” and we really enjoyed their reflections on the complexities and difficulties of doing this work together. In Team J’s paper, which focused more broadly on the possibility of authoring for and with children,

the paper was first written in Spanish including phrases from verbal discussions recorded in Zoom. The team reflected that the subsequent translation into English made the paper feel more academic in a pejorative sense even if still recognisable. Whilst the children “were proud of having achieved” this publication, they were also “disappointed that their friends and family could not enjoy a text like this”. An adult in that paper wrote:

“They would have written parts of the article differently, and we also would. Honestly, each one of us would have probably written this differently, but this is what we agreed to publish together, and we are very much aware that age played a part in how these differences were negotiated.”

Even in papers where adults and children and young people wrote the whole paper together, adult allies have chosen to develop spaces to separate off their own reflections. For example, in Team I, a collaboration with young children, the academic provides footnotes throughout, as an academic commentary on the shared narrative. This enabled us as an editorial collective of different ages and skills, to review the article in parallel. In a similar way, in Team A, the form and content of the article reflect a shared dialogue about participatory research between young people with migration experiences and the academic co-researcher. This paper includes an ‘afterword’ in which the academic ally reflects on ‘some of the critiques of participatory research in the academic literature’.

Many coauthoring teams have pointed out that the process of co-writing has brought into clarity its benefits. In Team I the adult ally wrote:

“The process of writing this article for *Childhood* has greatly challenged some of my understandings of working with children as co-researchers and highlights the need to involve children, particularly if they are positioned as co-inquirers, in every stage of the research, including the writing up. .... The call for papers stated that ‘adults underestimate the ways in which they keep control of the process, the resources, the writing and sharing of knowledge’.

Teams have also had to resolve issues of named authorship. In some cases, young people and adults are both named in full. In other cases, children have chosen pseudonyms or appear with first names only. Whilst we anticipated that all authors would be named in papers in the Special Issue, we respect the decisions that teams have made and these reflect that whilst many of the values and principles of collaborative practice are shared, the decision about how it is practised must be bespoke to the people and contexts in which it happens.

Overall, we think the different approaches to co-authoring represented in this special issue provide insight into what is possible, how and in which contexts, and we commend all the author teams for taking a chance and being prepared to be transparent about some of the problems with their own approaches.



## *Reflecting on an editorial collective and Special Issue*

We have all really enjoyed working together on this project. We have learned a lot from each other and found new ways to listen to each other throughout the process. We had the privilege of reading the work of the 11 teams whose papers make up this Special Issue and we thank them all for their contributions. We also wish to thank all of the reviewers who were sensitive to the focus of this Special Issue and generous with their time, often responding very quickly to help us deliver on time and allow author teams as much time as possible.

In the process of coediting, we have challenged ourselves to raise awareness of issues and to assist each other the best we can. We liked the complementary nature of this, the different experiences we bring together, as young people and academics. Every single voice in our editorial collective was included somewhere and somehow we sort of put them all together.

Ideally, we would have allowed everyone more time, because to meet the required publishing timescale for a special issue we have had to push teams in ways which we know have not always been helpful nor in line with participatory principles. We are grateful to the writing teams for how they have reminded us that we are also implicated in the politics of time and have found ourselves on the wrong side of this at some points in this project. We would suggest that future cocreated special issues be allowed longer timescales.

Reflecting across the articles in this special issue, we are struck by the depth of commitment amongst children, young people and adults involved in collaborative research, who are all seeking and finding new ways of knowing together. As we wrote in the call for papers, the early findings from an ongoing systematic review of participatory research (Nowland et al., 2021), highlighted the value of exploring ontology and social theory with young researchers. This is part of any researcher's orientation to a field of study. At the close of this special issue, we can see that there is a rich diversity of approaches and great scope for further theorising of how academics and children and young people can come to know and understand together.

We are presenting the work we have done on coediting this special issue at the International Creative Research Methods Conference in Manchester in September 2025 and we hope to develop our ideas together further, as Dan put it, "the only way we will make progress, is to get something long term out of this."

## **Included papers:**

Team A - Aisha, Arjana, Gulli, Mirfat, Abdullayeva, M., Zak, & Rosen, R. (2024). Reflecting on participation's promises: Insights from collaborative research about unaccompanied child migrants, care, and the UK's hostile immigration regime.

Team B - Crook, D.J., Zoha, Zainab, Alice, Elodie, Erin, Isabelle, Safiya, & Terry. (2024). Youth-led social action at school: 'It made me think that there could be a way to make things better in the future'.

Team C - MacLachlan, A., Pemmansani, P., Jamieson-Mackenzie, I., McMellon, C., Cunningham, E., Lewis, R., & Tisdall, E.K.M. (2024). Applying co-production principles in research: Reflections from young people and academics.

