International Journal of Child, Youth, and Family Studies (2014): 5(4.1) 611–628

PHOTO-NARRATIVE PROCESSES WITH CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

Marja Leena Böök and Johanna Mykkänen

Abstract: This article focuses on the photo-narrative research process with children and young people. The photo-narrative method invites children and young people to answer research questions by first taking photographs and then talking to the researcher about them. We reflect critically on our own photo-narrative study by asking such questions as: In what ways can the photo-narrative method be seen as a participative method? How were the various power relations between the child and the researcher actualized? What methodological and ethical challenges did we encounter during the research process? The study data were photographs and narratives by eight children and young people (aged 4 to 15 years), who were each interviewed twice. In the first interview, each participant was given a disposable camera and they were asked to take photographs of things and situations, persons, objects, and feelings relating to their everyday lives during one week. The second interview was a narrative interview where each participant could select the photographs he or she wanted to talk about. In this approach, interpretation of the photographs was primarily in the hands of the children and young people, while interpretation of the narratives was the responsibility of the researcher.

Keywords: children, photo-narrative, ethics

Marja Leena Böök, Ph.D., University lecturer, Department of Education, University of Jyväskylä. Postal address: PO Box 35, FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä. Finland.
E-mail: marja.leena.book@jyu.fi

Johanna Mykkänen, Ph.D., University lecturer, Department of Education, University of Jyväskylä. Postal address: PO Box 35, FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä 40014. Finland.
E-mail: johanna.mykkanen@jyu.fi

Our research attempts to show everyday family life from the viewpoint of children, fathers, and mothers, while also further developing and applying participative methods used in family research (Rönkä & Korvela, 2009). Our aim is to find out what forms of, and perspectives on, daily family life are revealed by photographic means, knowing at the same time that it is impossible to capture its constant flow. Pink (2012) reminds us that everyday life is neither static nor mundane; instead, it is replete with practices and "ordinary ways of being", and also constantly changing.

Using photo-narratives (Crane, 2012; Kaplan, Lewis, & Mumba, 2007; Rose, 2012; Wang & Burris, 1997), we hoped to gain a glimpse into the private life of families that would otherwise be difficult to access. The photo-narrative method gives participants a voice and encourages them to share their views and experiences with the researcher: Each family member takes photographs and talks about them with the researcher afterwards. Here, we focus on research with children and young people and, in particular, on how we "used" the photo-narrative method with them. We also focus on some issues that, according to Catalani and Minkler (2010), are under-studied: specifically, what methodological benefits, limits, and ethical questions emerged during the research process.

Generally, the lives of children and young people have been explored solely through adults' understandings. Recent qualitative research has highlighted the different perspectives on family life that children can provide (e.g., Mason & Tipper, 2008; Zartler & Richter, 2012). Multiple realities co-exist within families and relationships, and thus there has been a shift towards gathering multiple perspectives (Jamieson, Simpson, & Lewis, 2011). Childhood research has also encouraged us to look critically at the existing conceptualizations of childhood and their influence on how we conduct research in this area (Christensen & James, 2008; Tisdall, Davis, & Gallagher, 2009).

From the standpoint of childhood studies, childhood is seen as a social construction and children as social actors (e.g., Alanen, 1988; James & Prout, 1997). James and Prout (1997) stress that researchers should treat the child's "voice" as a necessity, a right and a skill, worthy of being listened to and studied in its own right. As James (2007) argues, the recognition and voices of children have become a symbol of the modern welfare state's commitment to the values of freedom, democracy, and care. It can even be said to have become a new research orthodoxy, although this is not enough to ensure that children's voices and views are heard.

Einarsdóttir (2007) states that qualitative research methodology and new methods of data-gathering have also led researchers to the possibility of seeking the perspectives of children and young people. Diverse studies have revealed that young children are reliable informants and give valuable and useful information. Children are capable and knowledgeable experts on their own lives, and therefore should be heard. However, children and young people are not a homogeneous group and the "voice" of children and young people is not monophonic. Hence it is important to identify and listen to a variety of children and young people's voices (Einarsdóttir, 2007; Komulainen, 2007; Tisdall, 2011).

Using Photo-narratives in Family Daily Life Research

Rönkä and Korvela (2009) reviewed many studies on daily family life and noted that the concept of daily life is often taken for granted and is under-studied, especially from the viewpoints of different family members. Verbalising daily life is challenging with adults – not to mention children and young people. Photography as a task-centred and participative

research method has helped children and young people to describe abstract things and the researcher to explore their lives (e.g., Cook & Hess, 2007; Jorgenson & Sullivan, 2010; Kaplan et al., 2007; Zartler & Richter, 2012; Young & Barrett, 2001).

Our research data consisted of photographs and photo-narrative interviews (Kaplan et al., 2007) with children and their parents living in the same household. So far, we have informants (n = 20) from six families. Here, we focus on the children and young people's data: eight children were individually interviewed twice. The first interview lasted between 20 and 40 minutes, and the second 15 to 45 minutes. Altogether, the children and young people took 104 photographs. The children and young people varied in age from 4 to 15 years. All came from central Finland, and all were from families with full-time working mothers and fathers with relatively homogeneous parental socio-economic status. Families were recruited through snowball sampling. Interviews were mostly conducted in family homes after the school day, when parents were at home (but in another room). The father of the youngest participant, aged 4, stayed in the same room most of the time.

