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**Keynote Speakers:** Kim Kullman and Rosie Flewitt

**Guest Professionals:** Mikel Elzaudria and Emilio Ferreiro
Introduction

This Summer School was organized under the DigiLitEY Cost Action (http://digilitey.eu/) and, continuing the work of the first summer school celebrated in 2016, focused on exploring the place of collaborative and participatory methodologies in the study of the digital literacies and multimodal practices of young children. The 2017 Summer School took place between 11-13th June 2017 in La Cristalera (www.lacristalera.com) a residential research facility run by the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM) in the mountain outskirts of Madrid and was co-organized by Spanish members of the COST Action and the UAM research group "Infancia Contemporanea" (www.infaniacontemporanea.com).

The 2017 DigiLitEY training event was aimed at postgraduate students and emergent researchers who are interested in understanding children’s digital practices through participatory/qualitative/ethnographic research and hoped to help participants develop further their understanding of how to design/carry out feasible and ethically-grounded research with young children around their digital literacies, practices and experiences. The Summer School also was an opportunity for the COST Action, particularly in connection to the interests of WG5 (focused on research methods and ethics) to take stock of emergent methodological and ethical concerns among researchers and professionals working with young children and digital technologies. The organization of the summer school in a residential facility allowed for many moments of informal discussion among all participants and we hope was a first step in an emergent network among a heterogeneous group of early career researchers in Europe.

The summer school placed special emphasis on hands-on and interactive sessions (which we call "Workshops") around particular research themes. The event was structured around three workshops in which trainees had to take a leading role in developing and presenting ideas and solutions to the problems posed by the workshop coordinators. Our work format fostered peer-collaboration, oral and visual thinking as key tools for the generation of collective knowledge. The summer school included two keynote talks which helped frame the workshops, given by Kim Kullman (The Open University) and Rosie Flewitt (Institute of Education, UCL), a roundtable session with professionals and practitioners working on digital media and childhood, an interactive role-playing activity and a field-visit to MediaLab Prado in downtown Madrid. In addition, the summer school materials and conversations were expanded via digital media through an on-line course course created by the summer school organizers in the on-line learning platform Perusall, a Facebook group created by trainees, a Twitter timeline around the hashtag #digiliteyst2017 and collaborative documents created by participants in the summer school. This first report is a summary of the development of the three workshops collaboratively written by the
sixteen trainees who completed the summer school and the four trainers in charge of the design and coordination of the workshops.

**Workshop 1: Concepts and Issues in Collaborative / Participatory Research**

Workshop 1 was linked to the keynote talk by Kim Kullman given earlier in the day. Kullman's talk, titled “Experimenting with the affective geographies of children and young people”, discussed central issues around experimental collaborative research with children and the role digital technologies and media might play in research projects framed as experimental collaborations. The subsequent workshop was designed to facilitate a fuller engagement with these key concepts and theoretical issues in collaborative and participatory research with children. After an icebreaking/reflective activity, the core of the workshop was divided into two activities. First, participants were asked to individually identify 3-4 concepts connected to collaborative research with children that are important in their own research projects or professional experiences, write them on a “sticky note” and post them on a wall, arranging them in such a way that similar concepts could be connected to each other (i.e. manually generating a simplified a “word cloud”). Second, participants were divided into small groups and each group was asked to use at least 5 concepts from the wall to assemble a visual representation to the question: what elements are essential for designing collaborative research with children? Simultaneously, one participant observant was designated per group assigned with the task of documenting collaborative processes within this small group. The workshop concluded with a presentation of the visual summary by each group and the report from the designated observer in each group about how they saw the process of collaboration in each group.

The photographs in Figure 1 illustrate the concepts generated in the group and their disposition on the wall. Below these images we have the artifacts generated by each small working group and an explanation of the rationale behind the design of the visual representation.

