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Abstract

Sociocultural definitions of citizenship challenge normative notions of the concept to include ‘differences’ (in terms of culture, gender, age, and so forth), in recognition of the diverse ways of being and acting as a citizen. Regarding children, due to conceptual and sociocultural beliefs, their recognition as citizens is challenging, and adult society usually tends to perceive them as “future citizens” or “partial citizens”. Within childhood studies, the importance and relevance of the concept of children’s citizenship have grown, and its understanding has been widely debated, just like the concept of childhood itself.

Because of the difference between being a citizen as a status and the daily experience of citizenship, scholars suggest the study of Lived citizenship, that relates to how people give meaning and negotiate the components of citizenship (e.g. rights, participation, belonging) in their contexts. Concerning children, it allows the researcher to explore the daily construction of children’s citizenship, the contradictions and resistance, as well as the different kinds of expression of children’s citizenship.

Based on the literature review, this study sought to explore the lived citizenship in early childhood in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru. To address the research aim, I undertook a qualitative research design influenced by the interpretivist paradigm. I collected the data over a nine-month period, using ethnographic research techniques, which allowed me to obtain ‘thick’ data on children’s experiences of lived citizenship. I conducted participatory observation at the pre-school located in the neighbourhood, children’s houses, and public spaces. I also conducted semi-structured interviews with children and adults, including caregivers and government workers. The study followed key ethical considerations to ensure respect to both participants’ and researcher rights and dignity as well as to guarantee their wellbeing.

This research found three expressions of children’s lived citizenship: (1) children appropriated and become familiar with their spaces, by exploring, playing and taking moments to rest; (2) children performed citizen actions, including taking care of
themselves, others and non-human entities (animals); and (3) children enacted their citizenship through acts of citizenship by transgressing social norms to enforce their rights. The research found that while adult caregivers recognised children’s participation in fostering the wellbeing of family members, children’s contribution to the economic activities of the family and in recovery and response activities in relation to the flooding season were overlooked. In addition, while adult caregivers and governmental workers recognised children as bearers of rights, there were some geographical limitations as well as limitations imposed by caregivers on the exercising of children’s rights. Regarding the right to play and to move around public spaces, girls and younger children were perceived by adults as having less skills to face the risks; hence, they were more limited in their outdoor play.

This study provides evidence on the importance of risky play, as well as taking moments to rest, in enacting children’s lived citizenship. The findings expand the literature on lived citizenship by providing evidence on how children in their early years contribute to the wellbeing of their societies (not only their families, but also at the community level). Further discussion about the links between care and lived citizenship is also provided. Contribution on methodological considerations includes the importance of being aware of researcher’s emotions and subconscious reactions during data collection, as well as in the process of data analysis.

This research has implications for policies and practice in the area of early childhood. The findings highlight the need to encourage children to recognise risks and learn how to face them in the cities where they live, in order to be able to move about independently and safely. Therefore, the evidence suggests that there is a need to ensure conditions for children that allow them to take risks, but still be protected to a certain extent. This is particularly relevant in places with natural hazards, to minimise the risk of injury. The results indicate that it is necessary to promote free play and spaces where children can socialise among peers, without the direct intervention of adults. The findings on how children perceive the floods, as well as their contributions to prevention, response and recovery measures, could help to develop strategies that actively involve children in mitigating the risks of natural
hazards. The findings of this research provide evidence on the importance of including children’s perceptions and needs in the urban design, to make cities more appropriate and that respond to what children need to exercise their rights. The study also lays the groundwork for future research, including the need to explore further membership (identity and belonging) and care as key elements of lived citizenship.
Lay summary

Citizenship is usually associated with a legal status of membership to a nation state. Sociocultural definitions of the concept expand the understanding of citizenship to explore the diverse ways of being and act as citizens. Regarding children, due to conceptual and sociocultural beliefs, their recognition as citizens is challenging, and adult society usually tends to perceive them as “future citizens” or “partial citizens”.

Because of the difference between being a citizen as a status and the daily experience of citizenship, scholars suggest the study of Lived citizenship, that relates to how people give meaning and negotiate their rights, participations, responsibilities and membership in their contexts. By exploring the children’s lived citizenship, researchers can understand the daily construction of children’s citizenship, the contradictions and resistance, as well as the different kinds of expression of children’s citizenship.

Based on the literature review, this study sought to explore the lived citizenship in early childhood in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru. To address the research aim, I undertook a qualitative research, and I collected the data over a nine-month period, using ethnographic research techniques, which allowed me to obtain ‘thick’ data on children’s experiences of lived citizenship. I conducted participatory observation at the pre-school located in the neighbourhood, children’s houses, and public spaces. I also conducted semi-structured interviews with children and adults, including caregivers and government workers. The study followed the ethical considerations to ensure respect to both participant’s and researcher rights and dignity as well as to guarantee their wellbeing.

This research found three expressions of children’s lived citizenship: (1) children appropriated and become familiar with their spaces, by exploring, playing and taking moments to rest; (2) children performed citizen actions, including taking care of themselves, others and animals; and (3) children enacted their citizenship through transgressing social norms to enforce their rights. Social norms refer to those shared
beliefs about what is a typical (normal) and appropriate (approved) behaviour. In the case of children some shared beliefs about how children must behave limits the practice of their rights, for instance the social norms that say that children must obey their elders limit children’s right to express their opinions freely.

The research found that while adult caregivers recognised children’s participation in fostering the wellbeing of family members, children’s contribution to the economic activities of the family and in recovery and response activities in relation to the flooding season were overlooked. In addition, while adult caregivers and governmental workers recognised children’s as bearers of rights, there were some geographical limitations as well as limitations imposed by caregivers on the exercising of children’s rights. For example, regarding the right to play and to move around public spaces, girls and younger children were perceived by adults as having less skills to face the risks; hence, they were more limited in their outdoor play.

This study provides evidence on the importance of risky play by children, as well as taking moments to rest, to practice rights, participation and responsibilities. The findings provide evidence on how children in their early years contribute to the wellbeing of their societies (not only their families, but also at the community level). Contribution on methodological considerations includes the importance of being aware of researcher’s emotions and subconscious reactions during data collection, as well as in the process of data analysis.

This research has implications for policies and practice in the area of early childhood. The findings highlight the need to encourage children to recognise risks and learn how to face them in the cities where they live, in order to be able to move about independently and safely. Therefore, the evidence suggests that there is a need to ensure conditions for children that allow them to take risks, but still be protected to a certain extent. The results indicate that it is necessary to promote free play and spaces where children can socialise among peers, without the direct intervention of adults. The findings on how children perceive the floods, as well as their contributions to prevention, response and recovery measures, could help to develop strategies that
actively involve children in mitigating the risks of natural hazards. The findings of this research provide evidence on the importance of including children’s perceptions and needs in the urban design, to make cities more appropriate and that respond to what children need to exercise their rights. The study also lays the groundwork for future research, including the need to explore further membership (identity and belonging) and care as key elements of lived citizenship.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

"Mucha gente pequeña en lugares pequeños, haciendo cosas pequeñas, pueden cambiar el mundo." [Many small people in small places, doing small things, can change the world.]

Eduardo Galeano, Latin American author

1.1. Research background

This project seeks to explore lived citizenship in early childhood in an urban flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru. Throughout history, citizenship has been a key concept in democracy, particularly regarding the inclusion (or exclusion) of minority groups (Isin & Turner, 2002; López, 1997; Moosa-Mitha, 2005). Normative and legalistic understandings of citizenship link the concept to legal status, that is membership of a nation state, whereas sociocultural understandings focus “less on legal rules and more on norms, practices, meanings, and identities” (Isin & Turner, 2002, p. 4). Sociocultural definitions reconsider the universalistic and homogeneous normative concept to include ‘differences’ (in terms of culture, gender, age, and so forth), in recognition of the diverse ways of being and acting as a citizen.

Post-modernisation and globalisation processes, as well as political events and trends worldwide, have led us to discuss more inclusive and ‘different-centred’ notions of citizenship. In Latin America, for instance, the return to democracy in the 1980s, after various dictatorial regimes, by many countries of the region demanded new understandings of citizenship that included the plurality and cultural heterogeneity of societies (Bello, 2009). Debates from environmental, cultural, and feminist points of view, among others, have contributed important ideas for the development of inclusive notions of citizenship, including the citizenship of some commonly excluded groups such as indigenous people, women, and children.

Regarding children, as there is an under-recognition of children as agents in their own right (Cockburn, 2017), they have been largely absent from the citizenship discourses.
Due to adult-centric and sociocultural beliefs, society tends to perceive them as either ‘future citizens’ or ‘partial citizens’. Childhood scholars agree on the need for a sociocultural concept of citizenship to explore the daily construction of children’s citizenship, the contradictions and resistance, as well as the different kinds of expression of children’s citizen (Cockburn, 2017; Larkins, 2014; Moosa-Mitha, 2005; Olsson, 2017; Warming & Fahnøe, 2017). In relation to this, the literature has put forward the concept of ‘lived citizenship’, which focuses on how individuals negotiate their citizenship in their daily experiences, including how children negotiate their citizenship in their daily life (Lister, 2007a).

As the literature review (in Chapter 2) shows, most of the discussions around children’s citizenship have focused on older children, and there has been a lack of research exploring the ways in which children in their early years experience citizenship. The research also tends to focus on children living in large urban areas, with little research on children in sub-urban areas. Considering these gaps, this research seeks to contribute, theoretically and practically, to understanding and promoting the lived citizenship of young children living in areas with challenging conditions, such as a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru.

As will be explained in the following chapters, the focus on a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru, responded to theoretical discussions, such as the lack of literature on children living in areas subject to slow-onset emergencies, like floods. It is worth mentioning here that, in addition to academic curiosity, I was motivated to conduct this research by my work in the field of childhood and risk management, as I elaborate on in the next section.

1.2. Previous experiences and practices

My interest in exploring children’s citizenship emerged from my academic and professional experience within the field of early childhood development, children’s rights, and disaster risk management in Peru. Throughout my career, I have had the privilege of working for governmental and academic institutions in implementing interventions in places affected by natural hazards. For example, I worked in an area
affected by the 2007 earthquake in Peru, the seasonal floods in Amazonian Peru in 2015–2016, and the floods caused by the El Niño phenomena in 2017. My role in these interventions was to support the socio-emotional recovery of children after such events. During these roles, I witnessed that despite the challenging situation of living in such settings, children, including those in their early years had a range of capacities that allowed them to positively influence the transformation of their context, however, both adults and the children themselves seemed to overlook this fact.

There were three key moments that made me decide to research citizenship in early childhood in an area affected by disasters. First was my experience of working and researching in an area affected by the 2007 earthquake in Peru. During this time, I worked for an academic institution in a project that sought to contribute to the reconstruction of infrastructure and psychosocial recovery of a human settlement affected by the earthquake. My role focused on working with children, but I also collaborated on some activities with adults. In parallel, I started my study for my Masters in Community Psychology, and I wrote my masters dissertation on child participation in the same settlement.

During this time, I witnessed that children had opinions and proposals for the reconstruction of their village. They also complained about how adults did not listen to them or include their proposals and ideas in the daily decisions made by their families or in the infrastructure reconstruction of the settlement. I also noticed that the children participated more actively than the adults in the meetings and were more courageous when making proposals. In my understanding, they seemed to show a more active and committed citizenship to improve the living conditions in the settlement. The adults, on the contrary, showed a more passive attitude and it was difficult to engage them in activities. This made me question how we could promote the active citizenship of children and keep it alive, so that they did not adopt the passive attitude that I observed in the adults.
A second moment was when I was working for the government, implementing a play-based project to contribute to psychosocial recovery after a flood that had affected a city in Amazonian Peru. Although I am Peruvian, I was born in a different area and this experience made me realise that I had some gaps in my academic and professional knowledge on Amazonian Peru. On that occasion, the children and adolescents involved in the intervention taught me about the place and local customs. I noticed that when they talked about their neighbourhood, they did so with emotion, especially when they showed me the river and its animals. However, they also had opinions and concerns about the challenging conditions. Unlike the earthquake, children had to live with flood for a few months every year. This made me question how living in an area with seasonal floods influenced the exercise of rights by children and their participation.

In this experience, I met a group of adolescents who lived in these areas and who were involved in carrying out campaigns to prevent violence against children. Some of the activities were supported by an institution, but others were self-managed by the adolescents. As in the previous experience, I was fascinated by their commitment to enhancing the wellbeing of others and I thought about what would be needed to promote such skills in other children.

Finally, in 2017, I was part of a team in charge of the design of public policies on early childhood, I identified that it was difficult for adults (and even for some members of the team) to recognise young children as rights holders, with the ability to contribute to their societies. Therefore, it was challenging to include policies that aimed at enhancing citizen competences among this age group.

All of this increased my interest in knowing more about the citizenship of children in their early years, and particularly among those living in challenging areas, such as flood-prone areas in Amazonian Peru.

1.3. Scope of the research

This research aims to explore lived citizenship in early childhood in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru. The following research questions were posed to address this aim:
Q.1. In what ways do children experience their lived citizenship in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru?

Q.2. In what ways do adults (families and communities\(^1\)) promote or limit citizenship in early childhood in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru?

To answer the research questions, I collected qualitative data through a 9-month ethnographic study in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru. This study involved participant observation in a pre-school, children’s homes, and public spaces in a neighbourhood in Amazonian Peru. I also interviewed children, adult caregivers, government workers and other key actors in the neighbourhood.

To choose the fieldwork location, I followed Rossman (2012), who asserts that the fieldwork location should have a mix of processes, people, programmes, interactions, and structures of interest. I chose the Amazonian Peru, due to its geographical characteristics, such as the annual cycle of the rivers, mixed with the deficient disaster risk management policies, which increase the probability of floods in the region. Further, Amazonian Peru has a rich indigenous legacy and environmental dynamics, coexisting with high levels of poverty and challenging living conditions. To select the specific fieldwork location, I interviewed government workers to identify the most appropriate place (see Chapter 3). I included children from three to five-years-old from the pre-school located in the neighbourhood.

1.4. Definition of terms

The chapter 2 presents and discusses the main conceptual debates underpinning this PhD research, however, this section presents useful definitions of key terms frequently used in this thesis.

- *Children, adolescents, and early childhood*: Following the definitions used in Peruvian policies, I used the term ‘children’ to refer to persons

---

\(^1\) In this research the understanding of ‘community’ follows the conceptualisation of the ecological model, which defines it as where school, work places and neighbourhood are placed, as defined by Krug, Dahlberg, Anthony, and Lozano (2002).
from when they were conceived until they are 12-years-old and ‘adolescents’ to refer to persons from 13 until 18-years of age (Código de los niños y adolescentes ACT N° 27337). I used ‘early childhood’ to refer to the first stage of life from zero to five-years-old (MIMP, 2012).

- **Neighbourhood:** The ‘neighbourhood’ referred to the peri-urban area in which children lived and undertook their usual activities.

- **Adult-caregiver:** The term ‘adult-caregiver’ was used broadly to refer to the person in charge of the child’s care and upbringing. During the fieldwork, I identified that this role was undertaken mainly by women in the study area, including mothers, older sisters, grandmothers and aunts. In some cases, it included male caregivers, such as fathers and grandfathers.

### 1.5. Structure of this thesis

Following this chapter, which introduces the research and presents the research questions, in Chapter 2 I present the relevant theoretical perspectives for this research, including recent debates on the research on citizenship in early childhood, including in disaster prone areas, as well as the gaps. I begin by exploring the existing literature on the concepts of citizenship, including seminal works, and outlining ongoing debates that open a path to understanding citizenship as a sociocultural and inclusive concept, rather than a mere legal status. I then discuss children’s citizenship, outlining the theoretical debates and exploring what is children’s citizenship, before introducing the concept of ‘lived citizenship’. This discussion existing theoretical debates, spotlighting contributions of Latin American Studies in understanding citizenship. The next section provides an overview of the living conditions of children in the Amazonia Peru and places affected by climate-related emergencies, such as flood-prone areas. The chapter is concluded by pulling out the key considerations into a broad aim and specific research questions for this project.

In Chapter 3, I describe and justify the research design to address the research aim. I begin by discussing the ontological and epistemological approach that shaped the
choice of ethnographic methods. I then set out the methodological choices (location site, sample population, research duration) and the process of data collection, including the justification for the location site, population sample, and duration, as well as the sampling for each method and the steps I follow during fieldwork. I also provide a detailed explanation on how I managed and analyse the data. In the subsequent section I discuss the ethical considerations, including guidelines for participants’ roles and involvement, for obtaining participants’ consent, for minimising possible harm, and for ensuring participants’ privacy and confidentiality, as well as respect for the cultural and social context. To conclude the chapter, I share my reflections on how my position as a researcher and my relationship with the children who participated in the study influenced the research process.

In Chapter 4, I present the fieldwork setting. I provide an overview of the main features of the neighbourhood to provide the reader with the necessary information to better understand the findings. This chapter includes information provided by the participants and data from institutional reports.

Chapter 5, 6 and 7 present the findings of this study. In Chapter 5, I explore how children become familiar with their neighbourhood. I explain and discuss that children learn about their context, including the risks, weather dynamics and characteristics of the Amazonian region, while exploring, playing, and resting outdoors, usually with other children and without the direct intervention of adults. I discuss how these activities provide children with opportunities to relate to and use their spaces, as well as to exercise their citizenship rights. I also look at how exploring, playing and taking moments to rest can contribute to the development of their identity as Amazonian citizens. In this chapter, I go on to explain how children learn about the geographical and social risks in their neighbourhood, as well as their own needs and those of others—knowledge that contributes to them being able to enact their lived citizenship, as explained in Chapters 6 and 7.

Chapter 6 discusses how children perform their citizenship by contributing to the wellbeing and sustainability of others, including their families and community. In the
first part of the chapter, I analyse how children care for themselves and others in their neighbourhood. I discuss how children contribute to fostering wellbeing by helping others meet their physical and emotional needs, and by participating in household chores and family economy. I analyse how children care and display actions that enhance the ability of others to face risks and meet their needs. In the second part, I describe and discuss children’s actions to take care of animals and participate in risk management procedures regarding the flooding season.

In Chapter 7, I analyse how children transgress (adult) social norms to face the and limitations on their citizen rights. I discuss examples of individual and collective transgressions, analysing why such acts should be understood as acts of citizenship.

I conclude the thesis in Chapter 8 by presenting a summary of the findings and answering the research questions. I also present the contributions of this research to the academic literature on lived citizenship, risk management and climate change, social norms in early childhood, and research methods with children, including the implication for policy and practice, as well as for future research.
Chapter 2. Literature review

Citizenship has been widely debated from different perspectives, including those who define it simply as a legal status and those who discuss a sociocultural understanding of citizenship. Legalistic understandings of citizenship make it challenging to recognise some groups as citizens, such as women, indigenous people, and children. Due to conceptual and sociocultural beliefs around childhood, the recognition of children as citizens is challenging and adults usually tend to perceive them as ‘future citizens’. However, in childhood studies, the importance and relevance of the concept of children’s citizenship has grown, and its understanding has been widely debated, as has the concept of childhood itself (Invernizzi & Milne, 2005; Invernizzi & Williams, 2008).

This chapter sets out the main theoretical perspectives underpinning this research. In it, I provide a scholarly discussion of the key themes, recent debates, and gaps in the study of citizenship in young children. Firstly, in section 2.1, I give an overview of the seminal works and recent debates on the concept of citizenship. This section presents a rethinking of historical and legalistic understandings of citizenship, outlining debates that have opened a path to more inclusive and sociocultural ideas of citizenship. This is followed by section 2.2, which looks at the literature on children’s citizenship, focusing on conceptual discussions that have contributed to recognising children as citizens. As I will discuss throughout this chapter, supporters of the rethinking of traditional legalistic concepts of citizenship, propose defining citizenship as a sociocultural concept, rather than merely a legal status. To do so, scholars, such as Lister (2007a) and Warming & Fahnøe (2017) put forward the concept of ‘lived citizenship’, which focuses on people’s daily experiences of citizenship. In section 2.3, I present the theoretical framework of the lived citizenship approach and outline some of the issues. As this research focuses on children living in an urban flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru, the last section provides an
overview of the literature on the living conditions of children in such settings followed by a theoretical discussion. In section 2.5, I conclude by drawing out the key considerations into a broad aim and specific research questions for this thesis. Throughout all the sections in this chapter, I highlight the contributions of studies conducted in Latin American to the understanding of citizenship, particularly children’s citizenship.