In the first interview, the researcher and the child or young person became acquainted with each other: We obtained some background information on each participant (age, family members, and hobbies) and asked some general interview questions (e.g., "*Tell me about your daily life? What have you been doing today, right from this morning until now?*"). During the first interview, each participant was given a disposable camera. The children and young people were asked to take photographs of things and situations, persons, objects, and feelings that related to their everyday life during the course of one week. After the photographed week, the researcher collected the cameras and printed two sets of pictures, one for the researcher and one for the child or young person. After printing, the second interview, conducted as a narrative interview, was held. First, all the photographs the child or young person had taken were spread out on the table. The first question was framed to elicit talk, for example, "*What can you tell me about this photograph?*". The purpose was to create a situation where the interpretation of the photographs would come from the child or young person. We also asked each child or young person to pick out the five most important photographs and to talk about them.

Nearly all the pictures were taken at home and indoors. Over half were of people, and most of these were the child's parents or siblings. Only a few were photographs of the children or young people themselves (Mykkänen & Böök, 2013). This relative absence can be explained as a consequence of the method, which situates children and young people in the role of a photographer (Mizen, 2005). Nearly one-third of the pictures were of everyday objects, such as the computer, television, or telephone (Mykkänen & Böök, 2013).

Our research method can be seen as embodying three levels of interpretation (White, Bushin, Carpena-Mendez, & Ni Laoire, 2010). On the first, the children and young people decided what to photograph and where. Some wanted to start immediately after receiving the camera; others needed parental reminders to take photographs. On the second level of interpretation, the children and young people picked out at least five photographs from among those brought by the researcher, and talked freely about them. This level of interpretation can be seen as co-constructive: The young participants and the researchers went through the chosen photographs together, following the narrative interview method. The photographs stimulated the children and young people to talk (Cook & Hess, 2007). In the final level of interpretation, the researchers analyzed the whole data (photographs and narrative interviews) and decided what to report and how (White et al., 2010).

Photographing as a Participative Method

Research methodology using photography has proliferated over the last few years (Catalani & Minkler, 2010). Various ways of using photography as a data-gathering tool have been presented, including the photo-narrative, the participatory photo-interview, and photovoice (Crane, 2012; Kaplan et al., 2007; Rose, 2012; Wang & Burris, 1994, 1997). In all cases, the participant is invited to answer research questions by taking photographs and explaining them to the researcher. Photographs can be seen as an “ice-breaker”, a medium that creates a comfortable space for discussion (Collier, 1997).

What is now termed photovoice was originally known as “community-based participatory research” (CBPR), and was developed for health promotion purposes: Individuals took photographs to document their lived reality. The goals of photovoice were (a) to enable people to record and reflect their community’s strengths and concerns, (b) to promote critical dialogue and knowledge about important issues through large and small group discussion of photographs, and (c) to reach policy-makers (Wang & Burris, 1997). Plunkett, Leipert, and Ray (2013) see photovoice as a useful tool for eliciting data that deepens understanding of lived experience, as it creates spaces and opportunities for marginalized voices to be heard. Wang and Redwood-Jones (2001) distinguish three major theoretical notions behind photovoice: The first is the approach to critical education proposed by Paolo Freire (1970), according to which the visual image is a tool that enables people to think critically about their life environment and community. The second lies in feminist theory, and the observation that women have less power and are heard less often than men. Photovoice is one answer to this because it can bring new or seldom-heard voices and ideas into the public domain (Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001). The third theoretical foundation is supplied by Spence (1995), who described “community photography” as a way of showing how ordinary people can use photography as a personal voice.

While aware that photovoice is the original term, we prefer to use the term *photo-narrative* to emphasize the agency of the informants (see Foster-Fishman, Nowell, Deacon, Nievar, & McCann, 2005), who both take the photographs and narrate about them afterwards. Here, narrating means “storytelling” about things and experiences related to what has been photographed; it does not mean telling or describing only what can be seen in the picture – narrative has a plot (Riessman, 2008).

When participants take photographs that are later looked at and discussed in interviews, the data gathering is more in their hands than those of the researcher. Photographs chosen by the research participant are utilized as the main prompts in open-ended interviewing (Crane, 2012). The researcher is not present during the photography, and thus the balance of power in this research phase shifts more toward the research participant (see also Ohmer & Owens, 2013), in this case a child or young person. Photo-narrative informants can be seen more as “active” than passive research participants (Kaplan, 2008). In our research, the photographs directed the interviews. The photographs chosen can be assumed to represent the children and young people’s perspectives, and hence the children and young people are active in reconstructing knowledge (e.g., Einrasdóttir, 2007).

Nanay (2009) asks how a picture can represent a whole narrative, when it shows only one slice of time and not a series of events? It is also obvious that researchers cannot see beyond or know about the moments that follow or precede a photograph. Hence we need the

accounts, experiences, and meaning-makings of the photgraphers – their voices – to complete the narrative surrounding the picture. Researching the everyday is a joint experience; it is not only research about people, but also research with people, co-produced ways of knowing (Pink 2012).

Fargas-Malet, McSherry, Larkin, and Robinson (2010) argue that using participants' photographs may help to build and maintain rapport between interviewee and interviewer, and may capture the interviewee's attention more easily and for longer. It also enables interviewees to choose what they talk about. Their own photographs are probably more likely to reflect what matters to them. In addition, photographs can evoke emotions. One 10-year-old told about a photograph in which her father was installing a new program in her computer: "*This picture, where he (father) is sitting here in this beanbag, this is funny, even though there's a chair next to him*".