**Figure 1: Generating a cloud of key concepts in collaborative research**

(Illustration)
Group 1: ‘Many Bakers do not Spoil the Cake’ (Members: Susan, Heidi and Kirsten)

We used the metaphor of baking to create a visual representation of collaborative and participatory research with children. Like bakers who work together on the perfect recipe, researchers and participants or co-researchers should be seen as partners in the research process. Since there is no “standard recipe” for collaborative and participatory research, the research partners must develop a specific solution for their particular project. This emphasizes the emergent character of this research approach, which relies in the co-creation of knowledge.

Using some concepts generated through the “post-it activity”, we discussed various ‘ingredients’ for collaborative and participatory research with children: AGENCY, EMPOWERMENT, RIGHTS and RESPECT. We think that all of these are important aspects when it comes to the participatory research process. Other ingredients may be added depending on the specific project, but these are essential elements in every piece of participatory research.

During the baking process, the various ingredients TRANSFORM into different results. Sometimes the cake gets burned or does not taste right and you have to start over and change your recipe. But sometimes the result succeeds and you get a diverse mix of interesting and multifaceted findings. Finally, we think that in the case of collaborative and participatory research with children, many bakers do not spoil the cake but are an important precondition for a successful project.
Group 2: ‘Awareness, Agency and Impact’ (Members: Raluca, Borja and Carla)

In this poster, we tried to offer a visual representation of three of the concepts that we considered pillars in designing and implementing participatory research: **Awareness**, **Agency** and **Impact**. We associated each concept with one specific phase in conducting a participatory study.

We associated **Awareness** with phase 1 of defining the problem and key aspects to be studied, of elaborating the hypothesis. We consider awareness the key element in participatory research, the aspect that makes the difference between subjects and participants. In order to assure participants’ awareness, the researcher must make sure that all his/her actions are characterized by **transparency**, making sure that the participants take **control** of certain steps in the research, showing **reflectiveness** while working together, offering suggestions for improvement through **negotiation**.

**Agency** is related to phase 2 of a study – the design, the steps to be taken in studying/solving the problem, in confirming the hypothesis. Agency refers to the participants’ **rights** expressed by their **voices** that must be heard and taken into consideration for each **action** as a specificity of the participatory research.

**Impact** refers to the final phase of the study – the assessment of the results that lead to confirming/invalidating the hypothesis. Sometimes a neglected aspect in the design of a study, the impact aims at emphasizing the
importance of the findings for the community, offering a sense of belonging based on the transformation generated by participatory research.

The process is recursive, as we illustrated in this poster by the bottom arrow. New transformations lead to new problems to be aware of and to be solved in a new cycle of AWARENESS, AGENCY and IMPACT.

Group 3: ‘Collaborative Research with Children as an Interconnected Root-Like System’ (Members: Kate, Teresa and Ana)

In this activity we consolidated our thinking about collaborative and participatory research by creating a poster visualizing key concepts. Revisiting the words generated through the post-it activity, we grouped these concepts into four central aspects to research: ATTITUDES, RELATIONSHIPS, METHODS and RESEARCHER ROLE, framed by ethics. These aspects highlighted the need for sound theories and values underpinning collaborative and participatory research, the meaningful partnerships needed with participants/co-researchers, the need for apt methods to give attention to multiple ‘voices’, and the need to reflect carefully on our own role as researchers.

Our discussions emphasized how participatory and collaborative research can reshape power relations and recognize agency, contrasting typical hierarchical approaches. We felt it was important to represent our concepts without a sense of hierarchy and were drawn to a more distributed, connected ‘rhizomatic’ layout (drawing on the work of Deleuze and Guattari, 1980,
mentioned in Kim Kullman’s lecture earlier that day). We therefore attempted to depict the concepts as an interconnected root-like system which becomes the fertile ground for change, transformation and empowerment, leading to impact.

