

Researching Children's Experience

Approaches and Methods



Edited by
Sheila Greene & Diane Hogan



Researching Children's Experience

Researching Children's Experience

Methods and Approaches

Edited by
Sheila Greene and Diane Hogan

 **SAGE Publications**
London • Thousand Oaks • New Delhi

Editorial Arrangement © Sheila Greene and
Diane Hogan 2005

Chapter 1 © Sheila Greene and
Malcolm Hill 2005

Chapter 2 © Diane Hogan 2005

Chapter 3 © Pia Christensen and
Alan Prout 2005

Chapter 4 © Malcolm Hill 2005

Chapter 5 © Judy Dunn 2005

Chapter 6 © Jonathan Tudge and
Diane Hogan 2005

Chapter 7 © Ruth Emond 2005

Chapter 8 © Helen Westcott and Karen
Littleton 2005

Chapter 9 © Annie G. Rogers 2005

Chapter 10 © Pam Alldred and
Erica Burman 2005

Chapter 11 © Susan Engel 2005

Chapter 12 © Tom Danaher and
Marc Briod 2005

Chapter 13 © Eilis Hennessy and Caroline
Heary 2005

Chapter 14 © Angela Veale 2005

First published 2005

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form, or by any means, only with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.



SAGE Publications Ltd
1 Oliver's Yard
55 City Road
London EC1Y 1SP

SAGE Publications Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd
B-42, Panchsheel Enclave
Post Box 4109
New Delhi 110 017

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data

A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

ISBN 0-7619-7102-5
ISBN 0-7619-7103-3 (pbk)

Library of Congress Control Number available

Typeset by C&M Digitals (P) Ltd., Chennai, India
Printed in Great Britain by Cromwell Press Ltd, Trowbridge, Wiltshire

Contents

Notes on Contributors	vii
Preface	xi
Acknowledgements	xiv
 Part One: Conceptual, methodological and ethical issues in researching children's experience	 1
1 Researching children's experience: methods and methodological issues <i>Sheila Greene and Malcolm Hill</i>	1
2 Researching 'the child' in developmental psychology <i>Diane Hogan</i>	22
3 Anthropological and sociological perspectives on the study of children <i>Pia Christensen and Alan Prout</i>	42
4 Ethical considerations in researching children's experiences <i>Malcolm Hill</i>	61
 Part Two: Methods for conducting research with children	 87
5 Naturalistic observations of children and their families <i>Judy Dunn</i>	87
6 An ecological approach to observations of children's everyday lives <i>Jonathan Tudge and Diane Hogan</i>	102
7 Ethnographic research methods with children and young people <i>Ruth Emond</i>	123

Part Three: The generation and analysis of text	141
8 Exploring meaning in interviews with children <i>Helen L. Westcott and Karen S. Littleton</i>	141
9 Interviewing children using an interpretive poetics <i>Annie G. Rogers</i>	158
10 Analysing children's accounts using discourse analysis <i>Pam Alldred and Erica Burman</i>	175
11 Narrative analysis of children's experience <i>Susan Engel</i>	199
12 Phenomenological approaches to research with children <i>Tom Danaher and Marc Briod</i>	217
13 Exploring children's views through focus groups <i>Eilis Hennessy and Caroline Heary</i>	236
14 Creative methodologies in participatory research with children <i>Angela Veale</i>	253
Index	273

Notes on Contributors

Dr Pam Alldred lectures in Childhood Studies in the School of Education at the University of Greenwich, UK. She was a member of the feminist research groups that produced *Ethics in qualitative research* (M. Mauthner, M. Birch, J. Jessop & T. Miller (Eds.), 2002, Sage) and *Feminist dilemmas in qualitative research: public knowledge, private lives* (J. Ribbens and R. Edwards (Eds.), 1998, Sage). Before that, she was part of the collectives that produced *Challenging women: psychology's exclusions, feminist possibilities* (E. Burman, P. Alldred, C. Bewley, B. Goldberg, C. Heenan, D. Marks, J. Marshall, K. Taylor, R. Ullah & S. Warner, 1996, Open University Press) and *Psychology, discourse, practice: from regulation to resistance* (E. Burman, G. Aitken, P. Alldred, R. Attwood, T. Billington, B. Goldberg, A.J. Gordo Lopez, C. Heenan, D. Marks, S. Warner, 1996, Taylor and Francis). Besides methodology, she also writes about young people's views of sex education, education policy and political activism.

Dr Marc Briod is Associate Professor of Education and Philosophy in the Department of Human Development and Child Studies at Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan, USA. His research and publications include a phenomenological approach to child development, a study of children's emerging sense of time and the clock, and an investigation of children's developing awareness of a future. His current work focuses on the essential role played by imagination for sense-making during childhood and throughout life. He is especially interested in conceptions of imagination that view it as the cognitive taproot for a wide range of thinking, meaning, and learning.

Erica Burman is Professor of Psychology and Women's Studies in the Department of Psychology and Speech Pathology at Manchester Metropolitan University, UK, where she is currently convenor of the Women's Studies Research Centre and co-director of the Discourse Unit. She has written extensively about the gendering of childhood, the critiques of developmental psychology and the projection of problematic North-South relations onto global discourses of development, as well as about the critical potential of discourse analysis. More recently she has written about power relations and difference in psychotherapy, and minoritization and racialization in service provision.

Pia Christensen is Senior Researcher at the National Institute of Public Health, Copenhagen, Denmark. She has published widely on children and health, schooling, the family, methods and research ethics, and children's time and space. Her publications include *Research with Children*, co-edited with A. James (Falmer Press, 2000) and *Children in the City*, co-edited with M. O'Brien (RoutledgeFalmer, 2002).

Tom Danaher, MA, is a therapist and psychological assessor for marginalized teenagers in shelters in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA. He has been researching these teenagers' sense of justice and injustice, which he sees as fundamental to their experience of anger/rage and their abuse of drugs. His studies in phenomenological method began in Pittsburgh at Duquesne University – one of the original centres for Existential-Phenomenology in the USA. He is currently working on his doctoral dissertation at Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center, San Francisco, California.

Judy Dunn is MRC Research Professor at the Institute of Psychiatry in London. A developmental psychologist, she has conducted extensive longitudinal research on children's close relationships, including siblings and friends, non-shared experiences within the family, the development of social understanding, and, most recently, family transitions and the impact of family change. Among honours bestowed she has recently received the Award for Distinguished Scientific Contributions to Child Development from the Society for Research in Child Development. She is a fellow of the British Academy and the Academy of Medical Sciences. She has published sixteen books and numerous papers.