2.1. Debates on citizenship

Citizenship is a contested concept that emerged among Western scholars and has expanded broadly into other contexts, including the Latin American region. The current theoretical understandings of citizenship are the result of discussions from different perspectives, including classic models of citizenship as well as modern conceptions. This section provides an overview of historical and contemporary debates on the concept of citizenship.

2.1.1. Classical and modern debates

Etymologically and historically, the concept of citizenship relates to belonging to a city and a state. The earliest classic understanding of citizenship dates back to ancient Rome and Greece, where “to be a citizen it was necessary to be a male aged 20 or over, of known genealogy as being born to an Athenian citizen family, to be a patriarch of a household, a warrior possessing the arms and ability to fight, and a master of the labour of others notably slaves” (Bellamy, 2008, p. 37). According to this concept, age, gender, origin, and class determined an individual’s eligibility to be a citizen and, thus, excluded some groups like women, immigrants, and children.

Theoretical and practical discussions around the concept have overlooked the etymological weight of citizenship as belonging to states and have discussed the inclusion of civil, political, and social rights to rethink the citizenship of certain groups that were left out of the earliest understandings of citizenship. Historically, the emergence of the notion of human rights after the French Revolution was a key milestone in opening the debate around the concept.
Modern and contemporary conceptions of citizenship have been influenced by the seminal work of Marshall (1950). Marshall’s work set the foundations for a social democratic conception of citizenship (see López, 1997). He stated that citizenship “[…] is a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community. All who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed” (Marshall, 1950, pp. 28–29). In his analysis, citizenship has three elements: civil, political, and social. The civil element relates to those rights necessary for individual freedom, such as freedom of speech, independence of thought and faith, the right to own property, the right to enter into valid contracts, and the right to have access to justice. It also includes the right to work and to have employees.

Regarding the political element, Marshall talked of the right to exercise political power, including the right to participate in a governmental authority or a member of a constituency. In relation to the social element, he described a group of rights including the right to economic welfare and security, to share in social heritage, and to live as a civilised being, according to the standards prevailing in society. He stated that full citizenship is possible when citizens enjoy these three types of rights (Marshall, 1950).

While the literature recognises Marshall contribution as key because of the inclusion of social rights in the notion of citizenship, some authors believe that Marshal’s conception of citizenship still contains a strong association with nationality and the nation state (Moosa-Mitha, 2017). This association shapes the understanding of citizenship as a legal status, instead of a practice, which is the focus of current debates (Kymlicka & Norman, 1994; Moosa-Mitha, 2017; Warming, 2018). Kymlicka and Norman (1994) also pointed out the ‘passive’ nature of Marshall’s conception of citizenship, because of its emphasis on passive entitlements and the absence of obligation to participate in public life. Another issue raised is the universalistic notion of citizenship, which limits the recognition of sociocultural pluralism (Kymlicka & Norman, 1994; Tubino, 2008).
2.1.2. Contemporary debates

The revision of classic and modern concepts of citizenship has highly influenced contemporary academic and political debates around the recognition and redistribution of citizenship rights, especially those related to minorities, such as women, indigenous people (Isin & Turner, 2002; Lister, 2003, 2007b; Tubino, 2008) and, more recently, children. Although after the 1970s, global interest in citizenship studies declined, in the 1990s there was a resurgence of interest in understanding citizenship with the emergence of post-modernisation, globalisation and other political events and trends, such as nationalist movements in Eastern Europe (Isin & Turner, 2002; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994). In Latin America, the return to democracy after the mid-1980s, following various socio-political struggles against dictatorships, contributed greatly to the debate on citizenship in the region (Bello, 2009; Latta, 2014; Molyneux, 2001; Tubino, 2008). Sojo (2002) explains that the new democratic Latin American governments faced challenges with social demands due to the economic and political crises. Civil society demanded their governments provide egalitarian structures participate and to enforce their rights, particularly members of groups historically left out, such as indigenous people, women and young people living in peri-urban spaces (Sojo, 2002). As a contested concept, there is no single definition of citizenship (Lister, 2007b). The literature suggests that the contemporary debate on citizenship has not concluded. As Purcell points out, “accepted definitions of citizenship are being undermined and rethought” (2003, p. 565). Some of the common aspects of contemporary debates about citizenship include challenging the conception of citizenship as only related to legal status, and perceiving citizenship as a practice, with inclusive and differentiated citizenship, instead of a universalistic citizenship.

2.1.2.1. Beyond legal membership of nation states

Understanding citizenship as a legal status responds to the historically and semantically-grounded geographic notion of citizenship. The studies that support this definition focus on issues like naturalisation, immigration and deportation (Isin, 2009). However, current debates on citizenship opt for a definition that goes beyond
legal memberships of a nation state. Purcell says that citizenship has been “rescaled, reterritorialized, and reoriented” (2003, p. 566), due to political and social changes. He adds that a nation state's territorial sovereignty and loyalty to the nation state have been increasingly thrown open to question and that the creation of communities on various scales has weakened the conception of a national-scale political community as a hegemonic rule. As a result, the contemporary notion of citizenship has moved away from the nation as the predominant political community (Purcell, 2003). Warming and Fahnøe (2017) state that citizenship is contested, dynamic and constituted through power relations and flows of ideas and communication that extend beyond specific localities and link them to other places. In addition, other scholars suggest that despite the fact that individuals can be recognised as citizens by their states, enforcing their rights and obligations can be challenging, which is an area of concern (Sojo, 2002).

2.1.2.2. As a practice, rather than a status

Rethinking traditional views of citizenship involves understanding citizenship as a sociocultural concept and a relational and learning process, instead of merely a formal legal ‘status’ linked to being a member of a nation state (Delanty, 2003; Lister, 2007a; Warming & Fahnøe, 2017). A sociocultural definition of citizenship focuses “less on legal rules and more on norms, practices, meanings, and identities” (Isin & Turner, 2002, p. 4) and, as such, it envisions individuals enacting their citizenship in their daily lives through their rights, responsibilities, and identity shaping, including the emotional dimension of belonging (Warming, 2018).

The enacting of citizenship in daily life depends on the historical context and is located within relational dynamics (Ansión, Turbino, & Alfaro, 2007; Moosa-Mitha, 2005; Tubino, 2008). “Difference-centred scholars highlight that the assumption of the citizen as passively inheriting the rights of liberty and equality is simply not reflective of the lived experiences of citizens who are ‘different’” (Moosa-Mitha, 2005, p. 7). Gender, age, and class, among other things, often limit citizenship rights, for instance, the right to access social services (such as education or health) or the
right to vote. These limitations are also a concern of studies that explore citizenship as a practice, as will be discussed later.

Scholars involved in these debates propose the concept of ‘lived citizenship’, which allows us to explore how people enact their citizenship in their daily lives, by examining who is (and feels) included, excluded or marginalised (Hobson & Lister, 2002).

Understanding citizenship as a practice also recognises that individuals are not passive agents but take actions to claim and exercise their rights as citizens. Some authors refer to this process as the construction of ‘citizenship from below’ (Cussiánovich, 2010; Liebel, 2007; Tubino, 2008). López (1997) and Sojo (2002), in their discussions about the notions and practices of citizenship in Latin America, argue that citizenship is not merely a legal status granted by governments, but that, because of historical processes in the region, social movements play a key role in the construction of citizenship through obligations and responsibilities, as well by claiming rights.

2.1.2.3. As an inclusive and differentiated concept, rather than a universalistic one

As the practice of citizenship depends on sociocultural and political factors, among other things, the literature challenges homogeneous, ideal, and universalistic notions of citizenship, such as the one proposed by Marshall (1950). Marshall paints the “image of an ideal citizenship against which achievements can be measured and towards which aspirations can be directed” (1950, p. 29). In contrast, difference-centred scholars propose the study of the different ways of enacting and claiming citizenship, particularly by those groups commonly excluded or living under unequal conditions. Along this line, Moosa-Mitha add that supporters of difference-centred citizenship analyse the specific “socio-economic historical realities in which citizens’ lived experiences of oppression are situated” (2005, p. 4). Lister (2007a) points out that claims about the universalistic nature of citizenship have been questioned from the perspectives of a range of marginalised groups and nation state ‘outsiders’,
resulting in the conceptualisation of differentiated forms of citizenship. Intercultural, environmental, and feminist approaches, as well as those working with children, have influenced the rethinking of traditional concepts, opening the way for a more inclusive understanding of citizenship.

Literature on intercultural citizenship claims that universal interpretations of citizenship promote an interpretation of ‘equity’ that promotes cultural homogeneity and that strongly emphasises individual rights over include collective rights (Ansión et al., 2007; Tubino, 2008). According to Tubino (2008), such universalistic understandings are against the world view of indigenous people. Intercultural scholars argue that an inclusive and differentiated-centred conceptualisation of citizenship allows us to include cultural and ethnic differences in understanding and practising citizenship rights and responsibilities.

The feminist approach addresses the gender blindness of the modern concept of citizenship. In contrast to the traditional universalistic and male-centred approach, feminist scholars argue for an inclusive and differentiated citizenship that reflects the different ways in which women understand and practice their citizenship (Hobson & Lister, 2002; Lister, 2007a; Molyneux, 2001). To do so, this approach reinterprets the traditional idea about the public-private divide, in which the public space is the only space for citizen participation, and recognises the ‘female roles’ of caring and nurturing as citizen actions (Barrientos & Muñoz, 2014; Jelin, 1997; Molyneux, 2001).

The environmental approach seeks to revise the anthropocentric view of the universalistic approach. It rethinks the relationship between nature, citizen participation and public policies (Latta & Wittman, 2010). Environmental citizenship encompasses the idea of embedded justice, which refers to our everyday reasoning and the actions we take to enhance equality and fairness (Hayward, 2020). Embedded justice not only includes the responsibilities and obligations to others who we may not ever know, because they are distant from us in either time or place, but also requires us to consider the rights of future generations and non-human entities (Hayward, 2020). As with the feminist perspective, the ‘care’ aspect is an important
part of the construction of citizen identity, because it implies the care of natural
resources as an expression of the individual and collective concerns and duties in society
(Curtin, 2002; Lister, 2007a).

As will be discussed in the next sub-section, childhood scholars have also contributed
to the discussion of a more inclusive understanding of citizenship. In Latin America,
discussions from the protagonist (progatonismo) paradigm have influenced the
debate. This paradigm arose in the 1970s as a criticism of historically paternalistic
policies by the Working Children and Adolescents’ Movement (NAT) in Latin America
and is based discussions on their organisational development and claim to
recognition as social subjects of rights (Alfageme, Cantos, & Martínez, 2003;
as a sociocultural construct and children as products and producers of their society.
In this understanding, the most suitable way to protect children is to ensure that they
are recognised as social actors, in an individual and collective sense (Alfageme et al.,
2003; Cussiánovich, 2006). This paradigm rejects the idea of children as ‘future
citizens’ or ‘partial citizens’, and proposes that children be recognised as having the
same rights as adults; for instance, the right to participate in political decisions
(Cussiánovich & Márquez, 2002; Liebel, 2009). Supporters of this paradigm state that
citizenship is not only an individual learning process, but a relational concept, as it
implies the recognition of the ‘other’ as an equal protagonist (Cussiánovich, 2010).
Liebel (2003, 2007) states that children can be citizens, because they have the
capacity to participate not only in children’s matters, but in all aspects of society, and
that they are protagonists at different levels, such as in their daily lives and practices,
at an institutional level, as well as a spontaneous or organised level.

Practical and theoretical discussions challenge the traditional understanding of
citizenship as a privileged status related to belonging to a nation state and propose
redefining citizenship as a sociocultural concept. This permits us to explore
citizenship as a practice, one that depends on the historical context and is
constructed within relational dynamics. Rethinking the universalistic and
homogeneous normative aspects of the concept opens the way for the inclusion of
‘differences’ (in terms of culture, gender, age, and so forth) in the diverse ways of acting and being a citizen.

2.1.3. Section conclusion and gaps

This section presented the roots of the concept of citizenship, which are found in ancient Greek and Roman societies. This historical definition has a strong focus on legal membership, in which age, gender and class determined a person’s eligibility for the status of citizen. As such, this definition excluded some groups, such as children and women, from being recognised as citizens. This section also presented the key contribution of Marshall to our understanding of citizenship, particularly to the discussion of social citizenship, as he included social rights in the notion of citizenship. Since then, contemporary debates have led us to recognise that citizenship is not only about the status given by a nation state, is a practice that is shaped by the historical and contextual conditions in place where the individual resides. Environmental, cultural and feminist approaches have contributed important ideas to the development of a more inclusive notion of citizenship, opening a path for discussing children’s citizenship. However, the recognition of children as citizen is still contentious and most debates still have a strong focus on adult citizenship. Hence, it is worth exploring further how the interplay among culture, gender, and environmental sustainability, among other things, shapes children’s experiences of citizenship.

2.2. Children’s citizenship

During the past few decades, the recognition of the concept of children’s citizenship has grown within the scholarly arena, showing a "strong commitment toward thinking about and improving the place of children in contemporary society” (Invernizzi & Milne, 2005, p. 1). While rethinking the universalistic, ethnocentric and male-centred understanding of citizenship permits the inclusion of some groups, the recognition of children as citizens is particularly contentious (Cussiánovich, 2006). Without denying the legal dimension of citizenship, childhood scholars call for a sociocultural and difference-centred approach that considers children’s individual
and social characteristics and needs, and responds to the diversity of each context (Alfageme et al., 2003; Cussiánovich, 2006; Invernizzi & Williams, 2007; Lister, 2007b, 2007c; Moosa-Mitha, 2005). In addition, scholars have addressed not only whether or not children can be citizens, but also what the concept and practices of children’s citizenship mean (e.g., Cockburn, 2013; Hill & Tisdall, 1997; Kallio, Wood Elisabeth, & Hämäläinen, 2020; Larkins, 2014; Liebel, 2012; Lister, 2007b). This section starts by setting out the recent debates on the recognition of children as citizens. This is followed by a literature review about the conceptual framework of children’s citizenship.

2.2.1. Theoretical debates

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) (UN General Assembly, 1990) is a crucial instrument in the recognition of children as ‘beings’. In Article 7, it establishes that children have the right to birth registration, through which they acquire a nationality. According to Jaap (2007), this is a justification for recognising children as citizens, in the present and from the moment since birth if we are to consider citizenship as membership of a nation state. However, in order to recognise children as citizens it is important to go beyond the legal recognition of their membership, but to consider the legal, individual and social consequences of such recognition (Cussiánovich, 2006). Besides, not all children and all societies recognise registration at birth and the provision of nationality as mandatory (Jaap, 2007). In fact, much research focuses, for example, on the struggle of migrants and refugees (including migrant and refugee children, as well as the children of refugees born in the host country who might not have legal status) for recognition as citizens (e.g., Fichtner & Trần, 2020; Finell, Olakivi, Liebkind, & Lipsanen, 2013).

While there have been significant improvements in the recognition of children as social actors, traditional adult-centric views, as well as vertical power relationships between children and adults, make it difficult for them to be recognised as citizens (Alfageme et al., 2003; Invernizzi & Williams, 2007; Lay-Lisboa, Araya-Bolvarán, Marabolí-Garay, Olivero-Tapia, & Santander-Andrade, 2018; Lister, 2007b). Adult society tends to deny children citizenship, or perceive them as ‘future citizens’ or
‘partial citizens’. This responds to common beliefs around childhood that see children as lacking the competencies needed for adult citizenship, such as social and economic independence, as well as lacking sufficient experience to undertake (political) responsibilities in public spaces (Alfageme et al., 2003; Cussiánovich, 2006; James, 2011; James, Curtis, & Birch, 2007; Lister, 2007b, 2008).

Societies usually define and measure citizenship using adult standards (Moosa-Mitha, 2005) and attribute non-adult characteristic, such as irrational and immature behaviour, to children. These beliefs shape the understanding of children as ‘future citizens’ or ‘partial citizens’. Societies tend to focus on children's education towards them being a future citizen and raise concern about protecting them from public harm and formulate strategies to ensure their health and welfare (Cockburn, 2013; Cussiánovich, 2010). For instance, in Marshall’s traditional understanding of citizenship, children are future citizens because, although they attended school, the social right to education was not a citizenship right for children to be educated, but “the right of adult citizens to have been educated” [emphasis added] (1950, p. 5). From this perspective, children cannot be recognised as citizens, because they do not have the same civil and political rights as adults, and they do not have the same responsibilities to society. For example, in many societies they cannot participate in the political process.

The notion of children as vulnerable beings with no ability to contribute to their societies relates to the common assumptions that children are dependant and irrational (Cockburn, 1998; Hill & Tisdall, 1997; Moosa-Mitha, 2005). Children’s economic and physical dependency hinders their recognition as full human beings (Alfageme et al., 2003; Cockburn, 2017; Cussiánovich, 2006; James et al., 2007; James, 2011). Liebel (2007) demands that children’s influence be recognised “not only in ‘children's affairs’ but also in all matters affecting the present and future of societies” (2007, p. 34). Childhood scholars (e.g., Cockburn, 1998; Cussiánovich, 2009; Lister, 2007b; Moosa-Mitha, 2005) also advocate for the need to highlight the interdependence of children and their societies, instead of only dependency. Young
(1998), from a feminist perspective, suggests differentiating two meanings of independence: independence as autonomy, which means being able to make choices and act on those choices, and independence as self-sufficiency, which means not needing external help or support. The author explains that in order to be a citizen, the autonomy to make and act upon one’s decision is what really matters.

As Moosa-Mitha (2005) discusses, difference-centred theorists challenge the notion of citizenship in which there is a normative way to participate as citizens, which usually relates to participation in public spaces. In addition to the perception of children as lacking citizen competencies, society tends to exclude them from the public sphere, assigning them to private and informal spaces (Kallio et al., 2020; Lister, 2003, 2008; Wood, 2020), which “serves to perpetuate [the idea of] young people as citizens in waiting” (Wood, 2020, p. 389). However, the evidence suggests that children’s interdependence with their families, communities and societies is enacted in their daily experience. They are constantly participating in different parts of community life, such as through their households and the care of others (Alderson, 2007; Cockburn, 2017; Jans, 2004; Lister, 2007b, 2007c), as well as through child labour and politics (e.g., enforcing their rights) (Alfageme et al., 2003; Espinosa, 2018; Figueroa, 2016). As mentioned previously, Liebel (2003, 2007) argues that children are citizens because of their capacity to participate not only in children’s matters, but in all issues and at all levels.

Despite the fact that ongoing debates have opened a path to recognise children as citizens in the present (not in the future), most of the existing research focuses on older children and adolescents; children under the age of seven or those who have not developed their linguistics skills enough to express themselves are largely absent from discussions on citizenship (Baraldi & Cockburn, 2018; Cockburn, 2020). However, the existing evidence suggests that despite the fact that children in their early years are more dependent on adults than older children, they can express their needs and contribute in diverse ways (Alderson, 2007; Alderson, Hawthorne, & Killen, 2005; Cockburn, 1998; Fichtner & Trân, 2020; Lansdown, 2005; Phillips, 2010). For instance, parents can learn from their toddlers how to raise their younger siblings,
and educators are constantly learning from children’s participation in public institutions (Liebel, 2007). Even in adverse contexts, such as emergency settings, children show great capacity in terms of preparedness, response, and the rehabilitation of their environment (Arrunátegui, 2018; Bartlett, 2008; Berse, 2017; Martin, 2011; Mort, Walker, Williams, & Bingley, 2018; Padilla & Rivera-Holguín, 2015).