Emotions arise not only from the things, scenes and people photographed, but also during the whole photographing process. We noticed that most of the children and young people were very eager to take, look, and tell about their photographs. After the second interview, the children and young people received prints of their photographs, and were very happy with them. For example, our youngest participant (age 4) was very satisfied with her photographs, which may also have bolstered her self-esteem:

> Researcher: *Here are all the photos. You can have these to keep.*
> Girl: *Oh, all of them* (surprised)?
> Researcher: *Yes, all of them.*
> Girl: *I can put them in my card bag, so they stay in good condition* (smiling, happy).

However, children and young people cannot be treated as a homogeneous group (Warming, 2011). They also engage in different ways with the idea of taking photographs. The method may not suit or interest everyone. If a child or young person is disinclined to participate in the research, is neither interested in nor capable of taking photographs or talking about them, the method to be used will have to be reconsidered (see Johnson, Pfister, & Vindrola-Padros, 2012). Some children and young people may be confident and experienced with cameras and enjoy using one, while others may struggle to find inspiration and take only a few pictures (Barker & Weller, 2003; Fargas-Malet et al., 2010). We discovered that in one case the photographs were not taken by the child but by his mother. Afterwards, however, the child was eager to view the photographs and wanted to tell about them (Mykkänen & Böök, 2013). Who, then, was really the participant in the photographing process, the mother or her child, or are these photographs to be understood as co-constructed by the mother and her child?

Every culture and society has its own social norms and codes. These also shape and influence photographic practices. Aesthetic principles may even frame photographs taken for research purposes (Jorgenson & Sullivan, 2010). Here, for example, there were relatively few photographs of parents' bedrooms, or of saunas, a central part of Finnish family daily life. Gatekeepers, such as parents, siblings, grandparents, friends, et cetera, may also have assisted in the photographing process and imposed limits on its quality and quantity.

The photo-narrative opens some doors and closes others; that is to say, it has benefits and limitations. Because photographs show images of people and everyday items, people may

say less about them than they might say otherwise, because there seems to be no real imperative to explain them (Mason & Davies, 2009). The photo-narrative method also presents challenges for the researcher: How far should the research participant control production of the data or, conversely, how closely should the researcher adhere to the researcher role when an informant is describing a touching or fascinating image? Doing research with children by the photo-narrative method constructs both the participation and roles of researcher and informant.

Zartler and Richter (2012) remind us that photo interviews, like other research approaches utilizing participatory elements, do not automatically decrease power differentials, respect children or young people's agency, or "empower" them (see also Gallacher & Gallagher, 2008; Punch, 2002). For example, we found that occasionally it was hard – or even impossible – to make photo-watching situations "power-neutral", meaning that power would be shared (equally) between the researcher and the young participant, even though we let the child or young person direct the interview by choosing which photographs to tell about. As researchers we had the "right" (or power) to ask some questions, and the participant was expected to answer. At worst, we felt that the interview was more like a "hearing" in which the young participant answered in a few words and the researcher quickly asked a new question. After the interview, we talked with the child or young person about how he or she had felt about the interview and taking photos. The children and young people's comments about the interviews were positive; they did not say anything about feeling obliged or manipulated to answer. It is, of course, possible they were less candid about the experience than if their feedback had been anonymous.

The photo-narrative method, like many other research methods, has to be implemented carefully and conscientiously (Zartler & Richter, 2012), and it neither self-evidently nor automatically entails a more equal relationship between researcher and informant, even if photography is an enjoyable event and social ritual for children and young people (Sharples, Davison, Thomas, & Rudman, 2003). At best, taking photographs can be an exciting and fun mode of self-expression (Punch, 2002). One 10-year-old girl told how she "had fun" with the camera and with her father: Her father took a photograph of her photographing him (Mykkänen & Böök, 2013) Both family members participated in the same study and took photographs during the same week, and according our interpretation they also found this task fun.

Black Photographs and Things Not Visible

Missing or failed photographs can be seen as a critical issue in photography. However, in our experience not only successful but also "failed" photographs and even missing photographs stimulated dicussion about things that were not represented in the finished product. Zartler and Richter (2012) describe how photographs encourage children to narrate what is present to them; they comment on visible persons and details. In addition, photographs may invite children and young people to talk about topics that are not in the picture and thus invisible to the researcher but which are important for the participant. Thus the photographs stimulated the young participants to talk about things that were not represented in the picture. In the following example, our youngest participant, a 4-year-old girl, talks about a photograph portraying what seems to be half of her father's face, a section of shelving and a curtain. In the beginning of the extract below, the child says that the daddy is going somewhere (which is not visible in the picture). The researcher asks her several times "Where's mommy?"; the child answers the question and this sets her pondering about her own "workplace" and what she usually does there:

Researcher: *Well… who's this here?*
Girl: *Well, it's daddy's face and he is going that way.*
Researcher: *Okay, what's he going to do?*
Girl: *… in the kitchen, he's cooking*
Researcher: *Mm.*
Girl: *I took this picture*
Researcher: *Mmm. Where's mommy here?*
Girl: *I don't know*
Researcher: *Is she at home all the time?*
Girl: *Well, not all the time*
Researcher: *Well, where is she?*
Girl: *She sometimes goes to work doing her job.*
Researcher: *Well, that's how it is every now and then.*
Girl: *My workplace is in the day care centre.*
Researcher: *Yes, what do you do there?*
Girl: *I play and make handicrafts and do, as soon as they are ready I bring them home as a decoration.*

At the end of the narrative interview we asked each child or young person if there anything was missing, if they wanted to talk about things that were not in the photographs, or if there were things that had not been taken into account when the photographs were taken. Our purpose in asking these questions was to give the participant an opportunity to add details or mention something that she or he had not noticed about a photograph earlier during the interview. Some children and young people commented that photographs of friends or of calm moments with family members (like watching television, or going for a walk with mommy) were missing. This may mean that spontaneous images of an event are more likely to be captured (Punch 2002; Sharples et al., 2003) and may direct what pictures are taken.