Dr Ruth Emond is a social work practitioner and academic. She is employed by the Department of Applied Social Science at the University of Stirling, UK, where she teaches mainly on the social work undergraduate and post-graduate programme. She also works part time as a social worker in a therapeutic project with children and families who have experienced trauma. Ruth has a keen research interest in the experiences of children who have involvement in a social welfare system and in children's experiences of friendship.

Susan Engel is Senior Lecturer at Williams College, Department of Psychology, where she is also Director of the Program in Teaching. She is co-founder and educational advisor to an experimental school, Hayground, in Bridgehampton, New York. Her research interests include narrative development, autobiographical memory, and the development of imagination. She is also interested in school reform and new models of education. She is the author of *The stories children tell* (W.H. Freeman, 1995).

Sheila Greene is Associate Professor in the Psychology Department, Trinity College Dublin (TCD). She is a co-founder of the Centre for Gender and Women's Studies and the Children's Research Centre, both at TCD, and is currently the Director of the Children's Research Centre. Her research and

publications are mainly in developmental psychology, with a focus on social development and developmental theory, and she is the author of *The psychological development of girls and women: rethinking change in time*, recently published by Routledge.

Dr Caroline Heary is a lecturer in developmental psychology at the National University of Ireland, Galway. Her research interests lie in the delivery of child-centred health services, child-centred research methodology and psycho-social factors associated with health and illness. She is also involved in a collaborative research project with Eilis Hennessy on children's understanding of psychological problems. She has experience in both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies and has a particular interest in the value of focus group interviews for research with children and young people.

Dr Eilis Hennessy is a lecturer in developmental psychology in the Psychology Department in University College Dublin, Ireland. Her research interests include children's experiences of child care environments and how these have an impact on their development. In addition, she has recently been involved in studies relating to children's perceptions of mental health and their experiences of health services. She is interested in qualitative research methods that facilitate communication with children about their lives and experiences.

Professor Malcolm Hill is Director of the Glasgow Centre for the Child & Society, which was established in 1991. He has been Director of the Centre since 1996. He has a degree in Geography, a Diploma in Applied Social Studies and a PhD in Social Science. For the past twenty years he has been teaching and carrying out research, largely in relation to children and families. He has written and edited a number of books on children's services and children's lives.

Dr Diane Hogan is a lecturer in developmental psychology in the Department of Psychology, Trinity College Dublin, and a Senior Research Fellow of The Children's Research Centre, Trinity College. Her research interests are in the area of children's social development within families. She has published in the areas of sociocultural theories of child development, children's experiences of parental separation, the impact of parental drug use on children, and on methodological issues associated with conducting research on children's subjective experiences.

Dr Karen Littleton is a Senior Lecturer in Developmental Psychology in the Centre for Childhood, Development and Learning at The Open University, UK, and Visiting Professor at the University of Helsinki. She has researched children's collaborative learning, with special reference to new technologies and gender, and has published extensively in this area. Karen co-edited *Learning with computers* (Routledge, 1999) with Paul Light, and is the co-author, also with Paul Light, of *Social processes in children's learning* (Cambridge

University Press, 1999). From 1994–99 she was senior scientist in the European Science Foundation's 'Learning in Humans and Machines' programme.

Alan Prout is Professor of Sociology at the University of Stirling and was formerly Director of the Economic and Social Research Council's 'Children 5–16 Research Programme'. He is author of many works on contemporary childhood, including *Theorizing childhood* (Polity Press, 1998, with Alison James and Chris Jenks), *The body, childhood and society* (Macmillan, 2000) and *Hearing the voices of children: social policy for new century* (RoutledgeFalmer, 2003, with Christine Hallett). His latest book is *The future of childhood: towards the interdisciplinary study of children* (RoutledgeFalmer, 2004).

Annie G. Rogers, PhD, is a clinical psychologist, poet and painter. Formerly Associate Professor at Harvard University, her interests include qualitative research methods, girls' psychological development, child sexual abuse and Lacanian psychoanalysis. She has a private practice in Amherst, Massachusetts, USA. She is currently Assistant Professor of Clinical Psychology at Hampshire College, a research associate in Psychology at Trinity College Dublin, and a member of the Boston Psychoanalytic Circle of the Freudian School of Quebec.

Jonathan Tudge is a Professor of Human Development and Family Studies, at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, USA. He was raised and educated in England (Lancaster and Oxford) before moving to the USA for his PhD (Cornell). His main interests are in peer social interactions and the relations between children's development and culture, and he has co-edited, with Jaan Valsiner and Mike Shanahan, *Comparisons in human development* (1997, Cambridge University Press), and is currently writing *The cultural ecology of young children*, also to be published by Cambridge University Press.

Angela Veale, PhD, is lecturer in Applied Psychology at the National University of Ireland, Cork. Her research and publications focus on youth in adversity, in particular asylum seekers and unaccompanied minors in Ireland, and the reintegration of war affected children and psychosocial interventions in Rwanda, Uganda, Sudan and Ethiopia. Currently, she is researching and publishing on child soldiers, youth and political involvement in conflict and post-conflict contexts.

Dr Helen L. Westcott is Senior Lecturer in Psychology at The Open University, UK. Her particular research interests lie in investigative interviewing and the evidence of children, and more recently in children's eyewitness identifications. She has also researched widely on the abuse of disabled children, and children's responses to child protection investigations. Helen writes and presents on these topics nationally and internationally, and is closely involved in projects with practitioners in the child protection and criminal justice systems.

Preface

In this book we have two main objectives. The first is to examine the theoretical and ethical issues that arise in researching children's experience and the second is to provide examples of how researchers from a variety of social science perspectives have set about carrying out research into children's experience. Our intention is to advance thinking and debate on why researching children's experience is important and on how it should be done. This book focuses on theory and practice and we hope that the reader will find within it both food for thought and very practical assistance in conducting research in this area. In the first section of the book we explore the theoretical and ethical issues and tensions that arise in researching what is inevitably a complex and sensitive topic and in the second part a range of authors discuss their approaches to accessing children's experience, outlining what they do and how they address the challenges entailed in using their particular method. We want this book to be useful to researchers embarking on research in this area and to experienced researchers who wish to explore new methods.