Group 4: ‘Handshake as a Metaphor for an Equal Relationship in Collaborative Research with Children’ (Members: Paulina, Lorleen and Misa)

Research in which the participants are children need to be implemented with a particular regard due to the sensitivity of those young people and at the same time with respect to their autonomy. Research conducted amongst children is a challenge for researchers, requiring both methodological and ethical standards to be set and met. There is a strong power imbalance between the parties. The child is always in relation to the researcher as a weaker subject, due to physical weakness, less experience, knowledge and competencies. The imbalance aggravates the cultural conditioning that commands the child to obey the elderly and the “duty” to answer the questions (Morrow, Richards, 1996). Researchers should try to minimize the inequity between adults and children throughout the whole research process, by attempting to encourage young respondents to express their own opinions and share their views (Kunch, 2002; Cousin, Milner, 2007). To achieve this, children should choose their way of expression or at least not be influenced to express in particular ways that can restrict their communication. For this reason, during the discussions on collaboration and participation in research, we have chosen 5 different research concepts, which we think are the general principles of the research. These are: RELATIONSHIPS, VOICE, RESPECT, AWARENESS and ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER. We have
decided to depict all those concepts with a single drawing, which is an illustration of holding hands. It emphasizes that the most important thing is to treat the children participating in collaborative research in a way that respects their subjectivities. Those hands show that everyone has the right to express his or her opinion and ideas. The handshake is a metaphor for the relationship in collaborative research - an equal partnership where the researcher acknowledges the role of the participant/collaborator with awareness, respect and the aim of giving them a voice.

The handshake is represented here on a Polaroid picture to indicate that like a photo, this relationship needs to develop. The blank space beneath the photo indicates the importance for the researcher to reflect on this relationship. In addition, they symbolize the power of all participants. Only through such an approach that treats all participants justly and equally, the research will be a source of knowledge for us – researchers.

Group 5: ‘Yin-Yang as a Metaphor for the Complementarity, Simultaneity and Flow of Participation Rights and Responsibilities in Collaborative Research (Members: Aline, Balázs and Merel)
The Yin-Yang of collaborative research represents the complementarity, simultaneity and flow of participation rights and responsibilities that happen in a genuine collaborative research. This complementarity allows that both researchers and participants be empowered throughout the process. Agency is the capacity of an actor to act within a given environment, this concept is a central aspect for (to) both researcher and participants and is negotiated throughout the research process. On the side of the researcher, he or she has the responsibility of transparency and clear communication. On the side of the participants, they have right to privacy. Both however, are complex and continuous processes that depend on both the researcher and the participants to be achieved. Empowerment is also a central aspect of collaborative research as it has to be equally applicable for the participants and for the researcher as well. It should mean equal rights and possibilities and it may guarantee positive outcomes and experiences for both sides. Underlying this graphic representation is the notion of recursivity and circularity. The transformation occurs together, in true collaborative research there will be an impact on both the researcher and the participant. Therefore, we choose the Yin-Yang symbol to represent this process.

**Workshop 2: Spatialities - Mobilities - Research Design**

While the first workshop focused on exploring theories and concepts, the purpose of the second workshop was to explore different research designs for investigating the digital practices of young children and to actually have trainees attempt to propose a possible design for a particular research issue. The workshop drew from the reading materials and the keynote lecture by Rosie Flewitt titled “Whose voice is it?: Conducting participatory research with children” in which she discussed several examples and challenges in the implementation of participatory research with children. Workshop 2 was structured in two parts, with an additional third part to be completed after the session. First, trainees were divided into small groups and commissioned to discuss and design a research proposal in response to a specific research problem/issue/case. Second, each group was asked to present their proposal and provide feedback on another proposal. Third, after the workshop, each group was asked to prepare a “reaction” to the feedback they received to their proposal. Here we provide: (a) the text for each research problem the groups had to address; (b) the visualization of the research proposal and a brief explanation of the proposal as redacted by each group.
Case 1: ‘iPads for Learning and Teaching’