For the researcher, asking about "missing photographs" is a tool to acquire richer and more precise narrative data on the informant's daily life, or hints regarding the possible social and cultural codes that guide the photographing activity. It is also an opportunity to check how the instructions on the photographing task have been understood. One seven-year-old girl seemed to be worried about whether she had followed the instructions "in the right way", because she hadn't taken photographs of her grandmother and friends, and sought reassurance from the researcher: "*I didn't know if I could take those photos, if I **was** allowed to*". Here the child may be trying to "read" the researcher's expectations or seeking knowledge of the conventions of photographic representation (Jorgenson & Sullivan, 2010): Is it a breach of privacy to take photographs of close relationships?

Although visual methods are useful with children, the question remains: What is a suitable age for a child to use a camera (Sharples et al., 2003)? At first, we wondered if a 4-year-old would be capable and competent enough to use a disposable camera. Our youngest informant produced five successful photographs out of 27. One was so underexposed that we almost deleted it beforehand. Luckily we did not. The 4-year-old child saw something in it and started to tell a story about an everyday evening at home.

Researcher: *What's this* (laughing)?
Girl: *It's all black.*
Researcher: *Can you even see where this was taken*?

> Girl: *Well, of course not. But it is from this room, the photo's a little dark and a little bit … distorted*
> Researcher: *Mmm.*
> Girl: *It's a little bit blurred.*
> Researcher: *Maybe there are no lights on at all.*
> Girl: *Mm-m*
> Researcher: *Could it be evening here?*
> Girl: *In the evening we girls are all the time going here and there …*
> Researcher: *You girls go there, did you say that?*
> Girl: *Yes. We move around all the time in different places.*
> Researcher: *You move around in different places*
> Girl: *Back and forth, I just laugh with [name of sister], we go that way, so that we almost fall [laughing while talking].*
> Researcher: *Well, what happens then*?
> Girl: *[Name of sister] and I just laugh and laugh. Our eyes try to go that way, so that I can't see any more.*

It was interesting to notice that the children and young people did not want to discard any photograph as a failed one. Unlike their parents, who participated in the same study and collected their own data, the children and young people did not think any of their pictures had failed or were "not good". Some parents said, "*If I'd had a digital camera, I'd have deleted this one*". The meaning of "a good picture" or "an aesthetic photograph" is different for different people, in this case children and adults. Or perhaps the invisible power relation between researcher and participant prevented explicitly labelling photographs as "failed". Even we, as researchers, thought that some of the photographs had failed and contained nothing to tell; however, every photograph taken seemed to be meaningful for the children and young people and they were active in constructing meanings for their photographs. Sharples et al. (2003) showed in their research that for the children it was more a matter of "capturing the moment", of showing their involvement with the subject, or of having fun than creating a conventionally posed picture.

Ethical Questions

Informed consent

The photo-narrative method is grounded in fundamental ethical principles. It respects informant autonomy, the active promotion of the positive and the avoidance of harm (Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001). Guillemin and Gilliam (2004) distinguish between "procedural ethics" and "ethics in practice". The first involves seeking approval from ethics committees and review boards. "Ethics in practice" refers to the everyday ethical issues that arise when conducting research (Phelan & Kinsella, 2013), which is our focus here. Some key ethical issues in photo-narrative research, such as consent, anonymity, and the ownership of visual data, are highlighted in this section. In addition, we describe our experiences of interviewing children in the home setting.

Ethical questions arise all the way from the planning to the reporting of research: for instance, how to secure the participants' consent during the research process; where and for how long you have permission to use the photographs; what to report and how, and from whose perspective. When starting research with children and young people, the researchers must first seek the co-operation of a range of gatekeepers, such as parents or school staff

(Cree, Kay, & Tisdall, 2002; Fargas-Malet et al., 2010). In our research, we first contacted and informed parents and asked if they would be willing to participate as a family in our study.

However, for participants, the meaning of the term "informed consent" may be somewhat fuzzy, as they may not be fully aware of what they are committing themselves to, for example, knowing beforehand what they are going to be asked to talk about (Josselson, 2011). It is also important to remember that, typically, research participants do not have the same academic background as the researcher (Marion & Crowder, 2013). It was for these reasons that we sought verbal permission to conduct and record the interview beforehand, and afterwards asked for written consent. At this stage of the study, consent was given by each participant.

Each child or young person was told that we were interested in her or his family life, and were gathering this information for a scientific study. The children and young people also signed an informed consent – even the youngest one wrote her first name on the consent form, and was very proud to do so. This does not, of course, mean that the child or young person has understood her or his rights. Cocks (2006) also argues that the notion of consent might exclude some potential participants, such as refugee or disabled children and young people, since in those particular contexts it might not always be possible to obtain informed consent.

When children and young people agree to participate in a study that evolves over a period of time, their consent should be treated as an ongoing process and open to review during the course of the study (Einarsdóttir, 2007). During the interviews, we made it clear that the child or young person was not required to participate against her or his wishes. Informants could also unilaterally decide to end the process. But was this really an option? Did the youngest ones really understand that this was their right? If an adult asks a question, is the child or young person obliged to answer? Can answering adults be a learned habit? There is always an imbalance, a hierarchic relation between researcher and participant – especially when the latter is a child (see Helavirta, 2007). At the first interview, our 4-year-old participant refused to participate, but nevertheless wanted to take the photographs. Asking if she would take part next time, she promised to think about it. When the next time came, she was the first in her family to participate.