As editors we started this project with a number of core principles in mind. The first is that there is strength in a multi-disciplinary approach. Children's lives benefit from being considered from multiple perspectives and there is no one theoretical or methodological perspective which deserves to be dominant. The social science disciplines – sociology, anthropology, education, social work, social policy and psychology – have much to learn from each other. Children's lives are complex and multi-faceted and require an analysis that is informed by knowledge of biological, psychological and social factors and their interactions. Different theoretical standpoints can build on each other or, at the very least, be open to being challenged by an alternative viewpoint.

Second, we are convinced that children are subject to historical and cultural influences that ensure that every child has an individual and unique experience of his or her childhood. Thus we were interested in approaches and methods of research that respected this individuality and diversity in children and childhoods. As a result, the methods described in this book are mainly, although not exclusively, qualitative since qualitative methods are suited to enquiry into children's unique and individual encounters with their worlds.

Third, we were interested in exploring and promoting those approaches that are premised on a view of children as human beings who share with

adults a comparable level of agency (likewise constrained) and the capacity to reflect on, and shape, their own experience.

Interest in accessing children's perspectives and views has been prompted in recent years by widespread acceptance and official endorsement of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of the Child, in itself a consequence of social movements which recognized and sought to vindicate children's rights. From this point of view it could be argued that we have an obligation to assist children to express their perspectives and views on matters of importance to them. We leave aside inevitably vexed questions about how this should be done and with what end. In this book we are not interested exclusively in methods of eliciting children's perspectives, views and opinions. Our primary focus is on children's experience, which is a factor in the formation of their opinions, but more than that, it is about the totality of their subjective engagement with the world.

From a scientific perspective also we have much to learn about children from children. By enquiring into children's experience we will come to know more about how they interpret and negotiate their worlds, material and discursive, past, present, and future. Knowledge about children includes knowledge about children's subjectivity and requires and deserves careful analysis and the use of appropriate methods. For example, we include in this book, observational studies on young children where the focus is on activity, but the intention is to infer what the activity means to the children concerned, not to assess levels or types of behaviour. Such an approach may be seen as problematic and indeed many of the issues arising in this arena are problematic and contested, and may well remain so.

We fully recognize the multiple and sometimes, but not always, compatible perspectives that exist in this field and thus, in this book, we have brought together authors from different disciplinary backgrounds and with different theoretical standpoints. What they share is an interest in developing research methods that can tell us more about how children experience their daily lives and make sense of their position in the world.

The editors of this book are both psychologists who freely admit to a frustration with the 'objective' stance of many of our colleagues in developmental psychology. Psychology's focus on the objective is seen in both its methodology and in its choice of subject matter. There is still little acceptance of the epistemological arguments that question our capacity to measure objectively our human subjects, and there is still a wariness of relying on children's views of their own lives and therefore of their experience. Children's individual experience is typically not valued as a focus of research since it is perceived as unreliable and idiosyncratic. In its urge to assess and measure the child, some mainstream developmental psychology has sought to homogenize the experience of children. (These issues are explored in more detail by Diane Hogan, and by Sheila Greene and Malcolm Hill in their chapters.) This characterization of developmental psychology is of course incomplete and to some extent a cartoon drawing. There is, in the mainstream, more recognition of diversity and on the margins, more critique of traditional epistemology and methodology. Research on children and childhood in recent years has been

strongly influenced by the emergence of the new sociology of childhood, as described by Pia Christensen and Alan Prout. More recently we have seen the emergence of childhood studies as an interdisciplinary field. While welcoming this coming together of disciplines, we would argue strongly for maintaining disciplinary diversity also. For example, while being very critical of some of the manifestations of our own discipline, we would both see it as essential to the study of children that we continue to address questions to do with psychological growth and change in time. We would therefore see a continuing place for developmental psychology in the consortium of disciplines with a shared interest in researching children and childhood.

In compiling the chapters for this book we were surprised again and again by how little explicit attention to method there is in published research on children or childhood. In journal articles, which are the main vehicle for publishing empirical research, much attention is given to describing the method, but very little attention is given to the rationale for using the method in the first place or to a critique of the method's strengths and weaknesses, including the practical and ethical problems arising when employing it. In the last (fifth, four volumes) edition of the *Handbook of Child Psychology*, we were struck by the relative neglect of attention to research methods. In looking for researchers who specialize in analysis of issues arising when using qualitative methods with children, we noted the huge expansion in the use of qualitative methods in research, but the lack of discussion about methodological issues in relation to children. We are encouraged, however, by the growth of interest in this area and note the publication of several texts in recent years that complement this one. We hope that this book will provide social science researchers with a broad conceptual framework for understanding and researching children's subjectivities and lived experiences, and equip them with a range of methods appropriate to the exploration and analysis of children's experience.

Sheila Greene and Diane Hogan
Editors

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our colleagues in the Psychology Department and in the Children's Research Centre in Trinity College Dublin for their support. In particular we would like to acknowledge the stimulation and encouragement offered by Robbie Gilligan at an early stage in our deliberations on this topic. We are grateful for the patience of our contributors and hope that they are as pleased as we are to see the book in print. Fionnuala Dillane helped us with considerable skill in the final formatting and editing of the manuscript. We are very grateful to Michael Carmichael and Fabienne Pedroletti and all the staff we have worked with at Sage who have been more than helpful.

Finally we thank our families: Martin Fellenz, Aine, Leah and Isabel Hogan Fellenz; and Paul, Kit and Helen O'Mahony.

Diane Hogan and Sheila Greene

Conceptual, Methodological and Ethical Issues in Researching Children's Experience

PART ONE

1

Researching Children's Experience: Methods and Methodological Issues

Sheila Greene and Malcolm Hill

Why Research Children's Experience?

As one looks from an historical perspective at the vast field of social scientific, empirical research already conducted on and with children, it is evident that the predominant emphasis has been on children as the objects of research rather than children as subjects, on child-related outcomes rather than child-related processes and on child variables rather than children as persons.