2.2.2. What is children’s citizenship?

As mentioned, there is no single definition of citizenship, rather the existing literature suggests a multi-layered definition. In the case of children’s citizenship, definitions usually include the following:

- Recognition and enforcement of children’s rights (see Cockburn, 1998; Delanty, 2007; James, 2011; Lister, 2007b; Novella, Agud, Llena, & Trilla, 2004)
- Recognition and promotion of the participation of children in their closest surroundings and wider communities (see Percy-Smith, 2020; Cook, Whitzman, & Tranter, 2015; Hart, 1992; Liebel, 2007; Lister, 2007b; Westwood, Larkins, Moxon, Perry, & Thomas, 2014)
- Recognition of children as having the ability to undertake responsibilities within their community (see Cockburn, 2017; Espinosa, 2018; Liebel, 2003, 2007; Lister, 2007b)
- Recognition of children as equal members of society (see Cockburn, 2017; Fichtner & Trân, 2020; Lister, 2007b; Novella et al., 2004; Yuval-Davis, 2007)

Hence, rights, participation, responsibilities, and equal membership are the most common dimensions of children’s citizenship.

From Marshall’s approach up to the current conceptualisations of citizenship, rights have been a central component. In the case of children’s rights, the UNCRC recognised children as social subjects of rights in political and academic discourse. This framework set out the civil, political, economic, social, health and cultural rights of children. Without denying the importance of this contribution, scholars,
particularly from the Global South, suggest the need to rethink the Western approach in the UNCRC, towards a more contextualised framework in order to respond to the cultural and social diversity of each context (Cussiánovich, 2009, 2010).

Participation is another a crucial element of citizenship. The UNCRC contemplates a group of rights related to children’s participation, including children’s right to express their ideas and to seek, receive and disseminate information. In addition, it considers children’s right to be heard and to give an opinion on the issues that concern them (UN General Assembly, 1990). Liebel (2007) advocates for including children not only in children’s affairs, but in all matters of society. From an environmental perspective, young children must have the right to be involved and contribute to the sustainability of their societies, especially in spaces highly affected by climate change (Berse, 2017; Hägglund & Johansson, 2014). The protagonist paradigm proposes that participation should "aim to express, develop, and strengthen the collective and personal experience of being a protagonist in the citizen practice" (Cussiánovich, 2009, p. 222). Citizenship participation also implies that children and young people have the right to challenge adult-centric constructions of childhood and social justice (Westwood et al., 2014).

Equal Membership relates to the relationship between individuals and the spaces that they inhabit; the term refers not only to a legal status, but also encompasses social and subjective aspects. Some authors, such as Cussiánovich (2010) and Novella et al. (2004), link membership to identity as a citizen. In addition to legal recognition, identity includes subjective and learnt processes expressed in discourses and citizen practices (Ocampo Talero, París, & Delgado, 2008). Another dimension of membership relates to the sense of belonging and being recognised as an equal and active member of society (Lister, 2008; Velázquez, 2007). From an environmental citizenship perspective, belonging refers also to the bond with the local community and the relationship with the world in the present, as well as with ancestors and descendants (Hägglund & Johansson, 2014).
The last element that many authors agree on is *responsibilities*. Lister (2008) establishes a difference between two aspects of children’s duties: responsibilities defined by the laws of each state and those that are exercised by choice. Societies usually attribute responsibilities to children taking into account various factors, such as age, and in line with beliefs about children’s autonomy. As the literature highlights, societies have contradictory ways of assigning responsibilities and recognising children as competent citizens who can fulfil those responsibilities (James et al., 2007; Jans, 2004).

Despite there being some agreement about the dimensions of children’s citizenship, childhood scholars recognise citizenship as a sociocultural, contextual and relational concept, hence, children experience such dimensions in different ways depending on individual and societal features (James, 2011; Lister, 2007b, 2007c; Olsson, 2017). There are also different opinions about if these aspects should be equal to or different than the aspects of adult citizenship (see Hill & Tisdall, 1997; Jans, 2004; Moosa-Mitha, 2005; Roche, 2005). Other scholars debate if children’s citizenship needs children’s structures, or if it can be developed in an inclusive process with adults (Invernizzi & Milne, 2005; Liebel, 2007; Lister, 2008). The literature contains at least three models of children’s citizenship: the incremental model, a ‘child-size’ model, and an inclusive and differential model.

The first model is a developmental model: as children grow older, the incremental development of their capacities over time allows them to gain more space to act as citizens (Cockburn, 2013). The premise underpinning this incremental model is that children need to learn how to practise their rights and responsibilities, and, for this to happen, they have to engage in collaborative activities with others with more experience and abilities than they have (Hart, 1992).

Recognising the difference between children and adults, the ‘child-size’ or partial model suggests that citizenship is a learning process and children’s citizenship must be distinctive from adults’ citizenship (Jans, 2004; Roche, 1999). Although diverse sociocultural aspects influence the conceptualisation of childhood, there are some
aspects that all children share, such as the need for special rights (Roche, 1999), protection and play, which makes it difficult to assign them the same rights and responsibilities as adults (Jans, 2004). Similarly, Cohen proposes the term ‘semi citizenship, recognising that children already occupy “a middle ground; they are citizens by certain standards and not by others” (p. 234), because of their inability to fulfil traditional criteria of citizenship, such as their lack of political independence.

Meanwhile, other scholars (see Cussiánovich, 2009; Liebel, 2007; Lister, 2007a, 2008; Moosa-Mitha, 2005) support the idea of an inclusive and differential citizenship, which has its roots in the feminist approach and the analysis of inclusionary-exclusionary tensions of minority groups, particularly in the Global South, as reviewed earlier (Barrientos & Muñoz, 2014; Lister, 2007a; Molyneux, 2001). Despite the agreement that children should not be seen as adults, in this perspective the differences between them should not be an obstacle to their equal participation (Liebel, 2007, 2012; Moosa-Mitha, 2005). Hence, inclusive citizenship considers recognising children as members of their societies, on the “basis of a ‘social difference’” (Liebel, 2007, p. 38). As mentioned previously, historically citizenship has been understood from the perspective of the dominant group (Isin & Turner, 2002), in this case, the adults. Difference-centred citizenship allows us to define children’s citizenship without referencing adults’ standards of children’s rights (Moosa-Mitha, 2005). Without denying the legalistic dimension of citizenship, this approach allows us to consider the construction of citizenship ‘from below’ in daily practice, instead of following adult-centric normative standards (Liebel, 2012). In this understanding, citizenship is a learning process; however, in contrast to models that understand citizen education as the gradual construction of citizenship, Liebel (2007) states that the learning process happens in the present and within a relational process among children and adults. In fact, this approach invites us to promote ‘co-protagonism’ between adults and children (Cussiánovich, 2009). As a relational concept, inclusive citizenship makes it possible to analyse the power relations (in terms of age, gender and so on) between adults and children, and among children themselves (Cussiánovich, 2009; Moosa-Mitha, 2005).
2.2.3. Section conclusion and gaps

This section has discussed current theoretical debates on children’s citizenship. Despite the significant improvements around the recognition of children as social actors, traditional views about what children are and what they can do, as well as the power relations between them and adults, make it difficult to recognise them as citizens (Alfageme et al., 2003; Invernizzi & Williams, 2008; James, 2011; Lister, 2007b). The tendency to associate children with non-adult citizen characteristics, such as being irrational and immature, still influence the understanding of children as ‘future citizens’ or ‘partial citizens’.

As was discussed, without denying the legal dimensions of citizenship, certain childhood scholars call for a sociocultural concept that considers children’s individual and social characteristics and needs, and to responds to the diversity of each context (Alfageme et al., 2003; Cussiánovich, 2006; Invernizzi & Williams, 2007; Lister, 2007b, 2008). Theoretical and practical debates by childhood scholars intend to answer discussions about why children should be citizens, what children’s citizenship means, and whether this concept should be the same as or different to adult citizenship. The literature reveals three different models of children’s citizenship: the incremental model, child-size model, and inclusive and differential model. As discussed, scholars who support the last model assert that citizenship is a daily construct and highlight the differential experiences of being a citizen (not only due to the age, but also gender and race). The literature provides significant contributions to discuss children’s citizenship, however, most of the research focuses on older children, leaving a gap in terms of citizenship in children in their early years for further study.

This research follows the premise, presented in this session, that children are actors with the capacity to be citizens and that children are interdependent with society, rather than only dependent. In line with the inclusive and differential model of citizenship discussed in the previous section, this research benefits from the recent debates by childhood scholars who suggest rethinking the traditional models and
looking at children’s citizenship as a sociocultural concept. Therefore, I argue that the inclusive and differential model of children’s citizenship is the most appropriate for this research, as it promotes exploration of the lived experience of citizenship as well as the contrast with the normative dimensions of citizenship.

2.3. Lived citizenship

There is a gap between the existence of legal citizen rights and realising them in practice; in other words, there is a significant difference between being a citizen (as a status) and acting like a citizen in daily life, including exercising the rights of a citizen (Lister, 2007a, 2007b, 2008). Thus, there is an increasing tendency to analyse citizenship in terms of the everyday experience of peoples (e.g., Delanty, 2003; Hall, Coffey, & Williamson, 2018; Larkins, 2014; Liebel, 2007, 2012; Lister, 2003, 2007b; Pettersson, 2012). For this purpose, supporters of inclusive citizenship have put forward the notion of ‘lived citizenship’ (Lister, 2003, 2007a). This section presents the theoretical framework and issues underpinning the concept of lived citizenship and explains its major contributions to understanding children’s daily experiences of citizenship. The second part discusses in more detail the common dimensions of lived citizenship, as discussed in the field of childhood studies.

2.3.1. What is lived citizenship?

Lived citizenship has been widely discussed, in both theory and practice, in a range of contexts. The body of literature includes research on children and youth (e.g., Fichtner & Trän, 2020; Larkins, 2014; Olsson, 2017; Trell & van Hoven, 2020; Westwood et al., 2014), religion (e.g., Rubin, Smilde, & Junge, 2014), migrants (Percy-Smith, 2020), social work (e.g., Warming & Fahnøe, 2017), and women (e.g., Lister, 2003). In this understanding, citizenship is contested, dynamic and constituted through power relations and the flow of ideas and communication, extending beyond specific localities and to other places (Warming & Fahnøe, 2017).

Lister (2007a) considers that lived citizenship relates to individuals’ subjective daily experiences and, therefore, understands it as how people give meaning to, and negotiate the components of, citizenship (e.g., rights, participation, membership) in
their contexts. This author states that lived citizenship underlines people’s agency in the construction of their environment in everyday experiences (Lister, 2003). Furthermore, it allows us to analyse the power relations that have resulted in discrimination against and the exclusion of some minority groups, including children (Lister, 2007a; Warming & Fahnøe, 2017).

Considering citizenship as a daily practice, rather than a static legal status, allows to understand citizenship as emerging from the multiple everyday interactions of people, understanding who is (and feels) included, excluded or marginalised, and recognising their contributions to their societies (Hobson & Lister, 2002; Wihstutz, 2017). Hence, lived citizenship implies the understanding of multiple forms of enacting and claiming citizenship rights and provides a lens through which to understand nuanced notions of citizenship as positioning and identity shaping (Baraldi & Cockburn, 2018).

The scholarly work on children’s lived citizenship recognises the various contributions of this concept to understanding children’s daily experiences. Scholars point that the lived citizenship approach extends our understanding of citizenship, as experienced, beyond its legalistic dimensions and allows us to explore citizenship as a social and continuous process (Kallio et al., 2020; Trell & van Hoven, 2020). Exploring citizenship beyond the legal framework allows us to recognise and make visible the different ways in which children enact their citizenship in their daily life and as a learning process (Cockburn, 2020; Lister, 2008). As such it also allows us to understand the diverse ways in which children act as citizens, thereby challenging the traditional understanding that perpetuates the idea of children as citizens only in the future (Larkins, Moxon, Perry, Thomas, & Westwood, 2014; Wood, 2020). The daily approach of lived citizenship enriches our understanding of citizenship, as experienced in the various contexts in which children live. In line with the feminist approach, it deepens our understanding and recognition of the practices of citizenship not only in public domains, but also in private spaces (Bonnesen, 2020; Wood, 2020). Furthermore, in addition to structural constraints, it draws attention to the various ways in which children contribute to their societies, as citizens in practice,
which raises questions about the traditional conception of children as passive agents and dependent on adults (Westwood et al., 2014).

As lived citizenship focuses on children’s daily practices, citizenship can vary depending on the setting where the processes take place. For instance, factors like ethnicity, gender and age could influence children’s lived citizenship (Moosa-Mitha, 2005, 2017; Pettersson, 2012). James (2011), for example, suggests highlighting generational relationships, because each society has established age-based divisions to attribute rights and responsibilities. The existing literature supports the idea that the younger the child, the more difficult it is to recognise them as citizens (Alderson et al., 2005; Alderson, 2007; Lansdown, 2005; Phillips, 2010). This is a major concern at this stage of a child’s development (Lansdown, 2005).

Children’s lived citizenship highlights the significance of children’s self-perception as social actors and citizens; it “draws attention to the possibility of social change and helps to identify shifts in the ways in which ideas about children’s competences and hence their citizenship status, might alter over time” (James, 2011, p. 172). As a relational concept, it also relates to how adults understand and attribute children’s agency and competencies (James, 2011). For instance, Phillips (2010), in her research with young children, found that adult discursive constructions about children and citizenship were a limitation on the practising of citizenship by children.

The lived citizenship approach has received increased attention; however, there are some aspects to consider for a further discussion, like the notion of ‘lived experiences’. Lived citizenship is based on the notion of lived experiences, which is an approach that has influenced discussions on different disciplines, such as the feminist, ethnographic studies (McIntosh & Wright, 2019), as well as childhood studies (Baraldi & Cockburn, 2018). While such an approach provides a framework to understand individuals’ subjectivities, McIntosh and Wright (2019) warn that the lived experience lens focuses attention on personal accounts of the ‘here and now’, instead of recognising how experiences are shaped by pre-existing discourses and influenced by social structures (Scott, 1992, cited in McIntosh & Wright, 2019).
Moosa-Mitha (2017) agrees that there is a need to understand the lived realities of citizenship; however, the author prefers to use the term ‘social citizenship’, rather than ‘lived citizenship’, “to draw attention to the material structures, such as systems of culture, economics and politics—not just subjective and individual experiences as forming a part of lived reality” (Moosa-Mitha, 2017, p. 227). The author highlights the need to be aware that subjects’ experiences are shaped by historical, sociocultural and other factors, and are not merely subjective experiences.

Scholars warn about the expansiveness and ambiguity of an inclusive and social concept of citizenship, more precisely, what counts and does not count as lived citizenship (e.g., Fichtner & Trần, 2020; Kallio et al., 2020; Larkins, 2014; Lay-Lisboa et al., 2018; Warming & Fahnøe, 2017; Wood, 2020). Kallio and colleagues (2020) point out that there is a risk that “lived citizenship [will] slip into ‘everything’ and therefore ‘nothing’” (Kallio et al., 2020, p. 723). These concerns are based on “the dangers of collapsing everything into the political” (Kallio et al., 2020, p. 723) or about the “the dangers of over-interpretation” (Fichtner & Trần, 2020, p. 176).

In their recent paper, Kallio et al. (2020) provide an insightful contribution to overcome such difficulties. These authors propose a conceptual framing of lived citizenship underpinned by four dimensions: spatial, intersubjective, performed, and affective. Such dimensions characterise the concept of lived citizenship and could further contribute to its analysis and exploration. According to these authors, the spatial relationship refers to the contextual aspect of lived citizenship and focuses on the established relationships between the individuals and their spaces. The intersubjective dimension draws attention to the relational aspects of citizenship. Citizenship takes place at the intersection of relationships between individuals with others, in the process of socialisation. The third dimension refers to the performative facet, and highlights the practices and actions related to citizenship. The affective dimension encompasses the feelings associated with the experiences of citizenship.

Together, the theoretical body of the relatively new concept of lived citizenship indicates that this is a more expansive and inclusive understanding of citizenship.
Acknowledging the daily experiences of children, in their contexts, prompts the rethinking of legal definitions of citizenship and highlights the need for more knowledge on the diverse ways of being and acting as citizens in practice. Childhood scholars have recognised the various advantages of the lived citizenship concept. For instance, it permits us to explore how factors like gender and age influence children’s daily citizen experiences. Regarding age, the literature shows that there is a gap in our understanding of the citizenship of children in the early years. While the literature highlights the important contributions of the concept of lived citizenship researchers also warn about the potential for over-interpretation and the imprecise use of the term.

2.3.2. Children’s lived citizenship

The literature suggests that most of the research on lived citizenship during childhood focuses on children’s actions of citizenship and on analysing citizenship in terms of children’s relationship with the spaces and places they inhabit.

2.3.2.1. As performed

Lived citizenship implies that citizenship emerges from the everyday interactions in which people perform, learn and experience citizenship in relational dynamics (Hobson & Lister, 2002). To understand how people act as citizens, Isin (2008, 2009) suggests exploring how subjects articulate and claim their rights. To do so, the author proposes analysing the rights (e.g., civil, political, social), scales (e.g., urban, regional, national), sites (e.g., bodies, streets, borders, media), and acts (e.g., voting, volunteering, protesting) through which individuals configure their citizenship.

Based on Isin work, Larkins (2014) advises that individuals enact their citizenship through ‘citizen actions’ and ‘acts of citizenship’. Individuals produce citizen actions when they act, within the given structures in their societies. Citizen actions are part of the existing practices that enable subjects to be citizens, the purpose of which is to contribute to the common good (Isin, 2008; Larkins; 2014). On the other hand, acts of citizenship refer to the acts that transgress established norms to claim rights, responsibilities, and status.
In relation to ‘citizen actions, the literature on children’s daily experiences of citizenship provides evidence of the ways in which children exercise, or do not exercise, their rights, depending on the norms and structures in their contexts (e.g., Cussiánovich, 2010; Liebel, 2012). As mentioned earlier, societies tend to assign responsibilities to their members, either as legal duties or as socially constructed responsibilities based on social consensus (Lister, 2007b). Literature on children’s studies shows that children negotiate and fulfil their responsibilities and participate in their context (Larkins, 2014). The existing evidence shows that children participate and are able to take on responsibilities in different areas, including in their schools, families, communities and political spaces, for the welfare of their societies (e.g., Liebel, 2003; Padilla & Rivera-Holguín, 2015).

The literature highlights that when individuals practise their citizenship, they usually enact it in a relational process and through fostering affective relationships with others (Kallio et al., 2020). In the case of children, for instance, they take care of others in their households (e.g., Larkins, 2014; Trell & van Hoven, 2020) or other members of their communities (e.g., Wihstutz, 2017). Recently, there has been an increased tendency to analyse how children take care of the environment (Hayward, 2020) as a part of their citizenship, as such actions evidence children’s concerns about others and are an example of how they take action to ensure others’ wellbeing.

Drawing on the work of Arendt about the ‘right to have rights’, Isin proposes ‘acts of citizenship’ as another way in which individuals perform their citizenship (Isin, 2009; Isin & Nielsen, 2008a, 2008b). Citizenship, then, is not just about exercising assigned rights, participating and taking the responsibilities assigned by society, it is also about struggle, contestation and transgression to demand citizenship rights. Isin and Nielsen (2008b) explain that the concept of ‘acts of citizenship’ is an alternative way to investigate citizenship that involves social-political, cultural and symbolic practices. As discussed previously, the established structures in society usually lead to the exclusion of some groups or individuals. In such cases, subjects need to carry out acts of citizenship to disrupt the existing dynamics in order to assert their rights as citizens. In order to define acts of citizenship, Isin (2009) proposes the following
considerations: (1) there must be a need for struggle for recognition; (2) the acts need to encompass the contestation of traditional structures and transgressions to the usual scripts of being a citizen; (3) and there is a need to produce a shift in people’s opinions and attitudes.

Along the same lines, Olsson asserts that children’s lived citizenship is an action zone, in which children challenge, negotiate and transgress boundaries, which are usually determined by (adult) authorities, rules and norms (2017, p. 556). Similarly, Larkins (2014) suggests that children not only enact their citizenship in formal spaces such as committees, forums and decision-making processes, but also through negotiating rules of social coexistence, contributing to the social good. She also warns that the distinction between ‘actions of citizenship’ and ‘acts of citizenship’ can be challenging, because recognising aspects of children’s practices as citizenship is already a challenge to dominant definitions of citizenship and claims a new status for children.