Research request

Dear researchers,

A local company, TechnoEd&Learn, with whom the Local Authority in Madrid has been working closely over the last 18 months, has donated free iPads for the entire Year 7 in one state school in Madrid, for the next three years. The offer is made subject to a number of conditions:

1. That the iPads be used across the curriculum by all subject teachers.
2. That students will be allowed to take the iPads home each day and to keep the iPad as their property.
3. Teachers and students will collaboratively write down the “norms of use” of the iPads in the school.
4. That teachers will use the applications placed on the iPad by TechnoEd&Learn. These applications will relate to the teaching of spelling and basic Maths in a fun and clear way.
5. That the school provide to the local authority and to TechnoEd&Learn an explanation of how the iPads will be introduced to the School and embedded into the curriculum.
6. That the school will report the local authority and to TechnoEd&Learn at the end of each academic year an evaluation of how the iPads have been used and how they have enhanced learning and teaching. This report should emphasize the student’s viewpoint of learning with iPad devices.

Your task consists of designing a study for gathering data during the following three years. I encourage you to go beyond standard research designs and experiment with new approaches, seeking to make children’s insights central in the research. This data will be the basis of the annual report that will be send to the local company funding the project (condition 5). Specific data about the student’s experiences using iPads for learning in a range of courses should be carefully gathered.

---

1 This project builds on ideas drawn from pedagogical approaches and activities of the ‘Children and Digital Cultures’ module at The University of Sheffield 2014.
Group 1: Proposal (Members: Carla, Kate, Paulina and Susan)

The group was guided in the preparation of this proposal by Carla’s experience in a similar project. Interestingly, this earlier research found that, while children’s formal learning outcomes were unaffected by the introduction of iPads to school/home environments, there were significant positive changes in terms of children’s ‘soft skills’ in their daily lives such as motivation, media skills and digital communication. One difficulty encountered in the research, however, was that teachers were somewhat slow to change their practices. This research group proposed the following four steps to follow:

**Phase 1:** The researchers propose spending time with the research participants to build relationships using games and activities. Also during this phase, observations of existing digital practices among children and teachers would be carried out. Working collaboratively, “norms of use” for the iPads in the school will be established, to be applied for the duration of the research project. This would be achieved by the use of assembly or focus group techniques.

**Phase 2:** Ipads will be introduced, and focus will move to children’s and teachers’ daily uses of the devices.

(i) Children will be requested to keep a daily ‘digital scrapbook’ of all activities engaged in with the Ipad - playing, learning or other. Using text, photos, emoticons etc; they will record what they did and why, commenting on what they enjoyed most, and what they felt at the time.

(ii) School uses of the Ipad will be researched through observation and annotation of practices. Data on the use of the devices in learning will be recorded in the form of annotations, photos and videos.

(iii) Teachers will be interviewed on how the Ipad/ apps contribute to teaching practices

**Phase 3:** The researchers plan to engage children in designing user interfaces using drawings, stickers, and mind maps, etc.

**Phase 4:** In the final phase, children will be supported to pitch to the design company. Researchers will ask some groups of children to present new app ideas that they came up with in the phase 3. Moreover, the researchers will write a report focusing on students’ experiences using iPads for learning. In addition, they will give feedback on existing apps
Case 2: ‘Researching Video Games Together’

Research Request

The relevant educational authorities of your region or municipality and a well-known school for its programs with Deaf children and bilingual sign language education have reached an agreement to explore the pedagogical value of video-games and video-gaming with children between 5-8 years of age (i.e. the beginning of primary education and the introduction to formal literacy instruction). They commission a research project to provide evidence in their decision making and work oriented to redesign their curriculum. The project is explicitly requested to follow two principles: (1) Pay particular attention to the inclusion of Deaf children - and, in extension, to other vulnerable populations; (2) Draw from commercial/available video-games, rather than video-games and applications specifically designed for educational purposes and educational settings. This school-educational authority coalition will use the research to rethink educational practices and has made arrangements with videogame designers and industry to, at the very least, share findings and recommendations related to accessibility in the design of video-games. Your research report/output is expected to provide specific recommendations in both of these areas.