The chapters by Hogan, and by Christensen and Prout in this book (Chapters 2 and 3 respectively) outline the assumptions held by psychologists, sociologists and anthropologists about children that shaped the approach taken by these disciplines for much of the twentieth century. Both chapters also describe the shift in emphasis and ideology which has become known as 'the new social studies of childhood'. As Hogan outlines, similar critiques of the dominant perspective on child development research have become evident amongst psychologists, although mainstream developmental psychology tends to be somewhat more wedded to traditional epistemologies than appears to be the case amongst contemporary sociologists and anthropologists, or indeed, other disciplines like geography and history (Holloway & Valentine, 2000).

This chapter is written by two people with different disciplinary backgrounds – developmental and clinical psychology (Greene) and social work and social research (Hill). Despite this difference in background and perspective, we share an interest in conducting research that helps us to understand more about children's experience of their worlds. This is not an easy task: there are many questions and pitfalls that can trouble the researcher in this area.

The impetus to set out to understand and describe children's experience may reflect one or more of a range of different commitments as a researcher. First, it may reflect an interest in experience itself. According to William James, 'individual experience defines the scope of psychology' (1990 [1890]: 361). Yet very few psychologists these days would agree with James on the centrality of experience. In fact, the idea that individual experience is central to psychology has come under siege from many quarters. For example, it does not accord with the desire on the part of twentieth-century mainstream psychology to identify itself as a science, in the very traditional sense of that term.

From the sociological perspective, experience, as a term, has been one that is relegated to the realm of the psychological. It is a phenomenon that does not fit with the sociological emphasis on social forces and factors as the causes of human activity (Giddens, 1989). Susan Oyama (1993) points out that both sociology and anthropology fought for a long time to replace psychological determinism with sociocultural determinism – although it must be said that this has been modified by the recent emphasis on the part of Giddens and others on the importance of individual agency. In fact, with a few exceptions, such as psychoanalysis, many contemporary psychologists eschew 'psychological' explanations, feeling much more comfortable with biological rather than psychological determinism. However, both sociocultural determinism and biological determinism avoid the psychological and serve to obliterate the person as agent and as experiencing subject.

Recent movements, such as social constructionism, the social scientific wing of postmodernism, have also played their part in undermining any claim that we can or should place experience at the centre of our interests. Where there is an attack on the notion of the unitary self, an attack on the notion of individual experience cannot be far behind. If there is no self, who is the experienter?

On the other hand, one might well argue that the nature of children's experience is of great interest to social science. It is, for example, very open to a developmental analysis. When do children begin to recognize that they have an internal representation of the world, which is private to them? Do young children experience their worlds via pictures, feelings or words? How do adults assist and shape the experiential life of young children? The active role that children play in constructing their own developmental story is increasingly recognized and calls out for a methodology that assists us in accessing and understanding children's experiential life.

Jerome Kagan has commented that, 'The person's interpretation of experience is simultaneously the most significant product of an encounter and the spur to the next' (1984: 279). It can be argued that without some kind of access to the content of a person's experience, we have a very incomplete account, from a scientific perspective, of what it is that causes any person, adult or child, to act as they do.

Second, aside from an interest in experience itself, research into children's experience can reflect an interest in the study of children as persons rather than study of the child that is carried out in order to advance our understanding

of human psychology in general. Studying children as persons implies a view of children as sentient beings who can act with intention and as agents in their own lives. An interest in researching children's experience can, therefore, be allied to a moral perspective on the role and status of children which respects and promotes their entitlement to being considered as persons of value and persons with rights. The focus shifts thereby to studying children and not child variables. The child as an experiencing subject is a person whose experience and whose response to that experience are of interest to themselves, to other children and to adults. In Chapter 3 of this volume, Christensen and Prout talk about conferring on children and childhood 'a sense of present value'. Children in most societies are valued for their potential and for what they will grow up to be but are devalued in terms of their present perspectives and experiences.

The researcher who values children's perspectives and wishes to understand their lived experience will be motivated to find out more about how children understand and interpret, negotiate and feel about their daily lives. If we accept a view of children as persons, the nature of children's experiential life becomes of central interest.

In recent years, children's right to be considered as persons has been voiced publicly in a number of different fora. Vindication of this right underpins the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), the Children Act (1989) in the UK and The National Children's Strategy (2000) in Ireland. The seeds were sown for the recognition of children's right to be heard in the 1960s and 1970s, a time of social upheaval in the West when the voices of marginalized groups such as women and ethnic minorities surfaced and changed the political landscape. An interest in children as marginalized people could be seen as part of this larger movement. Within the social sciences, a new interest in children's experience and perspectives was fueled by the alignment of researchers with this moral and political perspective on children's position in the world (see for example, Qvortrup, Bordy, Sgitha, & Wintersberger, 1994). Furthermore, the demand on the part of policy makers and practitioners to have ways of accessing the child's perspective and giving voice to children has also led to a pragmatic interest among researchers in the development of appropriate methods (Davie, 1993; Davie, Upton, & Varma, 1996).

Third, researching children's experience is premised on the view that children are not all the same. It resists the idea that what we are setting out to research is 'the child' and replaces this piece of automatic discourse – very central to the practice of developmental psychology in particular – with the recognition that children encounter their worlds in an individual and idiosyncratic manner and that their worlds are themselves all different. The longstanding lack of recognition of one major distinction, that of gender, led Ennew to comment on the existence of 'that strange ungendered isolate, the child' (Ennew, 1994). Clearly numerous other distinctions also apply. Setting out to research children's experience implies a respect for each child as a unique and valued experiencer of his or her world. It also demands the use of methods that can capture the nature of children's lives as lived rather

than those that rely on taking children out of their everyday lives into a professional's office or 'lab'.

Recognition of children's diversity and individuality has implications for research methodology. Developmental psychology has had and continues to have a fascination with statistics and with attempting to draw conclusions about 'the child' by combining measures of some particular behaviour of a large group of children. In an interesting review of a book by Cairns, Bergman and Kagan, *Methods and models for studying the individual* (1998), Ingrid Josephs repeats the guiding question for the eleven chapters of the book. 'How can the richness of individual lives be captured by the objective methods and statistical analyses of developmental research?' After reviewing the book, Josephs concludes, 'the answer is simple "It cannot be captured at all!"' (p. 475). Perhaps there is an unresolvable struggle between the desire for so-called objectivity and the wish to understand children and how they lead their lives.