The informed consent was updated during the research process, especially with respect to the photographs. The researchers went through every photograph with every child and young person, each of whom made the decision to accept or not to accept the photograph in question. The consent forms were signed and dated by the children and their parents. But do children really have the possibility to refuse or consent without their parents' permission? Ultimately, is children's permission always in their "parents' pocket"? For example, a child may give permission for the use of a photograph showing where she is playing, while her parents may not.

Visual culture and visual research methods have been utilized in many disciplines (Rose, 2012**)**. Although culture has always had a strong visual component, Lister and Wells (2004) have argued that over the past few decades the whole of western culture and everyday daily life has become increasingly visualized. Nowadays, children and youth are used to producing and watching all kinds of visual materials (Lister & Wells, 2004). The use of images in digital media has changed people's attitudes to using visual material, so that nowadays many people are comfortable being filmed on social networking sites or being seen

in online photo galleries (Muir & Mason, 2012; Wiles, Coffey, Robinson, & Heath, 2011). For example, in the present study, consent was refused in the case of only a few photographs. Before publishing, we asked participants for their consent once again. In this way we tried to ensure that the children and their parents know what they are "committed" to. The researcher has a responsibility to protect her informants, especially children and young people. It is also possible that children and young people want to be seen. As Wiles et al. (2011) argue, this may be the participant's wish, while it is also the participant's right to be visible. To summarize, in our research participants' informed consent was obtained at three points. The first was written consent to be interviewed and recorded. The second was consent to the analysis of the photographs. The third was consent to publish the final text and photographs. This final consent was important, as it enabled the researchers to be sure that the text and photographs were understood in the agreed research context and in accordance with the children and young people's meanings (See also Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001). As Marion and Crowder (2013) have noted, images can be perceived differently by viewers, who may also see different outcomes than anticipated by the researcher.

The home as a site of research

Using the home of a child or young person as a research location can present some challenges. Home interviews may be more time-consuming. A researcher has to negotiate her social position as a guest in the home, since this is not clearly defined (Fargas-Malet et al., 2010). The way a researcher presents himself or herself, uses language, dresses, interacts with the child or young person, and the context of the interview can all influence the balance of power in both a positive and negative way (Phelan & Kinsella, 2013).

We usually conducted the interviews in places preferred by the children and young people: often in their home and own room, which is usually a fairly private and quiet space. We acquainted ourselves with the youngest ones through a book or a board game. We met the children on literally the same level – for example, sitting on the floor – and talked and played, which laid a foundation for trust and, eventually, sharing and listening.

Home as a private place, and at the same time as a site of research, may affect the power relation between the child and the adult. Home interviews with children and young people may be seen by parents as giving the latter permission, or even obliging them, to take more of a hand in controlling the research process. Parents, for example, may ask the researcher or the children about the content of the interview. This, in turn, may induce stress in both researcher and young participant (Fargas-Malet et al., 2010). For example, in our study, one father asked the researcher what his children had said about him as a father. He was worried that he had not been able to spend as much time with all of his children as he thought he should have. In all cases, we explicitly gave both the children and their parents our assurance of confidentiality. However, our ability to ensure confidentiality was limited: For example, we had no control over what happened after the interview.

Visual and textual data and their ownership

Photographing may pose ethical challenges regarding confidentiality, since informed consent is difficult to obtain from all the people who appear in photographs (Fargas-Malet et al., 2010; Wiles et al., 2011). Clearly, individuals in photographs are identifiable, which conflicts with what is perhaps the issue of greatest concern: the guarantee of informant anonymity (Rose, 2012).

There were a few pictures of friends, and we promised, as researchers, that we would not publish them anywhere, as this might contradict the values that underlie photo-narrative. Wang and Redwood-Jones (2001) have argued participants should be advised to get people's permission before photographing them in a private space. Here, the concern is a possible loss of spontaneity that can prevent the researcher and the photographer from capturing the intended idea.

The researchers do not own the photographs taken by their participants. Legal ownership resides with the photographer, and hence the researcher has to negotiate with the copyright holder before reproducing the image (Rose, 2012). If pictures and photographs are subject to copyright and questions of ownership, then so too, it can be argued, are narratives. Josselson (2011) sees ethical dilemmas in narratives, and asks: Who owns the story? As she sees it, there are two accounts: the participant's and the researcher's. On the one hand there is the participant's understanding of his or her story, and on the other hand the researcher's interpretation of that life experience. The storyteller weaves experiences together, but the result is never the whole picture or absolute truth, meaning that it is only possible to represent partial selves.

An interview always contains many interwoven layers of meaning, which sit alongside or underlie a person's intentions. Josselson (2011) asks, "How could a participant possibly know, for example, that we will be paying close attention to the gaps in their speech, their use of 'I don't know', the sequence of topics they address or the ways in which words or images are repeated?" (p. 38). The participant can say that she did not mean any of that. Whose voices are found in narratives, and whose are left unheard, will depend to some extent on who the participant thinks the audience is (Josselson, 2011). Thus, truth is primarily a matter of perspective. As in this study, as researchers, we bring our own meaning-making horizon along with us. Together, we create a dialogue between aspects of ourselves and aspects of our participants.

Anonymity and public presentation

Because we are unsure how the child or young person might feel five to 10 years later when a picture is published (e.g., in an online article), we have chosen only to publish photographs in which it is hard to identify the child. In our recent article (Mykkänen & Böök, 2013), we sought to resolve this problem by sending the finished (not yet published) manuscript to the informants, and obtaining a further consent to publish the photographs and their textual interpretation.