Group 2: Proposal (Members: Kirsten, Heidi, Borja and Rocío)

We developed a highly collaborative research approach with a group of 7-8 year-old pupils who would take the role of co-researchers. We started the process with an assembly meeting in which different video games are introduced to the children. In addition, the pupils can present their favorite games to the group. In a democratic vote the games which will be examined during the project are selected. In the next step, various research methods to review the video games are presented to the children. Again, we use a joint discussion approach to choose the research methods that will be used. Then, together with the children, we will design a workshop in the classroom setting (involving teachers and children’s families) to review the different video games. During the workshop, important game features should be recorded by filming and observing. Drawing on the results of this workshop, researchers and co-researchers will finally develop recommendations regarding the use of video games in the pre-primary and primary education of Deaf children.
Case 3: ‘Navigation Application (NApp)’

Research Request

A digital technology and media company has drawn its attention to current research on children's mobilities and children's experiences in the city and their environments during their daily routes. The company is aware that some children's daily movements between home, school, after-school activities, etc. might happen inside vehicles, by foot, cycling or public transport (and combinations of these means of transportation).

This company is interested in exploring the role mobile apps could have in enhancing children's experiences during their daily movements and plans to fund research that would help the company in the successful design of this(these) app(s). Your team is in charge of implementing this research project with the generic task of exploring the potential feasibility of a digital app closely related to children's day-to-day mobilities and the areas that connect to the interests of children. In addition, the study team is asked to carefully scope in the project: (1) the impact of different itineraries and means of transportation; (2) how socio-economic, cultural and associated environmental conditions might affect the feasibility or design of the digital app/device.

Group 3: Proposal (Members: Ana, Karmele, Merel, Misa and Raluca)

Sample: The research project NApp will include participants aged 10–14 years from 5 countries (Japan, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania and Spain) belonging to two main socio-economic and cultural groups – big cities and rural areas - including high-income and low-income backgrounds. Children with special needs will be part of the study group as well (either from special schools or integrated in mainstream schools).

Methodology: The study will take the shape of participatory research so the voices of the children will be constantly heard and considered through methods such as: cartography (where children will be assisted in designing their regular routes. They will document the design of the maps with photos, videos, drawings etc.); questionnaires (aimed at identifying the daily itineraries but also details regarding their companions/apps/habits etc. and also asking how they would like to get
involved in designing a new app); focus groups (for collecting ideas regarding their desires and needs regarding a new app).

**Ethics:** During all the phases of the research we will follow the European and national standards for ethics. All the phases of the project will be implemented with the consent of the participants who will have the right to drop out at any time.

**Assessment:** The outputs of the project will consist of country reports regarding the specific national needs and routes of the children involved in the project. The reports will be used by the company to design the most appropriate product based on the findings of the study. All country reports will allow comparative/contrastive analysis to be shared/published.

**Case 4: ‘Europe 0-3 Year Olds - Digital Routines’**

**Research Request**

Your research network has been approached by the European Commission to study the digital routines of young children aged between 0 and 3 across European countries. Research focusing on the benefits and challenges associated with children’s use of the Internet has, so far, mainly targeted 9-16 years old (see, for example, the EU Kids Online research carried out since 2006) and beginning to include 3-7 years old (for instance, Chaurdron, 2015). While research shows that even younger children below 3 years old are going online, there is scarce research in the area.