We both subscribe to the view that the understanding of children, their lives and their development requires a multiplicity of methodological approaches. The method selected should fit the question that is asked. If the focus of enquiry is on the quality of individual lives, statistical methods are not the method of choice since statistics serve to obliterate individuality and richness. The richness of an individual's life is very often not to be found in the surface of life but in how it is lived, in the person's experiences and reactions to the world. On the other hand, if we want to know how many children in a particular population have experienced the death of a parent we must collect the appropriate statistics.

What is Meant by 'Experience'?

At this point it might be useful to ask what one means when one uses the word 'experience'. The *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* gives various definitions of experience. The most relevant from our perspective is perhaps the definition of experience as, 'The fact of being consciously the subject of a state or condition or of being consciously affected by an event. Also an instance of this.' By this definition, consciousness is a requisite for experience. The definition implies that those who experience are conscious of being the subject of a state/condition or the effects of an event. By this token, one might ask whether pre-verbal children can be said with confidence to have experiences since they cannot report on them in a self-conscious manner. That a young child has experiences of the world is an inference, which we make when and if we attribute consciousness to infants. This becomes relevant to the researcher who claims an interest in researching the experience of infants and young children via observation.

Sociocultural perspectives on the construction of self suggest persuasively that how we relate to the world is very largely a function of the cultural context, particularly, those discourses which are central to structuring the world and the individual's place in it. Thus, children come to think of themselves

as selves and interpret their encounters with self, the world and others in very different ways depending on the discourses that are dominant in their culture. Scheiffelin and Ochs (1998) describe the radically different attributions made by the Kaluli people in Papua New Guinea and the US and British middle classes about how infants relate to the world and how they should be treated. The Kaluli people assume that babies 'have no understanding' and do not address them or treat them as communicative partners. By contrast, in the middle-class homes of the USA and Britain 'from birth on, the infant is treated as a social being and as an addressee in social interaction' (p. 51). Where in many western cultures parents spend a lot of time interpreting the baby's behaviour and their underlying mood states, preferences, and so on, the Kaluli people show 'a cultural dispreference for talking about or making claims about what another might think, what another might do, or what another is about to do, especially if there is no external evidence' (p. 56). Thus the child is socialized into a mode of relating to her/himself and others that is very specific to his or her culture. The interest that we show in some parts of the West in the inner experience of others, even of babies, is not a universal phenomenon. Interest in, and interpretation of, experience is also likely to vary in important ways from culture to culture. How we value and speak about experience is then, in large part, a function of a culturally specific process.

In western cultures the observer of children tends to assume that their activity and verbalizations are products of, or in some essential way connected to, the child's experience. However, the nature of any child's (or adult's) experience is always in part inaccessible to an outsider: this must be a fundamental premise for the researcher. This inaccessibility is even more problematic when children are as yet unable to report on their conscious encounters with the world. We will leave aside for the moment the capacity of even very young children to deceive.

The inaccessibility of experience might be assumed to be total if experience is seen as essentially private. However most contemporary understandings of experience, since the time of John Dewey at least, would see experience as socially mediated and therefore, in some essentials, shared. Experience is interpretative and the medium by which humans interpret their encounters with the world is linguistic or at least symbolic. From a discourse theory perspective, our experience is constituted by the discourses that are available to us (see, for example, Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Venn, & Walkerdine, 1984). While recognizing the importance of discourse in creating meaning, to conclude that experience is entirely constituted by discourse is going a step too far since it negates the material and sensational foundation of some forms of experience, for example, the abscess that causes a pain in one's jaw.

Experience is about interpretation, on the part of the self to the self (as in reflexive mental processes) and on the part of the self to others (as in attempts to communicate experience) and, further, on the part of the others as they attempt to understand the original experience. The latter exchange has been encompassed in the term 'intersubjectivity', that process which

occurs in exchange between two or more subjectivities. This dialectic process applies not only to the development of meaning in children's daily lives, but also to the encounters by which researchers seek to understand children's experiences.

Researching children's experience is a project that is fundamentally problematic. The process is highly inferential. We assume that it is possible to learn about children's experience *both* by enquiry into their active engagement with their material and social worlds, whether the focus is on actions or words, *and* from their own reports on their subjective world. Thus, observational studies may give us an entrée into children's experience if they show us the ways in which children make efforts to understand and negotiate their worlds.

Kagan notes that, 'The problem psychologists have been unable to solve is how to diagnose these interpretations (children's interpretations) from the actions, statements and undetected physiological reactions of children' (1984: 279). This is an ongoing issue which will remain a problem for researchers in this area but it is a problem which is intrinsic to the nature of the questions which we are asking.

Researching Experience: Some Further Limitations on What can be Known

The researcher who sets out to research experience needs not only to be aware of the limitations on his or her capacity to access the experience of another person, but also the limits of what a focus on experience can tell us about the other.

It is salutary perhaps to look at the interest in experience that characterized a certain phase of research into the psychology of women. Because women's experience had been so blatantly disregarded by the social sciences, one of the first goals of feminist researchers was to find a central place for women's accounts of their own experiences of their lives. Feminist research was also in the main committed to the view that each woman's experience was different and that each woman's experience deserved to be heard. There are many resonances in the history of feminist research with the kind of rhetoric that is produced around children, rather more recently. One might accuse such researchers of valorizing experience beyond other sources of information on human life.

Much of the early feminist work appeared to be premised on the view that the woman herself has a special knowledge about the self. The work of Freud, among others, must lead us to radically question that assumption. Most psychologists accept that we may not have access to all of our feelings and motivations at all times. Mechanisms such as denial and dissociation result in the 'forgetting' of events and thoughts that have been experienced. People can report on their motivations and emotions only to the extent that they are aware of them and only in the manner that they have come to interpret

them. People are prone also to all sorts of biases in reporting their views and experiences to others. Psychometricians have spelled out the effect of unconscious response biases on the way in which people respond to surveys. For instance, the impulse to present oneself in a way that is socially acceptable to others (social desirability) can influence answers to direct questions and is likely to remain a significant factor even in extended qualitative encounters with a researcher. People can also deliberately set out to lie and deceive. Children are not exempt from any of these processes.