The definition of acts of citizenship is closely linked to another scholarly contribution, ‘citizenship from below’, which has been influenced by the protagonist approach (Liebel, 2007, 2012; Moosa-Mitha, 2005). This research considers that children are social actors, in an individual and collective sense, and both products and producers of their society. This understanding drives the understanding of children as producers of their own citizenship through their daily practices, challenging the structures that limit their recognition and their enactment of citizenship (Liebel, 2007). As mentioned above, the protagonist paradigm challenges the paternalism dynamics that limit children to acts of protagonist of their lives (Alfageme et al., 2003; Cussiánovich, 2006, 2009, 2010; Taft, 2017).

2.3.2.2. As a spatial process

As mentioned previously, citizenship has often been defined as a normative concept of belonging to a territory, with the nation state as the common site for membership (Isin, 2000). Lived citizenship enriches the notion of citizenship, extending it beyond the nation state or territorial boundaries (Kallio et al., 2020), proposing multiple,
more flexible notions of identity and connectedness to the places where citizenship takes place.

As Kallio and colleagues (2020) wrote, geographers have contributed to the understanding of individuals and their spaces and places, as part of the spatial dimension of citizenship. In particular, children’s geographies have provided researchers with a framework through which to understand how spatial relations affect children’s experiences of lived citizenship. This literature emphasises the way in which citizens construct and express their identities on personal, place-specific, and national scales. It highlights that concrete and embodied citizens are inseparable from the spaces where citizenship is practised and experienced (Pettersson, 2012). It also highlights that there are socio-political relationships and processes of exclusion and inclusion that exists in the concrete spaces that people inhabit, which in turn influence their daily experience of citizenship (Moosa-Mitha, 2017; Pettersson, 2012). In this sense, scholars point out factors such as poverty and social exclusion as conditions that make it harder to recognise some individuals as citizens (Ansión et al., 2007; Liebel, 2003; López, 2009). Living in contexts affected by natural disasters, such as flood-prone areas, for instance, could increase the conditions of vulnerability and make it tougher for children to access some citizen rights (Bartlett, 2008, 2011). However, without denying the difficulties of living in such challenging conditions, Cussiánovich (2009) points out that poverty could motivate children to act as citizens in order to bring about change in their societies.

Another assumption of the spatial dimension of lived citizenship is that children are active actors who appropriate, use and play a role in transforming the places where they live, as part of their citizenship rights and the development of their identity and belonging. Supporters of the ‘right to the city’ approach, suggest that individuals have the citizenship right to full and complete use of their urban spaces, and the right to participate in the transformation and production of their cities (Purcell, 2003; Sugranyes & Mathivet, 2010). Latin American scholars have demonstrated an increasing interest in this area, in order to analyse how the urbanisation process affects how individuals, particularly vulnerable groups such as women and children,
use and appropriate their cities (Falú, 2009; Sugranyes & Mathivet, 2010; Villena Higueras & Molina Fernandez, 2015).

Scholars highlight that children’s opportunities to use their cities increase their knowledge of their context and, therefore, enable them to engage in activities to contribute to the wellbeing of their societies, as well as develop a sense of belonging (Gülgönen, 2016; Gülgönen & Corona, 2015; Rissotto & Tonucci, 2002). Children’s independent mobility, a concept coined by Hillman (1990), has been linked to the understanding of the dimensions of citizenship. Cook and colleagues (2015) explain that independent mobility provides children with the opportunity to explore their neighbourhood and city playfully, “in increasing circles as they mature, giving them direct contact with both the physical (spatial) and social aspects of their communities” (p. 527). It also allows them to develop a sense of place and a feeling that they belong to their spaces (Engwicht, 1992). The existing evidence points to the fact that children’s independent mobility is constantly limited by a range of factors, including environmental factors (such as city traffic or pollution); socio-demographic factors (such as the child’s gender or age); and psychosocial factors (such as parents’ perception of the maturity of the child) (Alparone & Pacilli, 2012). This last aspect relates to the relational dimension of citizenship. As James (2011) states, as a relational concept, citizenship relates to how adults understand and attribute children’s agency and competencies.

Much of the research on lived citizenship that focus on exploring how children relate to their spaces is centred on large urban cities, like Mexico city (Gülgönen, 2016), Brisbane (Cook et al., 2015), Paris (Olsson, 2017) or Rome (Tonucci, 2020), which suggests that research on children living in small cities or rural areas is limited.

2.3.3. Section conclusion and gaps

This section has presented scholarly contributions to the definition of lived citizenship and the approaches to exploring it. Some of the common aspects of lived citizenship cited in the literature are as follows:
• Lived citizenship understands citizenship as a daily practice rather than a legal status. This allows us to recognise people’s struggles to negotiate their citizenship, as well as their contributions to their society.
• Lived citizenship implies different ways in which people enact their citizen actions and demand their citizen rights.
• Lived citizenship is contextual, because it depends on how the context shapes people’s experiences of citizenship, and how people relate to their living context.
• Lived citizenship is practised through relational dynamics and, hence, is not dependent only on contextual and societal features, but also on the ways that people relate to themselves and with others.
• As a relational concept, scholars point out the affective element, which influences how people experience their citizenship in their daily lives.

This section also discussed concepts related to children’s daily experiences of citizenship. This approach recognises children as citizens in the present, and as bearers of rights, with the capacity to take actions, claim their rights and fulfil their responsibilities. It also permits us to explore the different ways in which they perform their citizenship in their everyday lives, not only considering generational differences, but also including other individual and contextual factors, such as gender and the geographical features of the places where they live.

Finally, I presented a theoretical framework that has informed research on lived citizenship, and, as I will explain in Chapter 3 has contributed to the design of this research project, as well as the data collection and analysis.

• Children perform their citizenship through citizen actions and acts of citizenship.
• Lived citizenship relates to how the context shapes children’s citizenship.
• Children’s independent mobility provides children with important opportunities to learn about their context, take a role in transforming the places where their live, and develop their sense of belonging.
The existing research suggests that while the relational and affective dimension intersects with the spatiality and performative dimension, there is little research on the emotional aspects of the lived citizenship approach. The literature also suggests that there is a need for further study of lived citizenship of children in small cities and rural areas.

2.4. Children living in disaster-prone settings in Amazonian Peru

As discussed in the previous section, to understand children’s lived citizenship it is not only necessary to consider individual factors such as age and gender, but also the contextual factors of the places where their citizenship is experienced. As described in the first section of this chapter, Latin American scholars generally consider that, due to the cultural, political and geographical diversity of the region, it is necessary to rethink the traditional concept of citizenship in order to develop a more inclusive concept (Bello, 2009; Tubino, 2008). One of the areas of particularly interest, especially in relation to intercultural and environmental citizenship, is Amazonia. In Peru, in particular, there is interest in the study of citizenship in Amazonian Peru, not only because of the social, historical and cultural characteristics, but also the geographical and environmental conditions (Meltzer & Baldwin, 2012). This section provides an overview of the main features of children living in areas with natural hazards settings, particularly in the Amazonian Peru. The first sub-section looks at how historical processes have influenced the current understanding of childhood and the relationship of societies in the Amazonian Peru with children. The second sub-section provides an overview of the living conditions of children residing in flood-prone area.

2.4.1. Children in Amazonian Peru

The Amazonia is the largest region in Peru, it covers 76% of the territory (Zucchetti, Freundt, & Cánepa, 2020) and has the highest level of cultural and environmental diversity in Peru (UCLG Learning Team & Tapia, 2018; Zucchetti et al., 2020). Peru has 16 ethnolinguistic families and 76 ethnic groups, of which 15 are located in the Andean zone, 1 in the coastal zone, and 60 in the Amazonia region (Instituto Nacional
Nevertheless, the Amazonia region also has high rates of poverty and children’s vulnerability. A study on livelihoods in Amazonian cities found that the Human Development Index and gross domestic product in most of these cities is lower than the national average (Zuccetti et al., 2020).

The patriarchal and adult-centric social model introduced during the colonial period has been reinforced by various dictatorial regimes, compounded by political violence during the 1980s and 1990s, and exacerbated by the introduction of extractive industries in Amazonian Peru. These historical processes continue to shape the political, sociocultural and affective relationships between society and children in the region (Ludescher, 2001; Mannarelli, 2002; Rodríguez & Mannarelli, 2007). Spanish colonisation introduced new relationship models of submission and subordination, based on patriarchal structures (Mannarelli, 2002, 2007). A recent Peruvian study on parental practices in 19 regions of the country illustrates the replication of such vertical power relationship towards children (IOP-PUCP, 2017). The study found that 90% of people agree that it is more important to educate children to be obedient than to strengthen their autonomous thinking and develop their common sense. In the Amazonia region, 91.7% of participants in the study agreed with the following statement: “A child must obey his or her parents instead of being responsible for his or her own actions”. In addition, 92.9% stated that children must have respect for their elders, instead of thinking for themselves. The colonial period introduced concepts such as ‘abandoned’ and ‘illegitimate’, which today continue to be reproduced in different ways (Mannarelli, 2002, 2007). Although there is not a high rate of children being abandoned by their carer, there are other ways of being ‘illegitimate’. For instance, the high rate of pregnancy among girls and single mothers and the large number of undocumented children in Amazonian Peru has left many children without legal recognition and without emotional and social recognition (Anderson, Torrejón, & Zúñiga, 2016).

Studies in the country show that common beliefs around children and childhood encompass a mix of agency, vulnerability and control (Anderson et al., 2016; Luttrell-
Despite the fact that the official discourse recognises children as subjects of rights, the enforcement of their rights is ambiguous and ambivalent (Maclure, 2014). Furthermore, the perception of children as ‘at risk’ implies a need to control them; therefore, it limits the possibility of their participation and organisation (Cussiánovich, 2006, 2009).

Dictatorial regimes, political violence and environmental issues have all focused attention on children in Amazonian Peru. On the one hand, oppressive and dictatorial military policies, as well as internal political violence, have increased the perception of children as needing protection and decreased perceptions of their agency and ability to participate (Maclure, 2014). This perception is understandable due to the high rates of harm to children’s rights that have resulted from these socio-political situations, especially in poor areas, such as Amazonian Peru (Ludescher, 2001). The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (Comisión de la Verdad y Reconciliación, 2011) denounced serious rights violations against children during the period of political violence in Peru (1980–2000), not only from terrorist attacks, but also as a result of the systematic military recruitment carried out.

Environmental issues also influence the lived experiences of children in Peru’s Amazonia. For instance, evidence shows that in places where there are legal and illegal extractive industries there is a high risk of violence against children, including sexual violence, sexual exploitation and pregnancy among girls (Anderson et al., 2016; Ludescher, 2001). In addition, due to climate change, there are some areas in Amazonian Peru that are highly affected by natural disasters, such as wildfires, blizzards and floods (INDECI, 2019). Natural hazards in the Amazonia region cause not only health issues, but also economic, political, and social damage, all of which affect children’s wellbeing, as will be discussed in the next sub-section. A common feature in urban areas of the Amazonia is poor urban planning, which leaves people with few resources to survive in high-risk areas, such as flood zones. Consequently, the living conditions of people in such areas are challenging, placing children at greater risk of rights violations.
2.4.2. Children’s living conditions in flood-prone areas

Because of geographical characteristics, mixed with political, socioeconomic and psychosocial conditions, the impact of natural hazards has increased in Latin America (Albedaño & Fernandez, 2016). The presence of storms and hurricanes in Central America and the Caribbean, as well as earthquakes, landslides, and floods in areas adjacent to rivers in South America, have caused considerable impact and, hence, have increased the concern of governments and private institutions to reduce their damage (Albedaño & Fernandez, 2016). Peru is highly vulnerable to disasters and emergencies, because of its climate and geography, which is compounded by deficient policies for disaster risk reduction and to mitigate the impact of climate shocks (Zucchetti et al., 2020). During the last decade the number of emergencies and disasters has risen in the country (INDECI, 2019). The most common emergencies are urban fires, heavy rains, low temperatures, intense winds and floods. Floods and heavy rains affected the largest number of people in the first six month of 2019 (3,879 people affected and 21,586 damaged houses) (INDECI, 2019).

Before going deeper into the literature about flood-prone areas, there are some theoretical aspects concerning the field of risk management to consider. The definition of disaster or emergency not only relates to the hazard, but also to the level of disruption to a community and their ability to cope using their own resources. The bigger the impact or the need for external help, the more likely the event will be considered a disaster, rather than an emergency in which communities might have enough resources to cope with the event (Osorio & Díaz, 2012; UNISDR, 2005). A hazard can occur due to different reasons—it can be manmade or a natural phenomenon. Natural hazards are characterised by their magnitude or intensity, speed of onset, duration, and area of extension. The floods in Amazonian Peru are slow-onset disasters, because the annual cycle of the river causes seasonal rising and falling. However, these floods pose an extensive risk, which means “the exposure to a repeated or persistent hazardous conditions of low or moderate intensity” (UNISDR, 2005, pp. 15–16).
Current disaster risk management approaches tend to be holistic, rather than focusing solely on response (UNISDR, 2005). A natural hazard does not produce a disaster in itself. As Lavell and Maskrey remark, a “disaster is the manifestation of previous unresolved development problems and outcome-based indicators of the skewed unsustainable development process” (2014, p. 270). The relationship between vulnerability, natural hazards and their consequences are even more reinforcing if the event happens in a society with socioeconomic disadvantages and inefficient risk management policies (Osorio & Díaz, 2012). To break this cycle, there is a need for a comprehensive approach to reduce vulnerability and risks, and strengthen community resilience (UNISDR, 2005; Velázquez, Rivera-Holguin, & Morote, 2017). Experiences in recovery processes in Peru have yielded learnings about the need to involve the population actively and build their autonomy and control over decisions (Velázquez et al., 2017). In addition, different scholars have pointed out the need to promote young children’s participation in the various stages of disaster risk management. By doing so, children can strengthen their self-perception as subjects with agency, as well as their sense of belonging to their communities (Martin, 2011; Peek, 2008).

There is large volume of literature about the consequences of natural hazards (Catani, Jacob, Schauer, Kohila, & Neuner, 2008; Krishna, Ronan, & Alisic, 2018; Peek, Abramson, Cox, Fothergill, & Tobin, 2018; Stanke, Murray, Amlôt, Nurse, & Williams, 2012) and climate change (Bartlett, 2008, 2011; Berse, 2017; Burke, Sanson, & Hoorn, 2018). The literature tends to focus more on rapid-onset emergencies, like earthquakes, rather than slow-onset emergencies, such as flood prone areas (Peek, 2008; Stanke et al., 2012). The evidence suggests that women, the elderly, and children (particularly children in their early years) are more vulnerable to physical and psychosocial damage as a result climate-related emergencies and the impacts of climate change (Jabry, 2005; Peek et al., 2018).

Climate change, for instance, puts children at greater risk of experiencing physical and mental problems in the early stages of life. Prenatal and early years exposure to disasters, vector-borne diseases (like malaria, dengue fever and the Zika virus) and
other environmental stressors undermine children’s health, causing low birth weight, low height-for-age, malnutrition, allergies, and asthma, among other things (Anderko, Chalupka, Du, & Hauptman, 2020; Caruso, 2014; Molina & Saldarriaga, 2018; Saldarriaga, 2015; Sánchez, 2018). Such vector borne diseases are recurrent in the Amazonian Peru and the region has high rates of malaria and dengue (Anderson et al., 2016).

Children are also more likely than adults to suffer injury and other physical afflictions during disasters (e.g., Biswas, Rahman, Mashreky, Rahman, & Dalal, 2010; Jabry, 2005), which can lead to increased incidence of disability and disproportionately affects children with pre-existing disabilities (Stough, Ducy, & Kang, 2017). In flood settings, due to lack of safe water and environmental issues, there is an increase in respiratory diseases, diarrhoea and intestinal parasites (Martin, 2011; Save the Children UK, 2006).

The literature also documents the high risk of developing post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and other mental health problems (including depression, anxiety, substance abuse, phobias, sleep disorders, attachment disorders, regressive behaviours and somatic complaints) as a result of exposure to climate-related disasters (Anderko et al., 2020; Banks & Weems, 2014; Burke et al., 2018; Peek, 2008). These consequences, along with disruptions to their living situation, can lead to other complications, like problems with emotion regulation, behavioural problems, impaired language development and learning problems (Anderko et al., 2020; Burke et al., 2018; Peek, 2008).

Disruptions resulting from climate change disasters create and exacerbate conditions under which child protection issues are more likely to occur. The existing evidence highlights the increased risk of different types of violence, including child neglect, corporal punishment, sexual abuse, sex trafficking, child labour and child marriage (Alston, Whittenbury, Haynes, & Godden, 2014; Biswas et al., 2010; Caruso, 2014; Guarcello, Kovrova, & Rosati, 2008; Guarcello, Mealli, & Furio Camillo, 2009; Jabry, 2005; Rubenstein & Stark, 2017). Research carried out in flood-prone areas reveals
that there is an increased risk of violence against children, which is exacerbated when it is necessary to move people to shelters (Martin, 2011; Save the Children, 2006).

In research undertaken in flood-prone areas in Bangladesh, Biswas et al. (2010) found that children are likely to experience unintentional injuries because of parental neglect. Researchers explained that while mothers or other caregivers are occupied with post-flood cleaning and reconstruction activities, it can be challenging for them to supervise children. Furthermore, children are easily bored because their mobility is reduced during floods. For example, there are fewer public places to play and meet friends. This can intensify tense situations at home, increasing the likelihood of physical violence against children (Martin, 2011; Save the Children, 2006).

The literature mentions the experience of loss as a common direct impact after disasters. Children not only experience concrete losses (e.g., toys, school supplies, their home), but also a reduction in, or even total loss of, their spaces, both for socialising and for private matters (Banks & Weems, 2014; Mort et al., 2018; Stanke et al., 2012; Walker et al., 2012; Walker, Whittle, Medd, & Burningham, 2010). Some research suggests that such direct impacts can disrupt children’s social networks and increase social isolation, especially when families are re-located to temporary accommodation (Banks & Weems, 2014; Walker et al., 2012). The lack of information about how these, and other direct impacts, affect children’s social wellbeing suggests that further research is needed in this area. Scannell and colleagues (2016) suggest, for example, that additional work is needed on children’s place attachment after disasters to understand the impact on children’s social and affective bonds to their living spaces. As mentioned in the previous section, children’s relationships are a key element to explore in lived citizenship.

Moreover, while there is some research on social networks and disasters, the literature focuses on how social support mediates children’s recovery, rather than understanding the repercussions for their relationships (e.g., Banks & Weems, 2014; Bokszczanin, 2012; Lai, Osborne, Piscitello, Self-Brown, & Kelley, 2018; Rubens, Vernberg, Felix, & Canino, 2013). Further research is needed to explore how children
experience the impact of emergencies and disasters on their relationships with peers and others in their community, to better understand the consequences for their social development and, thus, on their lived citizenship.

Children’s age and gender, as well as being a member of a minority group, are individual factors that can affect the impacts of climate shocks. The high physical dependence of younger children on adults, in comparison to older children, puts them at greater risk of physical injury and neglect of their basic needs (Bartlett, 2011). Young children are also less able to move and seek refuge in a safe zone during sudden disasters such as flash floods or storms (Jabry, 2005).

Despite recognition of the high vulnerability of, and different impacts for, children in emergency settings, research in these areas has shown that children are not passive victims. In fact, they can become involved in actions to minimise some of the risks of natural hazards and offer practical and creative ideas to their families and communities to help them cope with and recover after a disaster (Jabry, 2005; Padilla & Rivera-Holguín, 2015; Peek, 2008). However, these capabilities are usually ignored and society tends to overlook children’s resilience to cope with critical situations (Jabry, 2005; Padilla & Rivera-Holguín, 2015; Barlett, 2008). This lack of recognition could affect the confidence of children and their self-perception as active agents, making them see themselves as powerless in the transformation of their context (Jabry, 2005; Martin, 2011; Mort et al., 2018), impacting on their lived citizenship experiences.