Team D - Paterson-Young, C., Adhikari, J., Lee, L., Maher, M., & Wright, L. H. V. (2024). Creating ownership: Strengths and tensions in co-production with children, young people, and adults across contexts.

Team E - Warrington, C., Bencheekroun, R., Millar, H., Whittington, E., Bradley, L., Elizabeth, M., Hamilton, C., Howard, K., Poingdestre, E., & Walker, K. (2024). Participation for protection: New perspectives on the value of young people's involvement in research addressing sexual violence.

Team F - Dimopolous, G., Horley, K., Anderson, T., & Liam. (2024). Children's voices for change: Co-researching with children and young people as family violence experts by experience.

Team G - Mreiwed, H., Wright, L. H. V., & Butler, K. (2024). Deepening our understanding: Collaboration through online peer-to-peer participatory action research with children.

Team H - Kilgour, G., Lu, A., Kozelj, N., Tracy, J., Hickey, L., Granlund, M., Shields, N., Morgan, P., Drake, G., Cleary, S., Johnston, L., & Imms, C. (2024). Participating together in CP-ACHIEVE: Experiences, opportunities and reflections from a collaborative research team of people with lived experience of cerebral palsy and health care professionals.

Team I - Hogarth, H., Wonderboy, Fairy, Miss Daisy, Tinkerbelle, Zak, Fatima, Donut, and Stickman. (2024). Play tales: Co-creating stories of childhood nature play in an urban forest school.

Team J - García González, M., Saona, I., Arrigiada, A., & Saintard, M. (2024). When a children's literary jury imagines other children as potential readers: A case of collaborative research.

Team K - DiGiacomo, D. K., & Ritchie, K. R. (2024). The power should be balanced: Central dimensions of healthy intergenerational partnerships.

### **Declaration of conflicting interests**

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **Funding**

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **References**

- Back L (2007) *The Art of Listening*. London Bloomsbury.
- Canosa A, Graham A and Wilson E (2018) Reflexivity and ethical mindfulness in participatory research with children: what does it really look like? *Childhood* 25(3): 400–415.
- Crook DJ (2021) Children changing spaces, changing schools. *Children & Society* 35(3): 445–460.

- Finch W, Martin K, Crook DJ, et al. (2003) Adventures in youth-led research with disabled young people in the UK and Japan. In Percy-Smith B, Thomas NP, O’Kane C, et al. (Eds) *A new handbook of children and young people’s participation: conversations for transformational change*. Routledge: London.
- Franks M (2011) Pockets of participation: revisiting child-centred participation research. *Children & Society* 25(1): 15–25.
- hooks b. (1989) *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black*. Routledge: London.
- Horgan D (2017) Child participatory research methods: attempts to go ‘deeper’. *Childhood* 24(2): 245–259.
- Kennelly J, Larkins C and Roy A (2023) Doing youth participatory action research (YPAR) with Bourdieu: an invitation to reflexive (participatory) sociology. *The Sociological Review* 72(3): 493–510.
- Kiili J and Larkins C (2018) Invited to labour or participate: intra-and inter-generational distinctions and the role of capital in children’s invited participation. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education* 39(3): 408–421.
- Kraftl P (2020) Childhood studies, after childhood. In: *After Childhood*. Routledge, 20–34.
- Kraftl P, Lynch I, Jarman P, et al. (2021) So you’re literally taking the piss?! Critically analysing and accounting for ethics (and risk) in interdisciplinary research on children and plastics, pp. 1–16.
- Nowland R, Robertson L, Farrelly N, et al. (2021) Collaborative research methods and best practice with children and young people: protocol for a mixed-method review of the health and social sciences literature. *BMJ Open* 12(10).
- Rosen R (2021) Participatory research in and against time. *Qualitative Research* 0(0): 1–17.
- Roy A (2016) Learning on the move: exploring work with vulnerable young men through the lens of movement. *Applied Mobilities* 1(2): 207–218.
- Roy A, Kennelly J, Rowley H, et al. (2020) A critical discussion of the use of film in participatory research projects with homeless young people: an analysis based on case examples from England and Canada. *Qualitative Research* 21(6): 957–974.
- Spyrou S (2017) Time to decenter childhood? *Childhood* 24(4): 433–437.
- Wright LHV, Tisdall K and Moore N (2021) Taking emotions seriously: fun and pride in participatory research. *Emotion, Space and Society* 41: 100836.

Victor Agbontean, Thomas Greeney, Cath Larkins, Beate Lezdkalne, Alastair (Ali) Roy,  
Daniel Sheehan and Evie Smith  
The Centre for Children and Young People’s Participation, University of Central  
Lancashire, UK