Accordingly, even where our focus is on the understanding of one human being's actions and motivations, his or her account of his or her own experience should be seen as but one source of information, one which may be valid as an experience but suspect as a source of complete understanding. To quote Kagan again:

When a mother, who has just struck a child with the heavy, blunt end of a chopping block explains with sincerity to an observer that she loves her child and is only trying to make sure that her daughter learns to control her strong will, we must reflect on that subjective interpretation – but we do not have to accept it in our objectively framed explanation. (1984: 278)

Kagan contrasts the subjective frame with the objective frame, two positions that the researcher can adopt, both having a contribution to make to our knowledge. There are ways other than Kagan's of characterizing sources of information, but what is important is that we acknowledge the strengths and limitations of each source, that we do not, for example use a child's account of her reactions to a particular event as the beginning and end of our understanding of her reaction. When parents and children give differing accounts of the same events or relationships, as they often do (Sweeting, 2001; Triseliotis, Borland, Hill, & Lambert, 1995), the researcher needs to present these as complementary perspectives and not seek a single version of the 'truth'.

Given all these caveats we might ask, 'Can research access experience?' As Stainton Rogers and Stainton Rogers state, 'there is no device for inquisiting the child which can tell us what the child is like' (1992: 17). Elsewhere in this book Annie Rogers comments, 'The very notion that we might know what is in a child's head is ridiculous' (p. 162). Ultimately we would agree with these statements but believe that we can and should aim towards an increased level of understanding, albeit a partial understanding, of children's experience and the ways in which they process it, mentally, physically and behaviourally.

The subjectivity of the researcher adds a further layer of complexity to the research process. William James suggests that 'we begin our study with our own experience since other experiences can be intelligible only in these terms' (1990 [1890]: 361). Despite the fact that James wrote in this way so many years ago, it is only comparatively recently that researchers have become alert once more to the extent of their own involvement with the research process. In the social sciences, this awareness was triggered in the wake of the realization by natural scientists of the impossibility of direct

perception of physical events. The lens of the observer or researcher inevitably distorts. Many social scientists, but not all, would accept that the objective researcher is a myth and that it is essential for researchers to scrutinize and take account of their own position as an enquirer. Reflexivity is therefore an essential element in any research (Davis, Watson, & Cunningham-Burley, 2000). As we set out to research children's experiences we must add analysis of this extra layer of interpretation to the interpretation that is at the heart of experience itself. As adults we bring to our encounters with children a particular package of attitudes and feelings, constructed through our own personal childhood history and our contemporary perspective on childhood, often coloured by one or more of the various prevailing ideologies of childhood.

Researching Children's Experience: What is Different about Children?

As we have attempted to argue, there are a number of difficulties that beset the researcher who embraces the aim of researching a person's experience. Are there particular difficulties and challenges in relation to researching children's experience? Some social scientists, particularly those who have identified with 'The new sociology (or social studies) of childhood' have argued strongly that there is no need for a specific set of methods to research children's lives (Christensen & James, 2000). Sociologists are critical of developmental psychology's tendency to see children as less than adult and as people in the making rather than as competent and complete social actors.

We would agree that researchers should not take for granted any adult-child distinction. The questioning of taken-for-granted assumptions about children and childhood is central to this book and to the project of enquiring into children's own perspectives on, and experience of, their worlds. However, we would suggest that the researcher must be open to the use of methods that are suited to children's level of understanding, knowledge, interests and particular location in the social world. In their discussion of children's role in research and the methods used to research their experience, Hogan, Etz, and Tudge (1999) ask 'how information can be obtained from children in developmentally appropriate ways'. This question cannot be disregarded: infants, young children and teenagers cannot be treated identically. The question of developmental differences in level of ability or understanding must arise. It is palpably ridiculous to claim that an infant has the same kind of understanding of the world as does a teenager. For example, infants and very young children cannot understand complex and/or abstract questions so it is therefore essential for the researcher to adjust their mode of enquiry accordingly.

But we need to keep open all the time our views on what 'developmentally appropriate' might mean in any particular context with any group of children. The simple equation of age with a particular level of ability or knowledge or set of attitudes should be avoided. It is easy for adults to underestimate children's abilities and to patronize them. Such attitudes to

children have undoubtedly been a feature of past research endeavours. It is also the case that researchers have tended to use age in a way that disregards the wide diversity of ability and interests that can be found in any group of children of the same chronological age. At the same time, age is a powerful social marker in our society and we adults very often ensure that children go through the same kind of experience simply because they have reached a particular age (Greene, 2003). Thus, 5-year-olds in the UK will typically experience the transition to formal schooling in unison. Similarly, all 13-year-olds in Ireland will be expected to make the transition to secondary school. Other countries have different ideas about what happens at what age, but the importance of age is central in the patterning of children's life courses.

We would endorse the view that in many ways children behave and think similarly to adults. It is important, however, not to essentialize either the differences or the similarities which research might reveal, since any set of findings is very often a function of local or historical demands and discourses and may not have any significance at another time or place.

Children, like adults, may be very open to the demand characteristics of the research setting and the nature of the relationship between themselves and the researcher or interrogator. An interview is a social exchange in which the social demands may outweigh the ostensible demands of the interview itself. Thus, children may give answers that are determined more by their desire to please than their desire to be truthful. Children behave in different ways in different settings so the choice of where to carry out research is as important as how to carry it out (Morrow & Richards, 1996).

Studies have shown that children will often answer very odd questions posed to them by adults. Hughes and Grieve (1980) asked children questions such as, 'Is red heavier than yellow?' and, 'One day there were two flies crawling up a wall. Which fly got to the top first?' They found that almost all children gave answers to the questions. In a follow-up study, Waterman, Blades, and Spencer (2001) asked 5 to 8-year-old children a series of nonsensical questions in closed and open format and found that children were much more likely to try to give answers to closed format questions, that is, those requiring a 'yes' or 'no' response. These researchers suggest that children will very often answer 'no' when they do not understand a question. Seventy six percent of children gave an inappropriate 'yes' or 'no' answer to a nonsense question compared to 20 per cent of adults. Waterman et al. suggest that interviewers should be very cautious about how they interpret children's answers to closed questions and that they 'should use open questions as much as possible' (p. 477). Such caveats also extend to questionnaire and test responses. To a significant extent, children are used to being directed by adults and to doing either what they are told or what adults seem to expect of them, however baffling.

The question arises, then, whether children are particularly suggestible, that is, more suggestible than adults. Children's suggestibility had been analysed by a number of researchers, particularly those with an interest in

children's reliability as witnesses in a legal setting (Spencer & Flin, 1991). Ceci, Ross, and Toglia (1987) found that children are more likely to take on board incorrect information supplied by an adult than that supplied by a child. On the other hand, it appears that there is very little difference between adults and children as regards memory loss and recall and both are helped by recognition aids (Spencer & Flin, 1991). So children are not necessarily less reliable informants than adults.