2.4.3. Section conclusion and gaps

This section has presented some elements that are key to our understanding of children’s living condition in the Amazonian Peru. The first section provided a brief overview of some of the historical processes that have influenced the perception of childhood and the relationship between societies and children in the Amazonia region. The literature suggests that patriarchal relationships, as well as the perception of children as vulnerable, and not active agents, still shapes relationships with children in Peruvian society. The Amazonian Peru has important historical and
contextual aspects to consider that have influenced, and continue to influence, children’s living experiences over time. Their cultural and environmental richness coexists with vulnerability and challenging conditions. One of the features of the region is the presence of flood-prone areas, which increases the risks for children. As this section has shown, despite the challenging conditions of children living in areas affected by emergencies and disasters, children are not passive agents, but have the ability to participate in prevention and recovery processes. This section also reveals some gaps in the literature, such as on the socio-emotional impacts of living in emergency settings, particularly in slow-onset emergency settings, as well as the relationship between children and their spaces.

2.5. Chapter conclusion: Research aim and questions

This chapter reveals that the debate around children’s citizenship is not only about if children can be recognised as citizens. The conceptualisation of children’s citizenship itself is merely part of a discussion in response to the particular individual and social needs in each context. Given the sociocultural dynamic, the concept of citizenship is constantly being deconstructed and reconstructed by the subjects themselves. In this chapter, I presented the theoretical background for children’s citizenship and some important points to understand children’s living conditions in the Amazonian Peru. Based on the literature review, I argue that the following key points and theoretical gaps justify a further exploration of the lived citizenship of children in their early years in flood-prone areas.

The concept of citizenship as based on the relationship with the nation state is being redefined as a sociocultural and inclusive concept, rather than a mere legal status. A sociocultural definition of citizenship focuses “less on legal rules and more on norms, practices, meanings, and identities” (Isin & Turner, 2002, p. 4). It depends on the historical context and is constructed within relational dynamics (Ansión et al., 2007; Tubino, 2008). In addition, this redefinition of citizenship is reconsidering the universalistic and homogeneous normative concept in order to include ‘differences’
(in terms of culture, gender, age, and so on) in recognition of the diverse ways of acting and being a citizen.

In line with such discussions, childhood scholars agree that there is a need to comprehend citizenship, beyond legal status, as sociocultural practice. Because of the difference between being a citizen as a status and the daily experience of citizenship, there is increased interesting in the study of lived citizenship. This concept has been introduced in a range of arenas, including the study of childhood citizen experiences. Lived citizenship allows researchers to understand the different kinds of citizen expressions of children and to challenges the common understandings that perpetuate the notion of children as only citizens in the future.

Regarding the theoretical understanding of children’s lived citizenship, it is necessary to consider the following key aspects:

- Lived citizenship relates to how children negotiate citizenship in their daily life, as well as how adults understand and attribute children’s agency and competences (James, 2011; Phillips, 2010).
- Most of the literature about children’s citizenship and citizen participation focuses on older children, revealing a gap in the understanding of the citizenship of children in their early years.
- The literature reveals that there is much information about the citizenship of children living in large urban cities, but research in sub-urban and rural areas remains limited.

Furthermore, in the previous section of this chapter, I presented some information on children living in disaster-prone areas affected by climate change. However, most of the research focuses on rapid-onset emergencies, rather than on slow-onset emergencies, such as floods. While there is a large amount of information about the impacts of disasters on children’s mental and physical health, little information exists about their effect on the social development of children, including their experience of citizenship.
Based on the literature review, this research project aims to explore lived citizenship in early childhood in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru. To fulfil this aim, I propose the following research questions:

Q.1. In what ways do children experience their lived citizenship in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru?

Q.2. In what ways do adults (families and communities) promote or limit citizenship in early childhood in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru?
Chapter 3.  Methodology: Researching with children in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru

In this chapter, I explain and justify the methodology that I applied while researching lived citizenship in early childhood in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru. I begin by explaining the ontological and epistemological approach that has influenced the research design of this project (section 3.1). This is followed by a description and justification of the choice of the ethnographic methods used to carry out the fieldwork (section 3.2). Section 3.3 sets out the methods used for data collection and section 3.4 describes the management and analysis of the data. Research is not a linear process, but one that requires constant rethinking, renegotiating and redesigning. Hence, in this section, I also present the challenges I faced during the research and their impact on my decision-making during data collection. Furthermore, conducting research with children can raise ethical dilemmas, even more so if the research takes place in an area affected by natural hazards. Therefore, this chapter also sets out the ethical considerations of the study (section 3.5). Finally, I reflect on my own position as a researcher, my relationship with the children who participated in the research and how these dynamics influenced the research process (section 3.6).

3.1. Ontological and epistemological considerations

This research project is informed by the interpretivist paradigm, which understands social reality as socially constructed and a product of its members, who maintain this reality as a necessary part of their everyday activities (Blaikie & Priest, 2017). The ontological assumptions underpinning this paradigm—the theoretical understanding of ‘what is reality’ (Crotty, 1998)—is that social reality is made up of the shared interpretations of social actors (Blaikie & Priest, 2017). The epistemological assumptions—the way of understanding ‘reality’ (Crotty, 1998)—follow the constructivism approach, which indicates that realities need to be understood in
terms of our engagement with social actors, which creates and recreates our world (Crotty, 1998).

The methodological choice to use the interpretivist paradigm responds to both the theoretical assumptions of the research topic, as well as the notions of children, childhood and lived citizenship. Lived citizenship is a sociocultural and relational concept, that relates to how people understand and negotiate their citizenship in their daily lives. Lived citizenship, then, is socially constructed and people create and recreate it depending on individual, social-cultural or geographic factors (James, 2011; James, Curtis, & Birch, 2007; Liebel, 2007; Pettersson, 2012). In this sense, it aligns with the assumptions of the interpretivist paradigm, which establishes that social reality is produced and reproduced by individuals in their daily lives (Blaikie & Priest, 2017).

As Gallagher (2009) suggests, thinking about ontological and epistemological views when researching with children demands that we reflect on the researcher’s own ideas of what is a child and what is childhood, as well as what we know about children and childhood and how we acquire this knowledge. Considering the discussions about lived citizenship presented in Chapter 2, this research adopts the theoretical assumptions of the protagonist (protagonismo) approach, which is in dialogue with the ‘new childhood studies’ promoted in the West (Tisdall & Punch, 2012). The ontological view of this approach is that there is not a single given reality, but numerous realities that are social constructed. Hence, this view proposes a sociocultural understanding of children, which means that there are diverse childhoods, and children are a product and producers of their own societies (Cussiánovich, 2006). This approach adopts a constructivist epistemology, which consider children as social agents, with competencies to produce and express their own perspectives and give information about their lived experiences (Alfageme, Cantos, & Martínez, 2003; Cussiánovich, 2006; Liebel, 2007). In addition, this understanding has been influenced by the relational approach (Mayall, 2002), which asserts that childhood studies should focus on how children experience their lives.
and the relational process among children and between children and their environment (Bustelo, 2012; Gaitán, 2006; Mayall, 2002).

Considering that the aim of this research was to explore the ways in which children enact their lived citizenship in their daily lives, paraphrasing Blaikie and Priest (2017), adopting an interpretivist approach allowed me to focus on meaningful social actions to understand the patterns of regularity in children’s lives. It also guided me to explore children’s lived citizenship by engaging myself in children’s contexts (Crotty, 1998) in order to understand children’s views and experiences of citizenship. Therefore, I adopted a qualitative research approach and used ethnographic methods. This methodology allowed me to interact with the participants in their own contexts, as well as to understand how they experience their daily practices in their natural settings (Creswell, 2013; Mason, 2002; Rossman, 2012). In the next section, I will explain in more detail the reasons behind my choices.

3.2. Qualitative research design: Ethnographic approach

Considering my ontological and epistemological position, as well as the theoretical assumptions about lived citizenship, I considered that a qualitative research design with ethnographic methods was methodologically and theoretically appropriate for this research. The qualitative methodology let me explore children’s daily experiences from their perspective and the production of knowledge through their own discourses, in their own context (Creswell, 2013; Mason, 2002; Montero, 2006; Rossman, 2012). In addition, as mentioned above, lived citizenship relates not only to individual factors, but also to social and contextual aspects of the particular settings in which children live. Hence, a qualitative research design allowed me to explore children’s experiences and understand the multi-dimensionality and complexity of “how things work in a particular context” (Mason, 2002, p. 1).

Among the qualitative methods, I chose ethnographic research, because, in comparison to other methods, such as interviews and focus group discussions, its naturalistic character, complexity, and long-term nature allowed me to explore children’s experiences together with the environmental changes taking place where
they live (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Mason, 2002; Van Blerk & Barker, 2008). It also enabled me to gather thick information in the child’s natural setting to develop a rich understanding about children and how they experience their lived citizenship.

Although there is no consensus on the definition of ethnography (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Konstantoni & Kustatscher, 2015), various authors point out some important characteristics. For some scholars, ‘ethnography’ is synonymous with qualitative research, others consider it to be a unique anthropological method (Walford, 2009a), while others still categorise it as one qualitative method among many, similar to phenomenology or action research (Baptista, Fernández, & Hernández, 2010; Mason, 2002). Ethnographers involve themselves in their subjects’ daily experiences in their context, “watching what happens, listening to what is said, and/or asking questions through informal and formal interviews, collecting documents and artefacts” (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007, p. 3).

The benefits of using ethnography in this research are in line with those mentioned in the literature about childhood studies (see Mukherji & Albon, 2015; Ames, Rojas, & Portugal, 2010; Emond, 2005; Konstantoni & Kustatscher, 2015; Punch, 2001), particularly those outlined by Mukherji and Albon (2015) in relation to early childhood research. Firstly, ethnography is conducted in natural settings. This benefited this research in various ways. On the one hand, young children feel more comfortable in a context that is familiar to them (Mukherji & Albon, 2015). On the other hand, these techniques allow the researcher to have a deep knowledge about the subjects studied and to explore the way they “see, understand and make changes in their lives” (Rockwell, 2009, p. 50). In other words, this methodology allowed me to explore the significant aspects of citizenship for children, instead of raising conclusions based on what my adult ‘lens’ would lead me to assume.

Secondly, ethnographic methods are valuable because they typically involve long-term fieldwork, allowing the researcher to explore phenomena and any variations across different periods of times (Mukherji & Albon, 2015; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007).

---

2 Author’s translation.
By being involved for a long period, I had the opportunity to witness the dynamics that children experience across yearly environmental changes and how this affects how they express their citizenship. Thirdly, an ethnographic researcher is able to explore different aspects of children’s experiences and, hence, their diversity and heterogeneity (Mukherji & Albon, 2015). This aspect was particularly beneficial in this research, because it allowed me to capture children’s experiences in diverse spaces and observe any variances as a result of characteristics, such as age and gender.

Although there are great advantages to undertaking ethnography in early childhood research, its application involves various challenges. After reviewing the literature, I was aware of some ethical and practical challenges, such as developing close relationships with the participants, which can give rise to ethical issues, such as the disclosure of sensitive topics, as well as the risk of increased bias in the research. In addition, due to privacy consideration, there are some personal spaces that I could not reach. For this reason, as I will explain later, I also included other methods such as interviews. Ethnography can produce a large amount of data, which can be hard to store and analyse (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Konstantoni & Kustatscher, 2015), in the following sections I will explain how I managed the data. Because of the risky characteristics of the location site, as well as the flexible and messy nature of ethnography, I faced challenges that I had to reflect on and solve along the way. In the following section, I present the study site and explain the characteristics of the population studied, as well as the duration of the study. Then, I explain and justify the ethnographic methods used and describe the main challenges and practicalities faced. Finally, I discuss the ethical issues and my own process of reflexivity.

To sum up, ethnographic methods were the most appropriate method to gather data to respond my research questions. Their naturalistic character, as well as their complexity and long-term nature, allowed me to have deep knowledge about children’s views and experiences in their spaces (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Mason, 2002; Van Blerk & Barker, 2008). In other words, these methods led me to
have a thick understanding about children and to explore how children experience their lived citizenship

3.2.1. Location site

As mentioned earlier, the intent of this research was to analyse the lived citizenship of children living in an area with natural hazards. Therefore, I conducted fieldwork in a flood-prone area located in an urban village adjacent to a river in Amazonian Peru. This site was selected for theoretical and practical reasons, which I will explain using Rossman’s (2012) suggestions for identifying the ideal site. In Rossman’s view, the fieldwork must be carried out in a place where “there is a rich mix of processes, people, programs, interaction, structures of interest or all of these” (2012, p. 137).

I chose this particular flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru for two main reasons:

- **The geographical characteristics of the area and the conditions of poverty and social vulnerability, as well as the inadequate risk management policies, all increase the probability of floods in the region** (Meltzer & Baldwin, 2012). The site selected is in one of the regions most affected by floods in Peru. Each year, during the rainy season, the river’s flow changes and produces a ‘rising stage’ (from March to May) and a ‘falling stage’ (from August to October). Between these two stages, there is a ‘transition period’ (November to February) (Palomino, 2015). The rainy season starts in the transition period and the rains are heaviest during the first months of the year (January to March) (Gobierno Regional de Loreto, 2012). In addition, it is one of the regions in the country with the highest rate of poverty and index of unsatisfied basic needs (Zucchetti, et al. 2020).

- **Amazonian Peru has a unique indigenous legacy, certain environmental aspects (such as the above-mentioned floods), and a history of conflict and protest** (Ludescher, 2001; Meltzer & Baldwin, 2012). The region is one with the highest density of indigenous people in Peru (INEI, 2016). These features have fostered intercultural citizenship studies focusing on
places like Amazonian Peru (see Ansión, Turbino, & Alfaro, 2007; Meltzer & Baldwin, 2012).

In addition, from the environmental citizenship perspective and literature on disasters and emergencies, the relationship between citizenship and the environment and the promotion of citizens’ participation for the reduction of the impact of natural hazards are growing areas of interest (Latta & Wittman, 2010; Meltzer & Baldwin, 2012). Some authors also emphasise the need to generate research about young children and their involvement in environmental sustainability (e.g., Berse, 2017; Hägglund & Johansson, 2014).

Given my previous experience working in the region, I was able to leverage networks with local non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and government actors, which facilitated my access to the study population. I started by meeting with key actors to gather more information about flood-prone zones in the city in order to select the most appropriate neighbourhood for this study.

When I visited the suggested places, I discovered that, despite the fact that the local government classifies those areas as being at risk of natural hazards, not all of the inhabitants see them as such. In some areas, people told me that their neighbourhoods were not flood-prone areas. In another location, they said that they did not have enough information on the projected level of rain and increment in the water level over the year, hence, could not say if the neighbourhood would be flooded or not. As the influence of environmental changes on children’s citizenship is a crucial aspect of this research, I decided to verify whether or not people (mainly children) in the area saw their neighbourhood as a flood-prone area and if they had experience of living there in both seasons: falling and rising water.

I decided to have a second set of meetings with governmental officials to discuss my concerns and ensure that the fieldwork site was indeed a flood-prone area. The gatekeepers explained to me that I had to select one of the ‘non-mitigatable areas’, that is to say an area where the water level rises every year, making it necessary to build bridges or use canoes to travel through the neighbourhood. In addition, to
ensure that there would be enough people (Rossman, 2012, p. 137), in this case children aged 3 to 5-years-old, who could participate in the research, I looked for an area with an early childhood school.

I identified four potential sites that met these criteria. I decided to choose only one of them, rather than including a comparison site, as I sought to explore children’s experiences in depth. In order to choose the site, again, I followed Rossman’s (2012) suggestions: “an ideal site is where the entry is possible, where the researcher is likely to build strong relations with the participants, and where there are not overwhelming ethical and political considerations” (Rossman, 2012, p. 137). In terms of relationships, in all of the neighbourhoods I visited, both children and adults showed openness to receive and interact with me. Regarding feasible access, I chose a place accessible by public transport, for practical and safety reasons. In addition, I decided to select a place where I could minimise ethical or political considerations, which would otherwise be an important risk for the participants and myself. I also decided to select a place where there were no NGOs working, to prevent a possible conflict of interest and make it easier to protect the privacy and confidentiality of participants.

To identify the location site, I visited some neighbourhoods and explored people's understandings of the weather changes. In addition, I talked to people acquainted with the area and with the local situation. All this led me to select an urban settlement in Amazonian Peru. This location is a flood-prone area that is qualified as ‘not mitigatable’, which means that it is impossible to prevent the river level from rising and flooding the neighbourhood. I obtained written permission to access the site from the neighbourhood leader and the teacher at the pre-school located in the area.

3.2.2. Population

Insofar as the purpose of this research was to explore the lived citizenship in early childhood, my understanding of ‘early childhood’ started with the categorisation of Peruvian policies. The Peruvian normative conceptualisation of a ‘child’ is all persons from when they were conceived until they are 12-years-old (Código de los niños y
adolescentes ACT Nº 27337), and ‘early childhood’ is the first stage of life from 0 to 5-years-old (MIMP, 2012).

To answer my research questions, I included children aged between 3 to 5-years-old, because this is the age when they start attending the official Peruvian education system. By participating in the school system, children begin to take part in official citizen discourses and practices (Cortés & Parra, 2009). Attending school also opens up other spaces for socialising, mainly with other children and adults who are not their relatives (Cortés & Parra, 2009). In fact, the curriculum of the Peruvian education system proposes the following aim for this age group:

COEXISTS AND PARTICIPATES DEMOCRATICALLY. The child acts in society relating to others in a fair and equitable manner, recognising that all people have the same rights and responsibilities. [...] it means assuming a position on those issues that involve them as citizens and contributing to the construction of the general welfare, the consolidation of democratic processes and the promotion of human rights. (Ministerio de Educación, 2016, p. 83)

I included children of different ages, because this allowed me to explore the intergenerational dynamics to analyse how age influences their lived citizenship: for example, if power relationships are replicated between the older and younger children.

3.2.3. Duration

Considering the long-term nature of ethnography, I conducted the research from mid-September 2018 to June 2019 (nine and a half months in total). This time covered both stages of the river flow, the rising and falling stage, as well as one transition period, so it allowed me to witness the environmental changes associated with the flooding season (see Figure 1). After the fieldwork, I realised that the most important moments when I took methodological decisions were in line with the climate variations and the beginning of the next seasonal stage. I identified three phases,
which I named following the labels that the children used when talking about the environmental changes.

3.2.3.1. Phase 1: “It is dry; it is soil” (October 2018–December 2018)
This phase went from the beginning of the data collection until when the neighbourhood started to be inundated with water. During this period, I carried out participant observation in the school setting and public spaces.

3.2.3.2. Phase 2: “It is a lagoon” (January 2019–April 2019)
This phase began when the area started to be inundated with water, but the people could still walk around in some parts. It ended when the water rose to its maximum level, when movement around the neighbourhood was only possible using the bridges. During this stage, the environmental conditions changed rapidly, and I had to constantly adapt myself to the new conditions in order to capture the children’s experiences. To collect the information, I used participant observation, as well as photographs and drawings, but in a different manner from in phase 1, as described later in this chapter. I also interviewed adults from NGOs and government workers.

3.2.3.3. Phase 3: “The water is going: The reunion with the ‘ground’ and children” (April 2019–June 2019)
This stage started when the water began to decrease. Gradually, the soil appeared again, and it was possible to walk around the neighbourhood on the ground. At this stage, I conducted participant observations and I interviewed children.
This number varied over time as explained in 3.3.1. Participant observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual cycle of the river</th>
<th>Falling stage (Aug-Oct)</th>
<th>Transition stage (Nov-Feb)</th>
<th>Rising stage (Mar-May)</th>
<th>Transition Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month</strong></td>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fieldwork phases</strong></td>
<td>Selecting fieldwork site</td>
<td>Phase 1: It is dry</td>
<td>Phase 2: It is lagoon: Walking through the bridges</td>
<td>Phase 3: The water is gone: The reunion with the ‘ground’ and children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ This number varied over time as explained in 3.3.1. Participant observation

---

Figure 1. Fieldwork phases and data collection methods
3.3. Methods and data collection

The ethnographic approach involves different methods of data gathering, such as participant observation, formal and informal interviews, and analysis of interactions, objects, and texts (Blaikie, 2009; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Konstantoni & Kustatscher, 2015; Mason, 2002). As the literature suggests, by using various techniques I was able to explore the diversity and multiplicity of children’s experiences in the study area (Punch, 2001; Abebe, 2009) and include the variety of ways in which children communicate (Ames et al., 2010; Palaiologou, 2017).