Wiles et al. (2011) argue that photographs used without identifying names or other contextual material offer a very limited risk for the identification of an individual. They ask why visual images are seen as more personal or threatening than written text, in the form of quotes, about an individual's thoughts or feelings. However, we have noticed when reporting our results that using photographs in combination with authentic examples of speech from the same person can be more revealing and identifying than photographs or interview data alone. This heightens the risk that detailed extracts from the interview transcripts, together with photographs, may enable identification of the child or young person and threaten his or her confidentiality and right to privacy (see also Phelan & Kinsella, 2013).

Respect for respondents includes respecting their autonomy over their lives, their right to privacy, the voluntary nature of participation, and ensuring their dignity and well-being (Wiles et al., 2011). Some children and young people in the present study were conscious

also of ethical questions: For example, one girl (aged 11) refused to let us use three photos of her friends in our research:

> Girl: *Firstly, I wouldn't like that photo to be there at all. And not that either, yes, and perhaps also not that.*
> Researcher: *Well, yes. I'll take these three photos away. Would you like to tell me why you really don't want to let me to use these photos?*
> Girl: *Well, in general, if I make some kind of collage of various pictures, and then I show it to everyone, or if I make one kind of power point presentation, I don't include terribly many pictures of humans, because it isn't nice.*
> Researcher: *Would you tell me why it isn't so nice?*
> Girl: *Well, you should have some privacy and that kind of thing.*

The ethical issues that researchers encounter are situated and emerge always in relation to the specific contexts of individual research projects (Wiles et al., 2008). Punch (2002) reminds us that reflexivity should be an important part of the research process with children and young people: Researchers should reflect on their roles and assumptions as well as their choice of methods.

Conclusion

There has been a turn towards the visual both in so-called "voice" research (e.g., Cook & Hess, 2007; Pink, 2007; Spyrou, 2011; Young & Barrett, 2001) and in childhood research (e.g., Einarsdóttir, 2005; Luttrell, 2010; Punch, 2002). Visual images, like photographs, may elicit different responses than those elicited by speech or writing, and may also evoke strong emotional responses. In addition, children and young people may find that photographs allow them to express themselves more easily and make their participation in research more comfortable (Thompson, 2008). A visual storytelling approach also encourages young research participants to select and contextualize issues that are important to them (Johnson, 2011). At its best, it also facilitates children's expression, supports their empowerment, awareness, and efficacy, and increases their sense of control over their own lives (Foster-Fishman et al., 2005). For example, trusting children and young people by giving them their own cameras, we wanted to send them the message that they were strong agents in the data-gathering process (Drew, Duncan, & Sawyer, 2010). Of course, good intentions are not always realized. There are many factors that can affect this: for example, various gatekeepers, the ages of the children, their motivation and the life-situation of their family. Notwithstanding, it was evident in our research process that the different family members had fun photographing each other and their daily life. This can strengthen relationships, encouraging interaction between family members and thus contribute to family well-being (see Garcia et al., 2013).

The photo-narrative method has the potential to diminish power imbalances between the researcher (adult) and the researched (child). Photographs taken and told about by a child or young person can give participants more control over the research process. Photo-narrative researchers, however, should not take children and young people's agency for granted: Power differences are present in all research encounters between young participants and adults (Spyrou, 2011). During the research process, children and young people can be simultaneously vulnerable and competent; however, their positioning is more likely to be in the hands of adults (James, 2007; Komulainen, 2007). During the research process, we met

most of these children and young people only twice: In order to guarantee their agency and position as co-researchers, we would need more encounters and also would need to plan the implementation of the research with them.

According to Wiles et al. (2011) a key ethical issue in visual research is anonymization. While the use of visual and textual data share some ethical issues, visual data, including photographs, present particular challenges, such as those outlined above. There seems to be an ethical tension between the desire to protect young research participants and the desire to give them a "voice" (Wiles et al., 2011). The researcher has to respect the voluntary participation and right to privacy of children and young people, and ensure their well-being throughout the research process.

In analyzing photographs, or pictures in general, certain issues merit special attention. Komulainen (2007) reminds us that all verbal interpretations of images are selective representations and, like all other texts, not authentic depictions of social reality. According to Rose (2012), "interpreting images is just that, interpretation" (p. xviii). In addition, the whole social world is always embedded in visual images. Researchers cannot escape everyday life. Clearly, we are not able to see the children and young people's daily lives as a whole; however, we can try to understand parts of their lives, for example through the ways they interpret experience and narrate it, not only through "successful", but also through missing and "black" photos.

References

Alanen, L. (1988). Rethinking childhood. *Acta Sosiologica, 31*(1), 59–67. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/000169938803100105

Barker, J., & Weller, S. (2003). "Is it fun?" Developing children centered research methods. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 23*(1/2), 33–58. doi: 10.1108/01443330310790435

Catalani, C., & Minkler, M. (2010). Photovoice: A review of the literature in health and public health. *Health Education and Behavior*, *37*(3), 424–451. doi: 0.1177/1090198109342084

Christensen, P., & James, A. (2008). Introduction. Researching children and childhood cultures of communication. In P. Christensen & A. James (Eds.), *Research with children. Perspectives and practices* (2nd ed., pp. 1–9). London: Routledge.