Are children less tolerant of ambiguity in language? It has been convincingly demonstrated that our language is permeated with metaphor (Gibbs, 1994). Children may show a lack of understanding of conventional metaphors frequently used by adults but equally they have a capacity to invent their own metaphorical expressions. In relation to the former, one of our research colleagues was surprised when a young child answered her question, which was one of a sequence of questions in the area of family relationships, as follows:

Q How close are you to your grandfather?

A Well, not very close really: I live in Dublin and he lives in Offaly.

This is not to say that children do not make use of metaphor in their speech. Indeed adults may often fail to understand the idiosyncratic and creative use of language that children can employ. A Finnish study of young people's text messaging revealed their high level of linguistic inventiveness, resulting in communication that was often obscure to uninitiated adults (Kaseniemi, 2001).

A question which arises when attempting to access children's experience is how one tells the difference between a child's recounting of an experience which actually happened to him or her and telling an imaginative tale concocted either to amuse or fascinate the researcher or to mislead. One might answer that it does not really matter but, again, whether it matters or not will depend upon the nature of the research question. Children start to tell lies at a young age. Studies reported by Lewis, Stanger and Sullivan (1989) show just how effectively many 3-year-olds lie about a minor transgression and how difficult it was for adults to detect whether or not they were lying from their facial expression and demeanour.

One major difference between the adult-adult research relationship and the adult-child research relationship relates to power (Alderson, 1995), although it must be noted that this is a quantitative difference since the power differential operates for adults also. Mayall argues that the subordinate position of children cannot be ignored and must be taken into account by the researcher (Mayall, 2000). Adults typically have authority over children and children often find it difficult to dissent, disagree or say things which they think may be unacceptable. Children may have difficulty in believing that any adult will take their views seriously if their daily experience of adults dictates otherwise (Cloe, 1995). At the same time children are adept at undermining the power of adults by such tactics as resistance, subversion and subterfuge. As Harris (1998) points out, children learn very early

on that they are part of a 'kids versus grown-ups' dynamic. Corsaro (1997) describes the strategies by which nursery school children, aged 3 to 5, 'mock and evade adult authority'. The researcher needs to be aware in every new context about the meaning that being asked questions by strange adults has for this child or this group of children. Have they learned to give careful, 'scripted' answers? Have their lives changed in negative ways as the result of answering adults' questions? As discussed below in relation to children's involvement in the construction of the research process, researchers may be advised to think about ways of giving up some of their power in the research situation by, for example, allowing the children to choose the time and place of interviews.

In some cases it seems to be possible for adults to convince children that they are, as adults go, pretty powerless. In the course of Emond's long sojourn with young people in a residential group home (described in Chapter 7 of this volume) it became clear to her fellow residents that being a doctoral student was not too much fun and she reports being seen eventually as 'an object of pity rather than a threat'.

It is clear that the characteristics of the researcher matter. We disagree with the view, still apparently fostered in some schools of thought, that researchers can be like flies on the wall or in some way neutralize themselves. The extent to which researchers need to be like their child subjects or participant is an issue, however. Researchers, especially ethnographers and anthropologists, have long debated how far it is necessary to adopt special tactics to allow them to enter the 'separate worlds' of children and young people (see for example, Corsaro, 1985, on 'peer culture'). At an extreme, this perspective on children's worlds implies that children occupy a different world to adults and that adults can never hope to understand the world of children. One response to this view is not to try and another is to become like children. The former seems to be an unnecessarily gloomy and probably invalid conclusion and the second unwise and doomed to failure. Our view would be that children would generally be quick to detect any contrivances that an adult may adopt to be more like them. There are, however, examples in the literature of researchers who have successfully negotiated a space somewhere between adult figures of authority and the children themselves (Christensen, 2004). Barrie Thorne describes how she attempted to negotiate a role as 'least adult', somewhere between the children she observed and their adult authority figures, and how complicated such a negotiation must be. Her chapter, 'Learning from kids' in *Gender Play* (1993) stands as a very thoughtful reflection on the relationship of the researcher to the children whom they engage in research. A further matter about which there can be little dispute is the importance of being familiar with the 'local cultural practices of communication' used by the children and young people involved in the research (Christensen & James, 2000: 7). This extends to establishing a familiarity with children's routines, timetables and expectations.

Finally we wish to touch briefly on children's role in research. We assume that children are actively engaged in making sense of the research process once they are engaged in it and that this effort after social understanding is

present even in very young children (Dunn, 1988). In this sense it is always appropriate to see children as participants in the research process. Researchers' terminology has changed in recent years in line with the view that the people who are the focus of research are participants not subjects (Woodhead & Faulkner, 2000). The extent of children's participation in the research process can vary beyond this basic level. One of us (Hill) discusses ethical issues surrounding consent and involvement in research in Chapter 4 of this volume. From the perspective of methodology, it is still the case that most of the research carried out into children's experience of their worlds is prompted, designed, analysed and disseminated by adults. Involving children in research design and data handling is unusual but a number of researchers are beginning to explore when and how this can be done (Alderson, 2000; Hill, 1997 and see Veale, Chapter 14 of this volume). Interesting examples of how children can be more fully drawn into the design and analysis of research are beginning to emerge in the literature. Children have been involved in advisory groups that work with researchers to identify appropriate methods and procedures for answering research questions (see for example, Edwards & Alldred, 1999; Emond, 2002), a practice which seems to hold a lot of potential. Checking back with child participants that the researcher's attempts at understanding make sense to them is also a very useful practice, which is in line with the goal of keeping faith with children's own perspective and voice. Some researchers have gone much further in assisting children in becoming involved to some extent at all stages of the research process (Emond, 2002). Ultimately, however, it is adults who control the world of publishing, policy making, the universities, the social services and so on, so children's independence and autonomy as researchers are fundamentally and intrinsically constrained.

Methods Suited to Researching Children's Experiences and Perspectives

There is a long but not very influential tradition of research on children's experience and experiences of their worlds. We might start with research where children are the informants on their own lives. Margaret Mead provides an early example in her interviews of children as reported in conversations with children and young people in New Guinea and Samoa (1930; 1961). A further early example is the work of Charlotte Bühler (1930) and her use of diaries as a mode of accessing the experience of teenage girls.