In order to address the first research question, which attempts to understand in what ways children experience their lived citizenship in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru, I carried out participant observations and interviewed children. I also interviewed adults who were significant to the children (caregivers) as well as government workers to understand their perceptions, the discourses about childhood and citizenship in their communities, and the policies in place (second research question). In the following sections, the theoretical and practical motives for the selection of data collection methods and procedures are described.

Conducting fieldwork is a continuous exercise of analysing, rethinking, and redesigning the methods. Therefore, during the nine months of fieldwork I continuously adapted my data collection techniques in order to respond not only to children’s individual and contextual needs, but also to my needs as a researcher.

3.3.1. Participant observation

I considered participant observation to be the most appropriate way of capturing how children negotiate their lived citizenship in their context. Mukherji and Albon (2015) assert the commonality of using observation in early childhood research, both for qualitative and quantitative research. This can be undertaken in a controlled environment, such as a laboratory or in children’s ‘usual environments’, such as their schools and homes (Mukherji & Albon, 2015, p. 135). As I decided to use ethnographic methods, the most suitable type of observation was participant observation. This tool allows researchers to take part in the daily life activities of the subjects, and can
involve different levels of participation: from total participation, which means that the researcher is actively involved in the participants’ activities, to mainly observation, or a combination of both (Blaikie, 2009). During the fieldwork, I alternated my level of participation depending on the receptiveness of the children. Whenever they invited me to participate in their activities, I took a more active role; in contrast, when I perceived that they did not want me to be involved, I asked them if I could stay around them, observing, but not participating. The adults also asked me to be actively involved in some activities. For example, sometimes the teacher asked me to help her facilitate activities. When these situations occurred, I always tried to involve the children. For example, if the teacher asked me to distribute materials, she invited the children to help me with this task. Observing children in their family environments allowed me to witness how they negotiate their citizenship in their daily lives and gain a greater understanding of children’s activities (Punch, 2001).

The literature underlines the advantages of using participant observation in research with children. For instance, this technique is less disruptive to the people involved in the study and more flexible than other methods (Gallagher, 2009). I particularly benefited from its flexibility, because it allowed me to adapt to environmental changes and the children’s needs. In addition, I was able to establish dialogues “about the issues while they are occurring, turning conversations to certain topics of interest” (Punch, 2001, p. 10). It also provides participants with an interactive role (Emond, 2005; Montero, 2006); for instance, as Emond (2005) describes, my presence and level of participation was negotiated with children, rather than imposed on them.

However, there are some aspects to consider in conducting ethnographic research, such as the development of close personal relationships (Gallagher, 2009; Montero, 2006), the witnessing of illegal or prohibited activities, and the challenges involved in negotiating informed consent (Gallagher, 2009). To face such difficulties, I tried to keep a record of the nature of my relationships with the children and to reflect on how this could influence my data collection procedures or analysis, so that I could
make decisions if necessary (see section 3.6 on rReflexivity for further discussion on my position as an atypical adult). As I explain in the section on ethical considerations (see section 3.5), I also developed strategies in case I witnessed sensitive issues and to ensure informed consent from participants. Environmental features, such as intense heat or variation of the river’s cycle, influenced my decision making about the spaces and times to visit the neighbourhood (see Figure 1), as I explain in the following section.

3.3.1.1. Sample

The participants were selected from the pre-school—Programa no escolarizado de Educación Inicial (PRONOEI)—located in the neighbourhood in which the study was conducted. This was for two main reasons: Firstly, from my initial visit to the neighbourhood, I learnt that most of the children aged three to five attended the school and, secondly, because I initially planned to observe children in a school setting. I selected the participants using the following criteria.

- Children who had been living in the area at least for a year prior to the study (encompassing the yearly rising and falling stage of the river).
- Children with families who did not anticipate moving from the area until after June 2019 (so that I was able to witness their experiences across the different phases of the river’s flow).

Tables 1 and 2 show the sample of participants for observation. As I will explain in the section on ethical considerations, I have used pseudonyms to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of participants.
### Table 1. Child participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heidy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daysi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ines</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimena</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazmin</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tito</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Summary of child participants by age and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-years-old</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-years-old</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-years-old</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the literature emphasises, in ethnographic research sampling can be negotiated during the fieldwork (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). In fact, the number of children observed was not constant throughout the data collection period, as the daily attendance of children at school fluctuated greatly. For example, some children did not attend school when it was raining. In addition, as the year went by, more children were enrolled, such as Diana (4-years-old), who joined the PRONOEI in the last month of school. Also, due to particular characteristics of the location, I faced difficulties in observing all of the children from my initial sample across with whole study period. For instance, as I will explain in more detail later, during the flooding season I was unable to reach some children’s homes because they did not have a bridge to access their home from the main road.

3.3.1.2. Procedure

In this sub-section, I describe the participant observation procedure during the three phases I explained earlier (see sub-section 3.2.3).

Phase 1: October 2018–December 2018

During the first weeks of fieldwork, I conducted informal interviews with children and adults. Montero calls this first stage ‘familiarisation’ (familiarización) (2006, p. 77), and it refers to the starting process in which the researcher and the people of the community learn about each other. This process allowed me to forge trusting relationships with children and adults, as well as gain an overview of their social and cultural context.

In my first visit to the neighbourhood, I went with the coordinator of the pre-schools in the area. This person introduced me to the children and the teacher of the PRONOEI in the neighbourhood. Although I had planned specific methods of asking children for their consent, I considered it particularly important to be aware of their reaction in this first encounter. For this reason, during this visit, I aimed to explore if children were going to feel comfortable with my presence. I explained to the children that I wanted to pass some time with them, learning, talking, playing, and joining them in their activities. Children showed openness. For instance, they expressed a
willingness to show me their personal belongings, invited me to sit with them and asked me about myself.

After selecting the study site, I had meetings with the community leader and the teacher to obtain their consent to the research. Once I had their consent, I initiated data collection. As part of the familiarisation process, in order to plan the best possible schedule for my visits, I spent the first weeks getting to know the neighbourhood, that is to say, the territorial boundaries, spaces and hours when children played, and so on. To do so, I decided to walk with children to their houses after school. This allowed me to form initial ideas about the neighbourhood from their point of view. This first stage of fieldwork focused on observing children at school in the mornings and in public spaces during the afternoon. During this stage, as I was becoming familiar with children and their families, I decided not to use participant observation at children’s family homes, because this method can be experienced as intrusive by the participants (Gallagher, 2009).

Although at the beginning I set a visiting schedule with established hours and days, the characteristics of the study site (mainly linked to the weather conditions and risky aspects) did not allow me to adhere to my schedule. For instance, I started by planning to go to the PRONOEI in the mornings on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday, and during the afternoons on Tuesday and Friday. However, heavy rain made it difficult for me to access the neighbourhood, so I had to change my visiting schedule. If it rained during the morning, I could not go to PRONOEI, so I went in the afternoon instead (swapping days on my schedule).

I decided to have a flexible schedule, which allowed me to cover the majority of the children’s routines and activities every day of the week, during both mornings and afternoons (see Table 3).
Table 3. Example of visiting hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the pre-school, it was a PRONOEI\(^4\) school, which is a non-formal community pre-school programme for children between 3 to 5-years of age in Peru (see 0 for more details). The school year in Peru starts in March and finishes in December. In this particular PRONOEI, school hours were from 8 am to 11 am, Monday to Thursday. All children studied in the same classroom. Being aware of the considerable amount of data that results from participant observation, as a strategy for data management and in order not to be perceived as intrusive, I decided to go two or three days a week. I agreed this plan with the teacher.

I also visited children for two hours mid-afternoon. My strategy during afternoons was to reach the neighbourhood and walk through the central street until I met the children casually. Then I waited for them to invite me to join their activities, or, alternatively, I asked if I could join them. During this phase, I did not plan to visit a specific child, but I combined my visits to the two main areas I identified. This gave me more possibilities of meeting all of the children who I observed in the mornings.

---

\(^4\) This type of centre focuses on children aged 3 to 5-years-old from marginal urban and rural areas. The persons in charge of these children are people from the neighbourhood who receive training from professionals from the Ministry of Education and the community provides the physical space for its operation.
I identified these zones as ‘A’ and ‘B’. I decided to exclude a third zone ‘C’, as it was a relatively dangerous area, not only because the access was difficult, but also because children and adults identified it as a zone with assaults and robberies. In Figure 2, I describe the zones in the study area.

![Figure 2. Drawing of the neighbourhood showing zones A, B and C (Field note, October 2018)](image)

As I mentioned, although at the beginning I had planned not to enter children’s houses, however, as the fieldwork went on, environmental considerations made me start visiting a few of them. For example, children started to invite me to their houses to protect me from the sun or rain. This situation led me to reconsider the ethical aspects, mainly regarding privacy, consent and the possibility of witnessing rights violations (Bushin, 2007) (see section 3.5 on Ethical considerations). Nevertheless, this permitted me to identify key emerging elements for the research.

As discussed before, participant observation can cause some practical difficulties. A disadvantage of using participant observation is that it can be difficult to make decisions about what exactly to observe, as well as when and how (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Mukherji & Albon, 2015). Moreover, because it is not always easy to plan the timing of visits in advance, some important moments can be missed.
(Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Punch, 2001). Therefore, to focus my participant observation on the core concepts related to the research, I made some decisions in advance. I decided to draw attention to the theoretical components of citizenship, which I had identified previously in the literature review, as described in Table 4. Considering the main dimensions of children’s citizenship recognised in the literature—rights, membership, participation and responsibilities—I identified the common aspects explored in similar studies to guide me on what aspects to observe. However, I was open to discovering other matters of interest to the children and, by reflecting on those, I identified new emerging topics as the study went on.

**Table 4. Examples of aspects observed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component of citizenship</th>
<th>Aspects observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>- How do children negotiate the enforcement of their rights with their peers and adults?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Which children’s rights are recognized?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do the living experiences of children concerning their rights vary with changes in the flow of the river (rising and falling stages)? (If so, how?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>- What do children say about living in their community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do children’s perceptions vary with changes in the flow of the river (rising and falling stages)? (If so, how?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>- What responsibilities are assigned to children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How do children experience their responsibilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do children’s responsibilities and their practices vary with changes in the flow of the river (rising and falling stages)? (If so, how?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>- Do children become involved in the identification of problems and solutions in family, school, and community affairs? (If so, how?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How do children negotiate their participation with their peers and adults?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does children’s participation vary with changes in the flow of the river (rising and falling stages)? (If so, how?)

During qualitative research, such as ethnographic research, it is common for the researcher to collect photographs, videos, drawings and other material to provide further evidence for the interpretation of the phenomena being studied (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). Accordingly, I started taking photographs a month after I arrived. I did not do it earlier, because I wanted to ensure I had consent and I did not want to be intrusive in relation to the neighbourhood’s life, considering I was new in the area. Although I asked caregivers and children for their consent to take photographs, I preferred to develop confidence in our relationship before I captured their experiences. Also, at this stage, I was not sure how to manage the consent of third parties (see section 3.5 on Ethical considerations).

When I began to take photographs, I did this to help me to remember the spaces I visited in the neighbourhood, to facilitate the taking of notes. Initially, I only took photographs of the context in order to have visual descriptions: for instance, of house structures, to record the process of how the main bridge was built, and so forth. I did my best to ensure that no one appeared in these photographs, or at least no children, apart from those who gave me their consent. As time went by, I started to take photographs of children and their activities, asking them before I took the photo for their consent.

Regarding drawings, from my very first visit I carried a notebook with me, mostly to write down my initial thoughts and pieces of information that I did not want to forget. During the afternoons when we were sheltering from the heat, the children often asked me if they could borrow my notebook. Moreover, children whose families could afford notebooks for schools brought them to the group to draw with me. For this reason, I decided to have one notebook and colour pens that children could use if they wanted to.
At the end of this stage, I took time to re-read my field notes and reflect on the main challenges I faced in order to make decisions and redesign the strategy for the next phase.

**Phase 2: January 2019–April 2019**

During this phase, there were new environmental conditions. At the beginning, I could walk on the ground and neighbourhood access was feasible, but, as the water level increased, mobility though the neighbourhood became challenging. The risky conditions were mainly related to the possibility of falling into the water and drowning. For instance, it was difficult to walk on the bridges because they were not stable: they broke easily and were slippery. To keep the children and myself safe, and to gather accurate information, I changed my strategy about the frequency of my visits and the places where I observed children.

In relation to the frequency of my visits, these reduced in both days and hours during this phase. I had to change my spontaneous approach to a more planned strategy. Unlike the previous phase, I did not try to cover most days and times (morning and afternoon). Instead, I made a list of the main activities of the children that I had observed during the first phase. My strategy was to visit children during the hours when they were usually engaged in such activities. For example, in phase 1, children used to go to the nearby church on Saturday, so an important part of gathering information was to witness if this activity continued or was modified during the rising stage.

Concerning spaces, these varied across time. During the first month of this phase, as the children were on school holidays and we could still transit on the ground in some parts of the neighbourhood, I spent time with the children in public spaces and, if the heat was high or it was raining, we took refuge in their houses on the ground floor or in the hallway of the upper floor.

When the mobility in public spaces became more difficult, I started going to children’s houses. To do this I had the following considerations:
I revised my earlier field notes and I identified those houses in which children used to meet in each area of the neighbourhood. For instance, in area ‘A’ (see Figure 2), some children used to go to Sandra’s house to watch TV; while in area ‘B’, Jimena’s house was a meeting point.

In addition to selecting children’s activities, I also tried to interact with all children from my initial sample. However, this was not always possible, as I could not reach some houses, because they were not linked by a bridge, or because the family travelled out of their neighbourhood during the school holidays.

Despite having participant consent (both the children’s and their caregivers’), I did not feel welcome in some houses, or I felt unsafe. I only visited those houses where I felt comfortable and where I observed that children and adults accepted my presence.

When classes started, I had planned to observe children in their school settings. In the end, I rejected this plan for the following reasons:

Primary schools: The majority of children who attended pre-school during phase 1 were 5-year-old children. During this phase, they turned 6 and began going to primary school. To observe them at school, I would have had to add the primary setting, as well as the pre-school setting. Although I had a meeting with teachers in the local primary school to gain access, I identified that not all of the children who I had been observing attended the same primary school. Moreover, the children who attended the primary school studied in two different classrooms with new students who I had never seen before. Therefore, to continue participant observation, I would have had to visit different classrooms in the same school. Plus, the presence of children who were not part of the initial sample would have introduced consent issues. Observing children in different schools and different classrooms would have been time-consuming, requiring me to spend more time in the neighbourhood. As I
said, I had reduced my time in the area in this phase because of mobility issues due to the weather. In addition, I would have had to build trust bonds with new students and their caregivers, who I did not plan to include in my research. I justify this exclusion because a core interest of the research was to observe children during the falling and rising stage of the river. As I did not interact with this additional group of children during the falling stage (phase 1), I would not have information to compare or analyse the environmental influences on their lived citizenship during the rising stage.

- Pre-school (PRONOEI): In Peru, the school year starts in March. However, after the first week, classes were cancelled by the teacher for two months because the rains had damaged the classroom. Therefore, it was not possible to carry out participant observation there. When classes restarted, a few children from my initial sample attended and new children with whom I had not previously interacted started to attend. For the same reason discussed above, I did not propose to include them in the research sample. During phase 1, I had felt frustrated by the precarious conditions, which made it difficult for me to observe the children. Being aware of this limitation was an additional reason for not visiting the school settings.

However, as their experiences at school were likely to be particularly important, I incorporated strategies to gather this information. For instance, I attended some of the school activities, such as the walk to the city's main square on the first day of classes. I also accompanied children back home and stayed with them for a while to talk about their school day.

In this phase, I continued using photographs and drawings as a tool, although in a different way from in the previous phase. This time, in addition to using them as field notes, the children themselves started to ask me to take photographs of them and their personal belongings. Although I explained to them that I could not give them a
print sample of the pictures, they asked if they could see them all the time. As seen in other research (Emond, 2005; Punch, 2001), looking at photos that we took during earlier months enabled us to talk about past events.

Concerning children’s drawings, I continued carrying my notebook; however, apart from the free drawings, a new dynamic arose in this phase. In the previous phase, children had used the notebook and returned it to me, but now the children asked if they could take sheets of paper out, on which they drew. I acceded, but I asked if I could take photographs of their drawings.

As I described, I tried to interact with all the children from my initial sample; however, it was not always possible, due to mobility issues. For instance, I could only interact with Jazmin in her house up until the neighbourhood was covered with water, because she did not have a bridge to get into her house. She and her family used a canoe to reach their house. I decided not to use her canoe because of the risk of drowning. I also realised that I interacted more with girls than with boys during this stage. When I arrived, most of the boys were not in their houses or were playing in the water. In order to keep track of all the children from my initial sample, when I noticed that I had not been interacting with one child for some time, I asked the other children about him or her. I also took note of these circumstances in order to adjust my participant observation and interviews in the following phase.

At the end of this phase (mid-April), the risks increased (on account of the weather). Hence, I stopped visiting the neighbourhood. As I will explain later, I took time to discuss my early findings and practical challenges with key actors in the area (particularly staff of NGOs working on related topics). From these dialogues, I gathered information to develop my interview procedures (practicalities and themes) and participant observation to make them more suitable in the next phase. In addition, I started developing the interviews for government workers.

**Phase 3: April 2019–June 2019**

During this stage the water was going down and it was possible to spend time with the children playing on the ground. Also, as I had built trust with the children, they
showed me more parts of their houses, apart from the vestibule where we socialised in the first stage. During this stage, I carried out interviews with children and adults in the neighbourhood.

Taking notes is one of the central challenges of using ethnographic methods (Emond, 2005; Rockwell, 2009; Walford, 2009b). The literature suggests that there is no one way of taking notes, because it depends on the preference of the researcher and the context (Walford, 2009b). At the beginning, I took notes immediately after my visits, but this was not always possible. As I will discuss in the section on reflexivity (section 3.6), the high temperatures and emotional issues regarding fieldwork made me feel overwhelmed at times. For these reasons, I decided to take some notes in my notebook after my visit and write the full notes the day after. When it was possible, I wrote field notes including verbatim descriptions of the aspects I was observing, as well as my feelings. I also took pictures to help me remember, and I used audio recordings of my voice. As Lofland (2006) suggests, I also wrote down the thematic ideas that occurred to me while observing or writing field notes. As I explain later, re-reading and revising the field notes and analytic reflection were particularly useful in planning appropriate questions for children and adult interviews. I also reported on my initial thoughts and reflections on the practicalities of the fieldwork, as well as emerging topics. These reports also formed part of the data analysed.

3.3.2. Interviews with children

To understand children’s experiences it is essential to gather information from their perspectives (Bustelo, 2012; Gaitán, 2006). As I stated earlier, lived citizenship is associated with children’s self-perceptions about aspects related to children’s citizenship (James, 2011; Olsson, 2017). Therefore, I decided to carry out semi-structured interviews with children in order to gather their perceptions about lived citizenship.
Before starting the fieldwork, I planned to develop participatory methods by inviting children to group sessions after school hours. These would have taken place in the school or a community centre. Since my arrival to the neighbourhood, I had worked on identifying the appropriate procedure to accomplish this goal. However, I faced difficulties due to safety issues as well as practicalities. Incidents of drowning and associated dangers made me give up the idea of doing an activity that required children to transit from their houses to a meeting point.

The meeting points in the neighbourhood were usually the PRONOEI and the church. As I mentioned, the PRONOEI was severely damaged by the rains; therefore, holding meetings there would be a risk. In relation to the church, children used to go on Saturdays. However, children saw it as a place where they were given gifts and food, in addition to the religious aspects. Consequently, I considered that these associations could influence the development of participatory workshops.

Instead of doing participative methods in groups, I decided to conduct interviews. I chose interviews as a method, because they allow the researcher to gather rich and detailed data on each individual child’s opinions and experiences (Gallagher, 2009). I opted for semi-structured interviews. While structured interviews set a previous list of questions, semi-structured interviews have an outline with topics or questions, and the researcher has the possibility of adding questions. In this way, I was able to gain a deeper understanding of the research theme from the interviewee’s perspective (Baptista, et al., 2010) and clarify my interpretation of the previous data collected (File, Mueller, Wisneski, & Stremmel, 2016). Although I had obtained information about children’s experiences from my participant observations, I needed to gather deeper information and to clarify some data on those children with whom I had interacted with less in phase 2.