Cocks, A. J. (2006). The ethical maze: Finding an inclusive path towards gaining children's agreement to research participation. *Childhood, 13*(2), 247–266. doi: 10.1177/0907568206062942

Collier, J. (1997). Visual anthropology's contributions to the field of anthropology. *Visual anthropology, 1*(1), 37–46. doi:10.1080/08949468.1987.9966459

Cook, T., & Hess, E. (2007). What the camera sees and from whose perspective. Fun methodologies for engaging children in enlightening adults. *Childhood*, *14*(1), 29–45. doi: 10.1177/0907568207068562

Crane, K. (2012). Photonarrative. In S. Loue & M. Sajatovic (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of immigrant health* (Vol. 1, pp. 1195–1196). New York: Springer.

Cree, V. E., Kay, H., & Tisdall, K. (2002). Research with children: Sharing the dilemmas. *Child and Family Social Work*, *7*(1), 47–56. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2206.2002.00223.x

Drew, S. E., Duncan, R. E., & Sawyer, S. M. (2010). Qualitative visual storytelling: A beneficial but challenging method for health research with young people. *Health Research, 20*(12), 1677–1688. doi: 10.1177/1049732310377455

Einarsdóttir, J. (2005). Playschool in pictures: Children's photographs as a research method. *Early Childhood Development and Care*, *175*(6), 523–541. Retrieved from http://stofnanir.hi.is/rannung/sites/files/rannung/Preschool%20in%20Pictures.pdf

Einarsdóttir, J. (2007). Research with children: Methodological and ethical challenges. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *15*(2), 197–211. doi: 10.1080/13502930701321477

Fargas-Malet, M., McSherry, D., Larkin, E., & Robinson, C. (2010). Research with children: Methodological issues and innovative techniques. *Journal of Early Childhood Research, 8*(2), 175–192. doi: 10.1177/1476718X09345412

Foster-Fishman, P., Nowell, B., Deacon, Z., Nievar, M., & McCann, P. (2005). Using methods that matter: The impact of reflection, dialogue, and voice. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 36*(3/4), 275–291. doi: 10.1007/s10464-005-8626-y

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.

Gallacher, L-A., & Gallagher, M. (2008). Methodological immaturity in childhood research? *Childhood, 15*(4), 499–516. doi: 10.1177/0907568208091672

Garcia, C. M., Aguilera-Guzman, R. M., Lindgren, S., Gutierrez, R., Raniolo, B., & Genis, T. (2013). Intergenerational photovoice projects: Optimizing this mechanism for influencing health promotion policies and strengthening relationships. *Health Promotion Practice, 14*(5), 695–705. doi: 10.1177/1524839912463575

Guillemin, M., & Gilliam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity and ethically important moments in research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *10*(2), 261–280. doi: 10.1177/1077800403262360

Helavirta, S. (2007). Lasten tutkimushaastattelu. Metodologista herkistymistä, joustoa ja tasapainottelua. [Research interviews with children. Methodological sensitivity, flexibility and balancing.]. *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka, 72*(6), 629–640.

James, A. (2007). Giving voice to children’s voices: Practices and problems, pitfalls and potentials. *American Anthropologist, 109*(2), 261–272. doi: 10.1525/aa.2007.109.2.261

James, A., & Prout, A. (1997). *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: Contemporary issues in sociological study of childhood*. London: Falmer. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203362600

Jamieson, L., Simpson, R., & Lewis, R. (2011). Introduction. In L. Jamieson, R. Simpson, & R. Lewis. (Eds.), *Researching families and relationships. Reflections on process* (pp. 1–18). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnson, G. A. (2011). A child's right to participation: Photovoice as methodology for documenting the experiences of children living in Kenyan orphanages. *Visual Anthropology Review, 27*(2), 141–161. doi: 10.1111/j.1548-7458.2011.01098.x

Johnson, G., Pfister, A. E., & Vindrola-Padros, C. (2012). Drawings, photos, and performances: Using visual methods with children. *Visual Anthropology Review, 28*(2), 164–178. doi: 10.1111/j.1548-7458.2012.01122.x

Jorgenson, J., & Sullivan, T. (2010). Accessing children’s perspectives through participatory photo interviews. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 11*(1). Retrieved from http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/447/2891

Josselson, R. (2011). “Bet you think this song is about you”: Whose narrative is it in narrative research? *Narrative works: Issues, investigations & interventions, 1*(1), 33–51. Retrieved from http://journals.hil.unb.ca/index.php/NW/article/view/18472/19971

Kaplan, I. (2008). Being ‘seen’ being ‘heard’: Engaging with students on the margins of education through participatory photography. In P. Thomson (Ed.), *Doing visual research with children and young people* (pp. 175–191). London and New York: Routledge.

Kaplan, I., Lewis, I., & Mumba, P. (2007). Picturing global educational inclusion? Looking and thinking across students’ photographs from the U.K., Zambia and Indonesia. *Journal of Research in Special Education*, *7*(1), 23–35. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-3802.2007.00078.x

Komulainen, S. (2007). The ambiguity of the child's voice in social research. *Childhood, 14*(1), 11–28. doi: 10.1177/0907568207068561

Lister, M., & Wells, L. (2004). Seeing beyond belief: Cultural studies as an approach to studying the visual. In T. van Leeuwen & C. Jewitt (Eds.), *Handbook of visual analysis* (pp. 61–91). London: Sage. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857020062.n4

Luttrell, W. (2010). 'A camera is big responsibility': a lens for analyzing children's visual voices. *Visual Studies*, *25*(3), 224–237. doi**:** 10.1080/1472586X.2010.523274

Marion, J. S., & Crowder, J. W. (2013*). Visual research. A concise introduction to thinking visually*. London: Bloomsbury.