The research should look into the role that the digital technologies play in their daily lives focusing on: 1) children’s uses: the devices and the applications they use, when, how, where and with whom they use them; 2) children’s preferences: which devices and applications they prefer and why they prefer them, and if these are different from the parents’ preferences for children’s uses of digital technologies; and 3) children’s perceptions of risks and benefits of technologies. It should analyze if there are any differences in pattern among different groups (by country, gender, socioeconomic status, etc.).
Group 4: Proposal (Members: Lorleen, Teresa, Aline and Balázs)

To investigate the digital routines of 0-3 year-olds across Europe we have designed a three-year long mixed methods study that would start with a comparative survey across countries. The survey would involve 1000 families in each country and would be addressed to parents. It would partially address the first objective of the research, of identifying children’s uses according to the parent’s perspectives and it would give us information about the different groups across countries, e.g., socioeconomic status, gender, family composition, etc. The survey would provide general information about perceptions, uses and patterns, which would be examined in depth in the qualitative stage.

The qualitative component would involve 20 families in each country, selected according to the general categories and behaviors identified in the surveys. It would involve interviews and observations with parents and children. This process would be collaborative, but because of the young age of the children, the main collaborators in the research would be the parents and possibly siblings, who would be given video equipment to register and focus on children’s routines, avoiding long and invasive observations in the families’ homes. To help the research process and to make the clarification easier a “co-researcher diary” could be given for the family members.

One of the anticipated issues with this method is that parents might have a different perspective of what constitutes digital use. For instance, TV and electronic toys could be overlooked, therefore the initial interview would need to clarify the research objectives and what do we mean by ‘digital technologies’. Due to the young age of the children and the fact that many participants are not yet able to speak, visual and creative methods would also be used to engage children and collect information about their preferences and perceptions and understanding of risks and benefits. To be able to identify routines, 2 or 3 visits for each family would be necessary, covering at least one day in the week and another in the weekend, when the routines may be different. In addition, a software to track app usage in the families touch screen devices would be employed, providing information about which apps are being used and for how long. One of the limitations of this method is that it cannot always determine whether the use is being made by the child or the adult. Even in the case of apps that are typically for children this information might not be precise if the family has more than one child and/or if the device is shared by different family members. At the same time a special application could be developed for this specific research situation which could distinguish the different members of the family and could track usage statistics by profiles. The qualitative methods would be fundamental to understand children’s preferences and
perceptions of risks and benefits - the second and third tasks that the research was asked to investigate -, as they require the direct involvement of children. Access to participants for both stages of the research would involve recruiting parents at hospitals and maternities, pediatricians, courses for parents to be, and nurseries.

Workshop 3: Ethical Issues and Challenges

The purpose of the third Workshop was to explore ethical questions and to take stock of emergent ethical concerns among researchers and professionals working with young children and digital technologies. The workshop was preceded by “brown bag lunch” with local professionals in which Mikel Elzaurdia (Independent Researcher) talked about critical pedagogies, digital media and after-school programs for children and youth and Emilio Ferreiro (Fundación CNSE) talked about work around digital media and applications designed for Deaf children and their families. Work for this workshop began before the summer training via e-mail communications. Two weeks before the event trainees were sent an email message with the following request: We ask that each of you attempts to outline key ethical issues in relation to research/practice around young children and digital media in each of your national contexts. We are not asking that you conduct a systematic review of issues, simply that you identify what, drawing on your experience and thoughts, engagement with national media, conversations with peers/parents/children, etc. (a) 2-3 issues that have received attention and are discussed in your national context (and how they are framed), (b) 2-3 issues that you think are important and are NOT receiving attention.