I was aware that interviewing children can raise some difficulties. For instance, children can feel uncomfortable with the one-to-one setting if they have had negative experiences with adults in similar situations (Gallagher, 2009). The time limit of the interview can be another disadvantage, as it can interfere with the completion of the
process (Abebe, 2009). In addition, ensuring privacy to conduct the interview can be tough (Bushin, 2007). As I will describe later, I prepared strategies in advance to mitigate these difficulties, by considering the literature on research methods. However, I faced other challenges during the processes, which I will reflect on in the sections on ethics (section 3.5) and reflexivity (section 3.6).

3.3.2.1. Sample
I selected children from my initial sample using the following criteria:

- To fulfil the ethical consideration of consent and choice, I selected those whose caregivers’ had given consent. I also asked children before the interview if they were willing to participate.
- I selected those with whom I had interacted with the most during phases 1 and 2. There were children who I interacted with in phase 1, but then only saw again once or twice in the neighbourhood without much communication between us. As I mentioned, some children could have felt uncomfortable with the interview setting (Gallagher, 2009); therefore, I decide to only include those children with whom I had established a bond of trust, by interacting for a longer time during fieldwork.

Tables 5 and 6 show the sample of children interviewed, giving their pseudonym, gender and age.

Table 5. Children interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimena</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I decided to exclude 3-year-old children for the following reasons:

- I had difficulties in fully understanding their verbal communication, not only because of their developmental stage, but also because of cultural expressions. Palaiologou (2017) asserts that it is more common for younger children not to fully understand some questions posed by adults than older children. However, I witnessed that this could also happen with older children.

- When the 5-year-old children started to go to primary school, I could spend more time with children below 5, therefore I considered that I already had sufficient information about the younger children from my participant observations.
3.3.2.2. Procedure

I conducted interviews during phase 3 of the fieldwork. To prepare the interviews, I started by outlining the information I had on each child. Doing this summary helped the subsequent process considerably. Firstly, I identified what information was missing on the children, in order to have almost the same data for each child. Secondly, it allowed me to consider the individual characteristics of each child, such as if they were more talkative or shy. Besides, I was aware of some aspects about their family and cultural background. This information allowed me to plan my questions for the respondents appropriately (Brooker, 2001).

Regarding the questions, I included the dimensions of citizenship that I found in the literature. I also incorporated some aspects that emerged during fieldwork. Inspired by other research (e.g., Ames et al., 2010; Ames, 2013; Olsson, 2017), I used props to stimulate our conversations. Scholars assert that the use of prompts and props helps to engage children’s interest, stimulates reflection and contributes to developing a ‘child-friendly’ process (Brooker, 2001, p. 166). I developed my first interview using one girl as a pilot (Baptista et al., 2010), in order to make sure that the questions and props would be understandable and familiar to children.

Table 7. Examples of children’s interviews questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship dimension</th>
<th>Sample of question</th>
<th>Sample of props</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in their closest surroundings (Liebel, 2007; Lister, 2008)</td>
<td>What do you do in your house during the day?</td>
<td>A drawing of their family</td>
<td>Ames et al., 2010; Ames, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What does each family member do during the day?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous mobility (Olsson, 2017)</td>
<td>Which places do you like the most? (Why?)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood map</td>
<td>Ames et al., 2010; Olsson, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are they different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I chose children’s houses as a location for the interviews. Firstly, as I mentioned, the risk of drowning was high, and I preferred to not make them travel on the bridges. Secondly, I felt this was the natural continuity of my fieldwork process. As I have described, I already was going to the children's homes, where we talked and drew. However, I was conscious that interviewing young children involves challenges and ethical issues, such as interruptions and privacy limitations, among other things (Bushin, 2007). Therefore, as discussed in the literature, I had to be flexible and prepared for interruptions and disruptions during the interviews, and I had to be aware of the individual as well as collective needs of children (Bushin, 2007; Irwin & Johnson, 2005; Kesby, 2007).

By the time I conducted the interviews, I had already interacted with the children over a long period of time; therefore, I was familiar to them and their families. However, conducting an interview in a one-to-one setting has the potential to make children feel uncomfortable (Brooker, 2001; Bushin, 2007; Gallagher, 2009). For this reason, I asked them continually if they felt comfortable and if they were fine to continue the interview, giving them the opportunity to stop the interview at any time. In two cases, they asked me to stop the interview and return another day, due to circumstantial disturbances. On one occasion, because the father arrived drunk and on the other one because it was the child’s time to watch cartoons.

In most of the cases, children asked me to interview them in the presence of their sibling(s) or mother, in the same way that we usually spent time during my participant observation. Regarding this request, I noticed privacy and confidentiality issues, as I
will discuss later. However, as Walker (2001) suggests, I had to balance the ethical privacy aims with the child’s request to have others present, as well as my personal and the participant’s safety. Likewise, as other studies highlight (e.g., Brooker, 2001; Bushin, 2007), I had to be prepared for the desire of adults or older siblings to interfere with children’s answers. Therefore, I had to be flexible, but also apply strategies to ensure the maximum authenticity in the children’s responses (Irwin & Johnson, 2005). For instance, when siblings were around, I also gave them sheets and colouring pens, so they accompanied us during the interview, but did their own drawings. When someone interrupted the child being interviewed, I reminded them that I was interested in knowing children’s responses; I also re-asked the question mentioning the children’s names on purpose and maintaining eye contact with them (Bushin, 2007) to encourage the child to respond themself.

In other cases, children asked me to interview them with another child together. I agreed because group interviews can contribute to children feeling confident and I could benefit from their peer discussions (Gallagher, 2009; Abebe, 2009). However, I was aware that it could also raise some complications, such as the domination or influence of one child over other (Abebe, 2009). For this reason, I made some decisions:

- I only interviewed children in pairs when I knew that they usually played together, in order to ensure confidence between them.
- When I asked questions, I mentioned the name of the children directly, to ensure that he or she would respond directly. However, I also recorded their discussions.

I also realised that some individual characteristics led me to use different strategies to conduct the interviews. For instance, one child was very shy; he agreed to participate in the interview, but instead of replying verbally to my questions, he drew his answers. In this case, I asked him what he was drawing to ensure that I had interpreted it correctly. In other cases, especially with girls, I had to perform the interview as a game instead of a conversation. While I was developing the interview,
I realised that some girls did not feel comfortable being asked directly, so I decided to shift the strategy. Considering that children express their beliefs and perceptions through play, I started to play as if we were in a local radio programme. To finish the interview, I provided them with sheets and colour pens, and allowed them to draw freely if they wanted to as a way of debriefing, in case the interview caused some distress (Brooker, 2001). With the child’s permission, I audio recorded the interview and then scanned the drawings to make a computer file. Some children did not allow me to record the interview, so I took notes at the time of the conversation.

3.3.3. Interviews with adults

As I explained earlier, my position as researcher understands children as subjects of rights with the competence to inform about their experiences. However, as lived citizenship is related to how adults recognise children as social actors (James, 2011), I developed semi-structured interviews with adults in the children’s closest surroundings (such as caregivers) as well as government workers. This method allowed me to obtain information about how their personal meanings and interpretations (Blaikie, 2009; Mason, 2002) about children’s citizenship. According to childhood scholars, by interviewing people surrounding the children, the researcher can obtain information about the values and concepts underlying the everyday practices observed by the researcher and their interactions with young people (see Olsson, 2017; Punch, 2002). By interviewing government workers, I obtained information about the policies related to children’s citizenship in the area. The information gathered helped me to understand the similarities and differences between children’s and adults’ perceptions and opinions about citizenship.

3.3.3.1. Sample

The selection of participants to interview during ethnographic research cannot always be pre-fixed. This can be negotiated over time and requires a reflective approach in order to select the appropriate informants, who are usually those who have the desired information and are willing to share it (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). For this reason, I considered different strategies to select the caregivers and
government workers (people who worked in government institutions, such as the municipality and the regional office of the Ministry of Education) to be interviewed.

Regarding caregivers, I identified those adults with more proximity and interaction with the children. I noticed that such adults were the ones who assigned responsibilities and where in charge of taking action to enforce children’s rights, such as ensure their attendance at school or for taking them to receive health care. By choosing those adults, I was able to learn more about their perceptions of the dimensions of children’s lived citizenship and compare and understand further what I observed from children’s actions. For example, I learnt more about how families assigned responsibilities to their members, as well as their perceptions of children’s roles.

In most of the cases I chose one adult person per child, usually the mother. In order to have representation of a male point of view, in the cases where I identified a father as significant person, I also interviewed them. In addition, I selected a community leader, because I identified that they would be familiar with the children. I interviewed 14 persons in the neighbourhood (see Table 8 and Table 9).

Table 8. Caregivers interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandra’s mother</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana and Shirley’s grandmother</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose’s mother</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimena’s mother</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis’s and Sara’s mother</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula’s mother</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel’s mother</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy’s father</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos’s mother</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego’s mother</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego’s father</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Saul’s and Heidy’s father  M  
Paula’s father  M  
Neighbourhood leader  M  

Table 9. Summary of caregivers interviewed by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To choose the government interviewees, I began by checking the structure of the regional and local government. Then, I identified those offices related to the topics of interest, such as those working in children’s services or citizens’ participation. By selecting participants from those offices, I was able to learn more about the official discourses around lived citizenship. I intended to interview both policymakers and those in charge of delivering social services. I used the following criteria:

- Three years’ experience working in the related areas, depending on the case (to ensure knowledge and experience about the theme)
- At least one year working experience in the zone prior to the research period (to ensure contextual knowledge)

To gain access to the participants, I contacted them in different ways. As I mentioned, I had connections with key actors in the government. When possible, I contacted them directly to request an interview. In cases where they were relatively new in the position, they informed me about those employees with more experience in the area. Then, I selected those who fulfilled the criteria and agreed to participate. I asked them for written consent and explained the aim of the research, the kind of questions that would be asked, and any ethical issues around their participation. I identified five government workers who met the criteria and were willing to participate: four men and one woman (see Table 10).
Table 10. Government worker interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.3.2. Procedure

As in the children’s interviews, I benefited from the flexibility of semi-structured interviews with adults. This feature allows me to ask certain questions across all participants, but also to include or clarify certain topics of interest depending on the interviewees’ position in the government (Baptista et al., 2010; File et al., 2016). Table 11 shows some examples of the questions posed.

Table 11. Examples of questions asked in adult interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All interviewees</td>
<td>Citizenship concept</td>
<td>What do you understand by the term ‘citizenship’?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers</td>
<td>Children’s participation</td>
<td>What do children do at home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewees from risk management office</td>
<td>Children’s participation</td>
<td>Do children participate in the risk management cycle? If so, how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewees from offices related to child protection</td>
<td>Children’s participation</td>
<td>Do children participate in the design of child protection strategies? If so, how?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aware of the importance of establishing a safe and comfortable space for the interviews (Baptista et al., 2010), I asked the participants about the best place to
interview them, assuming that this place would be a safe space for both the interviewee and myself.

I conducted the caregiver interviews in the neighbourhood, usually in their house when their children were at school. I asked for the caregiver’s consent to participate in the interview and for their permission to audio record it. Despite the fact that I was familiar to mothers, I interacted more with the children during my visits; therefore, for some of them this was the first time that we had spent time talking one-on-one. For this reason, some mothers used the time to share with me personal issues. As I will describe later, this led me to consider some ethical issues and practicalities. In those cases, when I witnessed distress, I stopped the interview and I offered time for debriefing.

Concerning the interviews with government workers, all of these took place outside the neighbourhood. Although (as I will describe later) anonymity and privacy was a crucial aspect of the research, I asked for some personal details, such as gender and length of experience working in the area and in the position to contextualise the information and improve later analysis.

3.4. Data management and analysis

One of the main challenges of using ethnographic methods is the large amount of data generated during fieldwork (Emond, 2005; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Rockwell, 2009). Thus, for the analysis it was essential to have mechanisms to reduce the data collected. In order to have a better attentional focus and selective method to collect data, I had three main strategies: with children, with myself and with key actors. I continuously checked with children about my choices of data collection. I tried to make sure that the phenomena I was observing were significant for children. In addition, I took time to re-read my field notes and view the photographs and pictures; after this, I wrote reports with my initial thoughts and ideas about the methodological challenges and emerging topics. In addition, I arranged meetings with key actors to discuss my work. Working in this way allowed me to assess and rethink
my methodology and to select the activities that I needed to observe later in order to address gaps and explore issues.

My data collection produced a range of pieces of information: field notes, pictures, interviews, drawings and reports. In Table 12, I state the data management process for each piece of raw data.

**Table 12. Data management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw data</th>
<th>Data management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photos and free drawings</td>
<td>I selected those photos and drawings that complemented my field notes, and stored them according to the date on which they were collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>I turned my field notes into transcripts and identified them by the date on which they were collected. When I wrote the field notes I used pseudonymous for the names of children and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording of interviews</td>
<td>I turned the audio recordings into transcripts and stored the transcripts together with basic information collected during the interview: who, where, and why it was collected, but preserving the participants’ anonymity by using pseudonymous (Ames et al., 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings from children’s interviews</td>
<td>I took photographs of the children’s drawings and stored them by date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I did not carry out the analysis at a single point in time after the gathering of the data, but instead immersed myself in a continuous and cyclical process that started during
the data collection, when I included my insights in the field notes and took notes on my reflections. In addition, I had moments when I stopped visiting the neighbourhood in order to read my field notes, review the literature or discuss my early findings with key actors. At these times, I identified new ideas and emerging topics that, as suggested by Saldaña (2009), contributed during the coding process.

After the fieldwork, the analysis continued during the data management process. While reading the field notes, transcribing interviews or looking at the photos and drawings, I wrote down my reflections and any ideas that came up. For instance, when I was transcribing the adult interviews, I identified some differences in their perspectives and perceptions about what children experienced.

As planned, I started coding using the NVivo computer software. I stored the field notes, interview transcripts and selected photos and drawings in the program. I benefited from the advantages of using computer software, such as its organised storage system and ease of locating the data. However, I also encountered some disadvantages, especially with the distance between the researcher and the data which originated partly as a consequence of the tactile-digital divide (Gilbert, 2002). Therefore, I combined the use of the screen with more tactile and manual data handling.

I applied thematic analysis in which researchers identify and interpret themes and patterns of meaning guided by the research question (Clarke & Braun, 2017). I followed a sequence that is in line with the six phases proposed by Braun and Clarke (2012). First, I familiarised myself with the data. This process started with the data management, in which, as I explained, I re-read the field notes, organised the photographs and drawings, and transcribed the interviews. As I mentioned, during the fieldwork I elaborated reports to show my progress to my supervisors, in which I included an initial analysis of the data.

After I was familiar with the data, I generated initial codes that were potentially relevant to my research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2012). I did this using the software, Nvivo, which I used for data reduction and storage. I highlighted and coded
excerpts in the field notes, reports and interview transcripts, and I selected and coded photographs and children’s drawings. For this coding, I used the themes identified in the literature review, particularly those related to the dimensions of children’s lived citizenship, including the aspects described in Table 4, and the emerging topics identified in my fieldwork reports. I also selected any data that drew my attention on account of being surprising or unusual. Although I started using the theory to generate the codes and the subsequent themes, the analysis combined inductive and deductive processes. I identified aspects related to the existing literature, but I was also attentive to the data that showed aspects of children lived citizenship that I did not anticipate. My open and attentive attitude to identifying the themes that came up during my observations and interactions with the participants was perhaps a crucial aspect in this regard.

As Braun and Clarke (2012) suggest, after the initial codes I searched themes by identifying similarities, patterns and overlaps in the codes. To do so, I printed the coded passages, selected pictures and started the second coding process manually. I also printed and cut out small squares with the name of the initial and new codes and ‘played’ with them repetitively as puzzles. At this stage, I paid particular attention to analysing if the codes appeared in a similar or different way depending on the phase of the fieldwork or the child’s age and gender. Considering these primary associations, I began to create groups of codes by organising and finding connections, contradictions and overlaps between them.

Next, I started to review potential themes. In this phase, researchers undertake a process to develop themes in relation to the coded data and the entire data set, which involves quality checking (Braun & Clarke, 2012). I continued this process manually; I checked the groups created to identify possible themes. As the literature indicates, I started by checking the themes against the coded excerpts to analyse if the themes worked in relation to the data (Braun & Clarke, 2012). I wrote the themes on sticky notes and moved around the themes and codes, relocating them when needed. To identify the themes, I had some considerations in line with the suggestions of Braun and Clarke (2012), such as to analyse if I had enough data to
evidence each theme, if the data that supports the theme was typical or unusual, if the themes and codes fitted in the existing literature or emerged from the data, as well as the boundaries of each theme. As I will explain in the section on reflexivity (section 3.6), reflecting constantly on my own perceptions and feelings during this stage was crucial in order to reduce any possible bias in my analysis. Also, to further ensure rigor, besides guiding myself with the existing literature, I shared and discussed the coding process and themes with my supervisors.

In the part of the data management, I started to define and name the themes. As the literature suggests, during this phase it is necessary to establish what is unique and specific about each theme (Braun & Clarke, 2012). To do so, I created a document in which I included the description of each theme, as well as the potential content, the selected excerpts, photos or drawings to discuss, and theoretical frameworks to support the arguments for each theme. I identified three themes related to: (1) how children perceive and learn about their environment, (2) how children perceive and learn about others, (3) how children find ways to participate and enforce their rights. In addition, I recognised three themes as a unifying thread: play, exploration and rest. I discussed the document with my supervisors and received feedback to ensure that the theoretical frameworks underpinning each theme were appropriate and adequately supported the arguments, that the themes were related, but did not overlap, and that the themes addressed the research questions.

After the discussion with my supervisors, I found the following: children learnt geographical and sociocultural features of their environment by playing, exploring and resting. From these activities and the knowledge gathered, they adapt to their contexts. For instance, they learnt how to swim during the rising stage, became familiar with the typical activities of their neighbourhood, recognised safe areas for walking during the falling stage, and so on. They also identified the risks of and limitations on playing, exploring and resting, either because of adult norms or geographical features. Based on this knowledge, children took on responsibilities and participated in activities to contribute to the wellbeing of themselves and others in the neighbourhood. Children also committed transgressions and engaged in
negotiations to enforce their rights. As a result, I propose the following framework in which to present the findings of this research:

- Chapter 5. Exploring, playing and resting to become familiar with the living context an urban flood-prone area
- Chapter 6. Performing citizen actions while playing, exploring and resting in a flood-prone area
- Chapter 7. Children’s acts of citizenship

I collected the data in Spanish and wrote fieldwork reports and thesis in English. Writing up the findings of the qualitative research in a different language to the language in which the data was collected can generate some difficulties that might result in a change or loss of meaning of what participants expressed, hence loss of the rigour of the study (van Nes, Abma; Jonsson & Deeg et. al 2010) For example, when translating the quotes, sometimes, it was challenging to find the exact word formulation in English to ensure the proper translation.

Being a native speaker of Spanish and being born in the country where I collected the data (Peru) contributed to reducing the challenges. I was able to understand what the children said and ask them for clarification if I did not understand some of the local words or phrases used in order to capture their meaning. As I have explained, the analysis was an ongoing process that began when I prepared the reports for my supervisors during the fieldwork. This also helped me to identify the words in Spanish that might be difficult to translate into English. When these words came up, I tried to include thick descriptions of what the children (or other interviewees) were referring to. I also checked with my supervisors and English speakers colleagues if I was using the proper words in English.

To sum up, the analysis process began during the fieldwork and continued while transcribing and storing the data. The process of coding was cyclical and involved the use of different procedures, including reviewing the data, going back to the literature, re-reading my initial thoughts, and so on. By combining manual and computer coding,
I identified three main categories and three unifying codes, which turn into a framework in which to present the results in this thesis.