Mason, J., & Tipper, B. (2008). Being related: How children define and create kinship. *Childhood*, *15*(4), 441–460. doi: 10.1177/0907568208097201

Mason, J., & Davies, K. (2009). Coming to our senses? A critical approach to sensory methodology. *Qualitative Research, 9*(5), 587–603. doi: 10.1177/1468794109343628

Mizen, P. (2005). A little "light work"? Children's images of their labour. *Visual Studies*, *20*(2), 124–139. doi: 10.1080/14725860500244001

Muir, S., & Mason, J. (2012). Capturing Christmas: The sensory potential of data from participant produced video. *Sociological Research Online*, *17*(1), 5. Retrieved from http://www.socresonline.org.uk/17/1/5.html

Mykkänen, J., & Böök, M. L. (2013). Photographing as a research method – Finnish children's views of everyday life. In E. Oinonen & K. Repo (Eds.), *Women, men and children in families. Private troubles and public issues* (pp. 169–194). Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Nanay, B. (2009). Narrative pictures. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 67*(1), 119–129. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6245.2008.01340.x

Ohmer, M. L., & Owens, J. (2013). Using photovoice to empower youth and adults to prevent crime. *Journal of Community Practice, 21*(4), 410–433. doi: 0.1080/10705422.2013.842196

Phelan, S. K., & Kinsella, E. A. (2013). Picture this … safety, dignity, and voice – ethical research with children: Practical considerations for the reflexive researcher. *Qualitative Inquiry, 19*(2), 81–90. doi: 10.1177/1077800412462987

Pink, S. (2007). *Doing visual ethnography*. London: Sage.

Pink, S. (2012). *Situating everyday life*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Plunkett, R., Leipert, B. D., & Ray S. L. (2013). Unspoken phenomena: Using the photovoice method to enrich phenomenological inquiry. *Nursing Inquiry, 20*(2), 156–164. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-1800.2012.00594.x

Punch, S. (2002). Research with children: The same or different from research with adults? *Childhood, 9*(3), 321–341. doi: 10.1177/0907568202009003005

Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative method for the human sciences*. London: Sage.

Rönkä, A., & Korvela, P. (2009). Everyday family life: Dimensions, approaches, and current challenges. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 1*(2), 87–102. doi: 10.1111/j.1756-2589.2009.00011.x

Rose, G. (2012). *Visual methodologies. An introduction to researching with visual materials*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Sharples, M., Davison, L., Thomas, G. V., & Rudman, P. (2003). Children as photographers: An analysis of children's photographic behaviour and intentions at three age levels. *Visual Communication, 2*(3), 303–330. doi: 10.1177/14703572030023004

Spence J. (1995). *Culturing sniping: The art of transgression*. New York: Routledge Kegan Paul.

Spyrou, S. (2011). The limits of children's voices: From authenticity to critical, reflexive representation. *Childhood*, *18*(2), 151–165. doi: 10.1177/0907568210387834

Thompson, P. (2008). Children and young people: Voices in visual research. In P. Thomson (Ed.), *Doing visual research with children and young people* (pp. 1–19). London and New York: Routledge.

Tisdall, E. K. M., Davis, J. M., & Gallagher, M. (2009). *Research with children and young people: Research design, methods and analysis*. London: Sage.

Tisdall, E. K. M. (2011). *The challenge and challenging of childhood studies? Learning from disability studies and research with disabled children.* Working paper. Retrieved from http://www.strath.ac.uk/media/faculties/hass/appliedsocialsciences/socialwork/esrcseminar/Tisdall_30.8.11%5B1%5Dks.pdf

Wang, C., & Burris, M. A. (1994). Empowerment through photo novella: Portraits of participation. *Health Education & Behavior, 21*(2), 171–186. doi: 10.1177/109019819402100204

Wang, C., & Burris, M. A. (1997). Photovoice: Concept, methodology, and use for participatory needs assessment. *Health Education & Behaviour, 24*(3), 369–387. doi: 10.1177/109019819702400309

Wang, C. C., & Redwood-Jones, Y. A. (2001). Photovoice ethics: Perspectives from Flint photovoice. *Health Education & Behaviour*, *28*(5), 560–572. doi: 10.1177/109019810102800504

Warming, H. (2011). Getting under their skins? Accessing young children's perspectives through ethnographic fieldwork. *Childhood, 18*(1), 39–53. doi: 10.1177/0907568210364666

White, A., Bushin, N., Carpena-Mendez, F., & Ni Laoire, C. (2010). Using visual methodologies to explore contemporary Irish childhoods. *Qualitative Research*, *10*(2), 143–157. doi: 10.1177/1468794109356735

Wiles, R., Prosser, J., Bagnoli, A., Clarke, A., Davies, K., Holland, S., & Renold, E. (2008). *Visual ethics: Ethical issues in visual research*. ESRC National Center for Research

Method Review Paper. NCRM/011. Retrieved from http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/421/1/MethodsReviewPaperNCRM-011.pdf

Wiles, R., Coffey, A., Robinson, J., & Heath, S. (2011). Anonymization and visual images: Issues of respect, 'voice' and protection. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 15*(1), 41–53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2011.564423

Young, L., & Barrett, H. (2001). Issues on access and identity: Adapting research methods with Kampala street children*. Childhood, 8*(3), 383–395. doi: 10.1177/0907568201008003005

Zartler, U., & Richter, R. (2012). My family through the lens. Photo interviews with children and sensitive aspects of family life. *Children & Society*, *28*(1), 1–13. doi: 10.1111/j.1099-0860.2012.00447.x