Over the twentieth century an immense range of different methods was developed and employed in research on and with children. This section focuses on methods that involve children themselves reporting on, or in some way revealing or displaying, their experience.

The approach to collecting data of this kind can be both qualitative and quantitative, or involve a mixture of both. Quantitative methods can be informative on children's experience but our emphasis here will be on qualitative methods

since they tend to be open-ended, narrative and holistic. They are more able to capture the full richness of experience whereas using numbers provides a means of summarizing some essential features of experience, as they relate to either single individuals or groups.

This is not to say that there is no place for measurement or statistics in researching children's experience (Alanen, 2003). Qvortrup (2000) argues, for example, that large-scale statistical surveys are important in capturing the diversity of childhood and of children's daily life experience. Such data may describe the parameters of experience but not the subjective content. Meaning and content can be accessed through standardized questionnaires, but in many ways use of such tools conflicts with the goal of arriving at an understanding of how children themselves construe and negotiate their worlds.

Some of the wide range of possible methods that can be useful in accessing children's experience are listed below. At this stage, there will be no attempt to describe or discuss methods in detail. Several of them are discussed in full in succeeding chapters and further information can be found in recent texts referenced in this book, such as that of Grieg and Taylor (1999).

Observation

The use of observation is discussed in two of the chapters in this volume: those of Dunn (Chapter 5) and Tudge and Hogan (Chapter 6: participant observation, as used by Emond, is discussed in Chapter 7).

Observational methods can take a variety of forms. In terms of content, they can be naturalistic or contrived. The possibilities in terms of recording are even more various, involving paper and pencil, audio, video and filmed records. The data may include children's actions and verbalizations. Sampling methods also dictate what is recorded. For example, time sampling methods result in frequency counts, whereas event sampling typically produces descriptive narratives.

In relation to children's experience, the analysis and interpretation of observational records of behaviour (including speech) necessitate a level of inference beyond that which is required when the child is in some way reporting directly on his or her experience.

Interviews – individual and group

Interview methods are discussed and described in several chapters in this volume, (Wescott & Littleton (Chapter 8); Rogers (Chapter 9); Hennessy & Heary (Chapter 13)).

Interviews may involve single children with a single interviewer or groups of children responding to one or more interviewers, as in the focus group method. The interviewer may ask children standardized questions or allow the nature of the questions to flow with the conversation. Between

a totally prescribed set of questions and a totally unstructured exchange lies the more frequently occupied territory of the semi-structured interview. Within an interview setting, there is scope for the use of a variety of linked methods such as brainstorming on a theme or an object, or interspersing the question and answer format with pencil and paper or other tasks.

The possible data generated through interviews are rich and varied. Depending on the focus of the interview the data may extend from straightforward facts about the child's life to data which require a great deal of interpretation, perhaps guided by psychoanalytic or other depth psychologies. Interviewers need not be human! Measelle, Ablow, Cowan and Cowan, for example, have used puppets successfully as 'interviewers' of 4- to 7-year-old children (The Berkeley Puppet Interview, 1998).

Creative methods

Reference to the use of creative methods can be found in the chapters by Veale (Chapter 14) and by Rogers (Chapter 9) in this volume.

Creative methods are those that explicitly give reign to the child's imagination. They would include creative writing, such as telling or writing stories (as opposed to giving a factual account of one's past experiences), writing poems, drawing or painting, taking photographs, making videos or films and drama and role play (Christenson & James, 2000; Levin, 1995).

Elicited self-reports and children's spontaneous narratives

Self-report methods include those which rely on verbal reports but which involve children in writing or recording their views, feelings, and so on without direct and ongoing interaction with an interviewer. Other methods include asking children to respond to scenarios and vignettes (see Barter and Renold, 2000, for an interesting discussion on the use of vignettes with children), questionnaires, sentence completion tasks, recording children's naturally occurring narratives and asking children to record their commentaries in diaries. Simple but effective verbal prompts such as asking children to tell or write down their 'three wishes' fall somewhere between this category and the interview category.

The analysis of autobiography and life stories represents a growing area of interest in social science research (for example, Josselson & Lieblich, 1993). Work with children is very much less common than work with adults and is represented in this book by the chapter by Engel (Chapter 11).

New forms of computing technology offer considerable scope for use in research. Children are often more familiar than adults with these media and can use them readily to communicate with others about their lives (Borland, Hill, Laybourn, & Stafford, 2001; Holloway & Valentine, 2001).

Use of material props and visual prompts

Under this heading, one might place mapping and graphical methods (such as ecomaps, life story charts, genograms), the use of dolls, puppets and other toys or games and using pictures, cartoons or photographs as triggers or prompts.

Projective techniques

These techniques rely on children's responses to ambiguous stimuli. Their responses are assumed to reveal their unconscious orientations and feelings. Examples include the Blacky Drawings and the Children's Thematic Apperception Test.

Methods that can capture the ongoing interactions and transactions of children's lives

Many of the methods listed above have been developed within the traditional positivist model of the child and how the child should be researched (Hogan et al., 1999). Contemporary perspectives on children's lives that characterize children as social actors and that place emphasis on seeing children as embedded in a rich sociocultural context demand methods that can address these conceptualizations. In many ways, our repertoire of methods is inadequate to the task. They speak to the isolated child in a fixed and universalized context.

Ethnographic methods can often be well suited to capturing the ongoing flow and complexities of children's daily lives (see Emond, Chapter 7 of this volume). Ethnographic approaches involve spending extended time with children in their everyday environments, such as a school or play space (Christensen, 2004; James, 1993; Moore, 1986). They often combine participant observation with key informant interviews, informal group discussions and creative exercises. For pre-school children an interesting mix of methods has been developed in the Mosaic Model (Clark & Moss, 2001).

All of the above methods generate data that may be recorded in a variety of different ways (audiotaped, videotaped, filmed, photographed, and written down contemporaneously or after the event). The potential of online recording and analysis is huge and varied (Holloway & Valentine, 2001). The data, however collected, must be analysed and here again a number of choices can be made depending on the focus of the study and the theoretical commitments of the researcher. For example, the discourse analyst would see all data sets as potential texts, which are open to discourse analysis (see Alldred & Burman, Chapter 10 of this volume).