This request helped begin the discussion in the workshop and the organization of activities around two main parts. In the first part, participants were asked to come up with, as a whole group, a few principles that are fundamental in conducting research on the digital literacies and multimodal practices of young children. As a result, they agreed on the principles of consent, data management, privacy and anonymity, and research & empowerment as the fundamental principles in ethical discussions (Figure 2 below). In the second part of the workshop, trainees were divided into smaller groups and asked to think about how to communicate these four principles to different stakeholders: children, families and practitioners. Each group had to discuss main questions around how the principles can be translated for different audiences and the particular devices/artifacts that will assist in this communication. Here we present the proposal of each working group and their rationale for the design of the particular artifact.
Group 1: Presenting Ethical Principles to Children through Video (Members: Lorleen, Kirsten, Alie, Teresa, Paulina and Susan)

We focused on children aged 4-5 years old as a target audience to explain these ethical principles. We agreed that the best way to present ethical issues to this age group would be through a video created specifically for this purpose (similar to the video from Aline’s colleague explaining research to children, which for us was inspirational: https://fersacambridge.wordpress.com/2017/02/10/making-research-accessible-animation/).

Taking this video as a starting point we identified some aspects in which it could be improved for our purpose:

The aim of the video is to explain what research is in a child-friendly and engaging manner, possibly also explaining the benefits of participation through the voices of other children who have previously participated in research. It should be positive, funny, with both words and
images, and would serve also as an icebreaker. In addition, the video ought to be accessible, for example, including sign language to make it accessible to Deaf children.

The timeline indicates that although the main way to explain this will be through a video shown to children, it will be preceded and followed by a conversation/discussion about these principles with the child/children. Together with the video, this can help stimulate critical thinking and the child becomes an active in the process of giving assent as they can indicate by means of the stickers whether they agree/disagree or whether they have further questions they would like to clarify.

**Group 2: The Model to Present Ethical Principles to Families (Members: Carla, Heidi, Misa, Raluca, Borja and Balázs)**

When carrying out participatory, collaborative research, different ethical issues can appear. Therefore, a well-structured plan and clear guidelines must be applied for each level of the participants. Our guidelines were written for families and tried to cover as many fields of a complex research process as possible. The model consists of two main steps. The first step is about presenting information for the participant families while the second step is about sharing the outcomes. In the background, our theoretical consideration was to share as much information as necessary in a positive way with positive communication (e.g. safety measures instead of risks). Meeting the families is also a must which can be accomplished individually or in groups. Depending on the number of participants, meeting in person or online solutions can also be effective. During the meeting, researchers can assure the families that the project follows ethical guidelines of the university and the European standards for data protection. During the whole process the families have the opportunity to ask questions to the researchers, and also have the possibility to stop or drop out. After sharing and having them understand the structure of the research written or oral consent will be sought by the participants and will be carefully stored.

In the second step of the dissemination of the research, we plan to share the outcomes and results in various manners; different guidelines, workshops, lectures and webinars can be made and organized. Different types of financial compensations can also raise the number and the involvement of the participants.
Group 3: Practitioners’ Bill of Research Rights (Members: Merel, Ana, Kate and Rocio)

We elaborated on a way to communicate guidelines for practitioners in the form of a Bill of Rights. We believe that this is a delicate matter that needs special attention within a research project. We felt that all parties within a collaborative or participatory research should be well informed about their rights and this should be seen as an ongoing process. We thought of practitioners as gatekeepers (to children or to families), as participants, or in the form of researcher-participant.

The rights of the practitioners in the research process have to be taken into account as much as the rights of the participants, and that may not always be easy. The Bill of Rights of the Practitioner can help them become aware of their own rights, while understanding the whole process.

In any of the roles mentioned above, practitioners should be aware of the terms of the research and have the power to decide to be involved or involve children under their responsibility, and have a voice in deciding how the research process is carried out. The process is flexible and includes the right to: 1) participate in the research design; 2) to know for what purpose the research is being conducted; 3) to know what kinds of data are being collected, 4) to know how the data will be stored; 5) to know how the data will be used, 6) to ask questions at any point about the research, and; 7) to opt out of the research at any time, without reason.

This bill could be disseminated across countries as a guideline, as different countries have different conditions for ethics. In the field, this could take the form of letters, or better, dialogue sessions so that the practitioners and the participants can talk to reconcile different views on privacy and participate in the construction of the consent.