3.5. Ethical considerations

According to the Ethical Research Involving Children (ERIC) project, (Graham, Powell, Taylor, Anderson, & Fitzgerald, 2013), a study should ensure respect for the participants’ rights and dignity, have the principle of non-maleficence and beneficence for the participants, as well as justice. However, taking into account these ethical considerations when carrying out research with children can pose challenges, even more when using ethnographic methods (Emond, 2005; Konstantoni & Kustatscher, 2015) and in a challenging context, such as areas with natural hazards (e.g., Ferreira, Buttell, & Cannon, 2018; Mukherji, Ganapati, & Rahill, 2014).

Therefore, besides literature about research with children (Farrell, 2015; Graham et al., 2013; Hill, 2005), I reviewed literature on the ethical aspects of conducting research in risky areas due to natural hazards (Ferreira et al., 2018; Inter-Agency Standing Committee, 2006) and literature on research ethics with people living in vulnerable situations, particularly in Latin America (Montero, 2006; Winkler, Alvear, Olivares, & Pasmanik, 2014). I obtained approval for the research from the School of Social and Political Science, University of Edinburgh, and followed the proscribed procedures for ethical research.

Considering the above, I included the following criteria: participants’ role and involvement; informed consent; participants’ protection; privacy and confidentiality; and respecting the participants and their cultural and social context, which are elaborated on in the following sub-sections.

3.5.1. Participants’ role and involvement

Theoretical assumptions in this research assume that children are protagonists within their societies; therefore, I envisaged them as participating actively in the study, rather than being simply informants. Although I, as an adult researcher, proposed the research design, during fieldwork I assumed a receptive attitude. This means that I
allowed myself to be guided by the children as the investigation developed. In this
sense, I sought to be sensitive to the children, their environmental needs, and their
characteristics, and was ready to adapt my data collection procedure accordingly. As
I will explain, I sought the voluntary and genuine participation of participants.

Involving children respectfully and ethically required gathering the data from their
own perspectives, as well as my own (Ames et al., 2010; Gaitán, 2006). Hence, to
ensure that I was collecting and understanding their perspectives, I took advantage
of ethnographic methods, because they allow the capturing of children’s experiences
from their point of view and challenge any preconceived ideas held by the researcher
about childhood and childhood experiences (Emond, 2005). Despite children being
the central focus of the research, I also made sure that I was gathering and
understanding adults’ perspectives as well. To do so, I asked questions, as many times
as necessary, to confirm that I was gathering and understanding the opinions and
views of the adult participants.

In terms of feedback to the participants, we had a farewell party at the end of the
fieldwork, where I verbally shared my initial ideas of what I learned with them. In
addition, I plan to write fact sheets with the implications of this study to deliver to
the policy makers involved in the research. (see section 8.3).

3.5.2. Consent and choice

The literature emphasises the difficulties involved in obtaining the informed consent
of the participants in ethnographic research (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007),
especially from children, because of the issues related to the possibility of
participation and power relations (Ames et al., 2010; Farrell, 2015; Konstantoni,
2012; Konstantoni & Kustatscher, 2015). I followed the suggestions of the Ethical
Research Involving Children (ERIC) project (Graham et al., 2013), which asserts that
consent should be explicit, informed, voluntary and renegotiated. Accordingly, I
obtained consent from the children and the adults involved in the research.
To obtain children’s consent, I asked for their consent directly and obtain their caregiver’s consent in writing. I asked for consent from those children who were ‘directly involved’ in the research (those who I was hoping to observe and who would take part in the interviews), as well as those ‘indirectly involved’ (other children in the neighbourhood). Because the data collection procedure took place in different spaces, I used different techniques.

I used the ‘magnets’ technique used by Kustatscher (2014) to ask for the consent of children in the school setting during the first stage of fieldwork. To do this, I placed a board divided in two on a wall. In each part I put a picture of myself, and I gave each child a picture of themselves. I also put a check ‘✓’ at the top, and an ‘X’ at the bottom (see Figure 3). I explained to the children that those who agreed to play and socialise with me could put their picture on the ‘✓’ side (opt-in option); those who did not agreed to participate, could place their picture on the ‘X’ side (opt-out option).

I made adaptations to the technique to make it understandable to the children and similar to other strategies used in the PRONOEI. Kustatscher (2014) used magnets, but as magnets were unfamiliar materials at the site where I collected the data, I identified the materials usually used by the teacher in their activities. I used a piece of fabric and the pictures had a hook and loop tape to stick it onto the fabric. Kustatscher (2014) used a green-encircled magnetic picture of herself as the ‘opt-in’ option, and the same picture but red-encircled and crossed-out as the ‘opt-out’ option. I realised that the red-encircled picture with the crossed line made children feel that they were punishing me. One of the children suggested to use ‘✓’ and ‘X’ next to my picture. I explored this option with the rest of participants, and they seemed to be more familiar with such symbols, as the teacher used them for other activities when children needed to say ‘yes’ or ‘no’. By using this technique, the children gave me their consent. Furthermore, they also had the choice to decide their level of involvement; for instance, they had the option to decide to participate in some activities and not to become involved in others (Kustatscher, 2014).
I developed an additional strategy to obtain children’s consent during participant observation, in public spaces and in their houses. Each time I visited the neighbourhood, and before I began my participant observation, I asked them if they agreed for me to be around them and if they wanted me to accompany them during their activities or to interact with them.

Nevertheless, in some situations it was challenging to ensure ‘explicit’ consent, as suggested in the literature (Graham et al., 2013). In particular, children in vulnerable situations can find it difficult to express their refusal to participate, due to differences in power relationships (Ames et al., 2010). Therefore, I had to be sensitive to the non-verbal communication of children and their family members, as well as to my own feelings. As I described earlier, I did not interact with children in public spaces or enter their houses if I perceived discomfort on the part of the participant or felt unsafe.

To obtain a participant’s written consent, I created consent sheets on which I detailed the aims and the proposed methods of the research, the time I planned to spend in the community, and the type of participation I required of the participant (See Appendixes). In addition, I explained who I would share the results of the research with and how, the benefits for the participants, and the level of confidentiality. I used different procedures to obtain consent from children and from adults. I asked
caregivers for their written consent for participation by their children, and I explained to them that, parallel to their consent, I would also seek the verbal consent of the children.

To obtain the consent of adults to participate in the interviews and the teacher’s permission for the participant observation in the school, I asked for their written consent using the above mentioned information. Initially, I planned to organise meetings with families, teachers, community leaders, and government workers to share the core information. However, I identified that a one-to-one conversation would be more beneficial. Firstly, I identified that community meetings were not usual in the area. Secondly, due to cultural understandings about privacy and information sharing, the practice of requesting written consent to participate in research was not common. Thirdly, I observed that children’s caregivers were mostly adult women (mainly mothers), who due to local gender dynamics do not usually express their doubts and ideas in public spaces. Therefore, I preferred to meet them in private spaces to be able to explain and discuss the information and clarifying any doubts or perceptions about the research or my role. Some of the caregivers were illiterate; in those cases, I read the consent sheet out loud and asked them to include their fingerprints.

Carrying out participant observation in public spaces poses particular challenges to obtaining consent, especially from those who are not participating directly in the research (such as other residents in the study site). I met the community leaders to ask the best way to inform the community about my research. From the information obtained in these meetings, I decided to show up at meeting points in the neighbourhood, for instance, the convenience store or the area were neighbours usually played volleyball. Once I was there, I interacted with the people around me, talking about the research and myself. I also noticed that the children also talked about me and introduced me to other residents (both children and adults). Therefore, as I will describe later, I had continuous information about how children understood my role. In addition, when I took photographs, I tried not to capture those children who were not participating directly in the research or their belongings.
Ames and colleagues (2010) point out that, because of Peru’s historical background and insecurity level, the population may have misgivings about foreign researchers. For this reason, I considered their proposal about consent as a process, rather than a moment, and I discussed and provided information as many times as necessary in order to ensure that participants were constantly informed and able to clear up doubts or withdraw at any time.

3.5.3. Minimising possible harm

Although the research does not explore particularly sensitive issues or include participants who have suffered violence or who are victims of persistent suffering, I took some measures in case I witnessed risky situations to prevent possible harm or discomfort on the part of the participants or myself (Graham et al., 2013; Hill, 2005). During the familiarisation period, I identified local institutions in the area from which children or adults could seek support. Before I began the research, I made contact with the Local Ombudsman for children’s services to notify the office that I would contact them in case I witnessed such issues.

Conducting research in a risky area may increase the possibility of encountering threats or witnessing situations that affect children emotionally or physically (Montgomery, 2012; Mukherji et al., 2014). During the fieldwork, several such situations occurred. For example, two people drowned during the flooding season and a child was murdered in the city. In these cases, taking advantage of my background as a psychologist, I conducted debriefing activities and I provided time for children to express their feelings and discomfort. In addition, as I explained earlier, I continuously adjusted my methods in order to ensure the protection of myself and the participants. For instance, I reduced my visits to the neighbourhood when I identified increased risks during the flooding season. I also opted to interview children in their houses, instead of using participatory methods at meeting points, to avoid children having to move across the weak bridges.

Lastly, the literature about doing studies in emergency settings and vulnerable areas highlights the importance of the researcher taking care about their own security.
(Inter-Agency Standing Committee, 2006; Lee, 1995; Montgomery, 2012). According to Lee’s (1995) suggestions, I informed a local colleague of my location every time I arrived and left the neighbourhood. I will describe later the measures undertaken with this colleague to ensure privacy and confidentiality. In addition, I always ensured that I had money for transport, I avoided visiting the neighbourhood at risky times, such as at night, and I equipped myself with proper clothing to respond to the climatic conditions.

3.5.4. Privacy and confidentiality

Both children and adults have the right to have their privacy protected during the research (Farrell, 2015; Graham et al., 2013; Hill, 2005). Informed by the literature on childhood studies, I sought to protect the identity of the participants, as well as the data I collected. To protect their identity, I ensured anonymity in relation to the management and dissemination of data, by using pseudonyms when writing field notes, as well as in the transcription of the information gathered. In addition, I removed anything that may identify its owner, as well as any information about the neighbourhood or school. To protect the information shared by the participants, only I have access to the audio recordings, transcripts, and visual data for research analysis purposes. I shared these data with my supervisors through the analytical process, but only after it was anonymised. The audio recordings and transcripts of the sessions and hard copies of data are stored in a locked area, and electronic data are stored on a secure system in a location that only the researcher has access to. After the thesis is accepted, the non-anonymised data will be deleted, and only the anonymised data will be kept for academic purposes.

In disseminating the findings, I have included quotes and photographs of the children, as is usual in qualitative research. In doing so, in addition to using pseudonyms, I have taken care not to include information that could lead to the identification of the participants. In the case of photographs, I have only used those in which the participants cannot be identified and, where necessary, the resolution of the photographs has been changed to ensure this.
As I mentioned, at the end of phases 1 and 2 I reduced my visits to the neighbourhood and took time to rethink the data collection procedure. As part of this reflexive process, I had discussions/meetings not only with my supervisors, but also with key actors from local NGOs and other institutions. Therefore, to ensure privacy and confidentiality, I did not share any information that could identify participants or the specific location of the study site. Instead, we discussed broadly their working experiences with children in similar flood-prone areas in the city. Nevertheless, as I mentioned, I selected one colleague to share my location with for security reasons, and she agreed only to share the information if my safety was in question.

Christensen (2004) points out that during ethnographic research children might share with the researcher information that has not been told to other children or adults, or that is secret to other adults. I considered it important to explain to children and their caregivers (mainly their mothers) that I would respect their privacy and confidentiality, but if I become aware of possible significant harm or damage, I would need to inform an adult or the local Ombudsman for children’s services.

However, in resonance with other researchers (see Bushin, 2007), I had to rethink if the standards required in the literature were appropriate and feasible in my fieldwork location. For instances, issues around cultural understandings of private/public spaces made me rethink the need to conduct interviews in a private and neutral space, where children could express themselves freely and to reduce the possibility of them being influenced by other people (Baptista et al., 2010). As I mentioned above, some children asked to be interviewed in pairs or in the presence of their sibling(s) or caregiver(s). Therefore, I balanced the children’s wishes with the personal safety of the children and myself (Bushin, 2007) and, as described, took measures to reduce the influence of other people over children’s responses. Moreover, I considered it important to capture these dynamics in my field notes as insights in themselves.
3.5.5. Respect for the cultural and social context

Winkler and colleagues (2014) highlight the need to have adequate knowledge and respect for participants’ value systems and social structures. In this regard, my Peruvian background and my work experience gave me some familiarity with the Amazonian context and an ability to speak the same language (Spanish) as the participants. However, I needed a deeper understanding of the particular needs and characteristics of the population. For this reason, I made myself aware of the policies and statistical data, as well as other pertinent information about the fieldwork site. In addition, even though the aim of the familiarisation was to know and understand the values, beliefs, and cultural expressions, this process of cultural understanding was ongoing during all phases of the fieldwork. In doing so, a reflexive attitude was useful.

To sum up, informed by other research conducted in similar areas, I followed ethical principles to ensure the protection of participants’ rights and to position children as protagonists in the research. However, I faced various ethical dilemmas that shaped my decision-making during and after data collection. As the literature highlights, reflexivity was vital to address such dilemmas (Graham et al., 2013). This is addressed in the following section.

3.6. Reflexivity

Ethnographic methods require the researcher to be immersed in the context of the participants. In this process, the researcher is constantly building relations and making interpretations about what he or she hears, witnesses or is being told (Emond, 2005; Mason, 2002; Rockwell, 2009; Rossman, 2012). What is more, collecting data from people in a vulnerable situation can elicit in the researcher a process of rethinking personal issues (Gaskell, 2008; Hunt, 1989). Reflexivity helped me to be aware of subjectivities, biases and possible power relations (see Graham et al., 2013; Mason, 2002). ‘Reflexivity’ refers to the process in which the researcher reflects on his or her own assumptions, beliefs, and practices and how these may influence the research. As part of this, the researcher explores the “personal,
interpersonal, institutional, pragmatic, emotional, theoretical, epistemological and ontological influences on the research and data analysis process” (Mauthner & Doucet, 2003, p. 425). I identified that I had to reflect on how some of my individual characteristics, such as being a woman from outside the area (not from the same city), alone, and an adult, may have shaped my experiences in the fieldwork and, therefore, my relationships with the participants and myself.

3.6.1. My relationship with the context: Rethinking the stigma of living in an Amazonian flood-prone area

When preparing my research proposal, I informed myself about the challenges of performing ethnographic research, mainly regarding its flexible and messy features (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Walford, 2009b). To be prepared I followed the suggestions of other scholars about familiarising myself with the area (e.g., Montero, 2006; Winkler et al., 2014). As mentioned previously, I read about research conducted in the area, statistics, policies, and so on. I also took time to explore the city and settle myself in accommodation where I felt secure. By doing this, I assumed that it would help me to feel more secure and, hence, that it would be easier for me to be flexible during data collection.

I was aware of the main characteristics of the location, such as the level of insecurity, high poverty rate, and prevalence of diarrhoea and other stomach complaints. As it was a flood-prone area, I knew that I had to adapt my methodology to the weather conditions. However, the context always surprised me, and I never felt totally prepared. I had to be more flexible than I expected and at times more than I could manage.

The main elements that surprised me were not related to children per se, but to the site characteristics. Unpredictable weather conditions, as well as risky features and pollution, produced in me different kinds of negative feelings and ideas about the neighbourhood. I needed to reflect on such emotions in order to analyse their impact on my relationships with the children and adults who were taking part in the study.
What is more, I realised that my feelings changed with the river’s behaviour (falling, rising or transition). During the first phase of the research (when the river was in transition), the most common feeling was anger about the scarcity conditions and the lack of adult action to improve the situation. Reflecting on my feelings led me to rethink notions of Amazonian people as ‘lazy and conformist’. Such ideas are common beliefs in Peru about people living in the Amazonia, as shown in a study carried out in Lima, the capital of Peru: 22.2% of participants consider that Amazonian people are lazy and conformists (Espinosa, Calderón Prada, Burga, & Gúímac, 2007). After analysing my anger, I was able to refocus my observation on children's experiences. In parallel with the start of the rising stage (phase 2 of the research), I experienced fear and disgust. Reflecting on such emotions guided me to reconsider the prevalent stigma: ‘poor and needy Amazonian children who live in substandard conditions’. As I will explain, continuous reflection permitted me to be aware of and minimise the differences between children and myself, and to finish the data collection.

The vulnerable situation and the lack of preparedness for the weather variations made me feel annoyed. I noticed that it was difficult for me to take field notes, in part because I was focusing more on the scarcity I could see around me, than on observing or hearing children experiences. In my discussions with other local colleagues, I found myself ranting about the government or passive adult attitudes in the area. By reflecting on my frustration, I noticed that I was replicating the stigma against people living in the area by seeing them as ‘lazy and conformist’.

One of the situations that made me rethink my concept of conformist adults was to understand the bridge construction process in the rising stage. When the level of the water started to increase, locals began to build bridges. From my knowledge of risk management, an adequate preparedness measure is to ensure proper and solid infrastructure. I realised that the locals built bridges yearly as a response to the floods. While the level of the water is rising, they add wood to the bridges. This bothered me because I could not know in advance if I would be able to transit across
the bridges and, therefore, was unable to plan my visits. However, when I explored why people used this system to construct the bridges, I found reasonable explanations. Neither the population nor I had information about the daily rain patterns or the maximum level of the flood expected each year. Local residents subsidised the cost of the wood for the bridges, so if they built a high bridge, they could be ‘wasting’ their money if the water did not reach that level. Learning that there was a good reason helped me to feel less annoyed and have a more reflective attitude to understanding children’s living conditions.

As mentioned previously, another stigma associate with the conformist attitude is laziness. Understanding some of the common behaviours of the population helped me to reflect on my own preconceptions. For instance, people living in such areas commonly pass time sitting or lying on the floor of their houses. Foreign visitors usually perceive this behaviour as laziness. However, when I visited children’s homes, I also laid down with them to play, talk or rest. I was able to experience myself that lying on the floor was a strategy to avoid the heat. What is more, I witnessed that their daily working hours were different from those living in the city centre. Because of the high temperatures, they usually worked early in the morning, while at noon, when temperatures increased, they stayed in their houses.

Reflecting on my feelings of danger and disgust made it easier for me to deal with them. However, I started having new feelings: fear of risks and disgust for the dirt and lack of hygiene. It was essential to discuss such feelings for two main reasons: to ensure protection for both the children and myself, and to avoid the stigma of Amazonian children as ‘people in need’.

The neighbourhood was a risky area, as expressed by a person from the city centre who gave me the following advice:

You have to take care, in that part of the city it is very dangerous, besides every time you return (from the neighbourhood); you have to wash your clothes and sandals with bleach. Poor
children, thanks for helping them. (A person from the city centre giving me advice)

As Lee (1995) explained, research locations usually have ambient and situational dangers. Ambient dangers are those inherent in the fieldwork, such as hazards related to a flood-prone area in the Amazon (e.g., drowning, tropical diseases, etc.). Situational dangers are produced by the researcher’s presence or behaviour that evoke aggression from within the field-site, such as my being a woman, which placed me more at risk than a male researcher.

Despite knowing that the study area was risky, I unconsciously denied this feature during the first phase of the research. It is common for researchers to ignore some feelings, such fear, for different reasons (Gaskell, 2008). This denial can be a protection mechanism (García-Santesmases Fernández, 2019; Gaskell, 2008) or because they are afraid of being considered a ‘bad’ researcher (De la Aldea & Lewkowicz, 1999; Gaskell, 2008).

It was not until the children warned me about dangers that I started to be aware of them. For instance, as I mentioned above, during the first phase, I used to visit the neighbourhood during the afternoons and stayed there until night. I changed this when Andy (4-years-old) told me: “Miss Karina, you must go home, it is getting dark and there will not be light”. After this warning, I started to be more cautious. At times, I felt overwhelmed by my fears and it was necessary for me to determine whether I was at actual risk or overreacting.

In addition, being conscious of the risks is also related to becoming familiar with the cultural and social context (Lee 1995). It was helpful for me to observe how children faced risky situations. Here, my attitude of “letting me be guided by children” was particularly important. I realised that I only felt safe when I followed the children's advice. They were always exploring the best and secure ways to transit in their neighbourhood. On various occasions, they also did this for me, e.g., when I could not follow them because I am bigger or I was afraid of walking where they did.
Sometimes, adult women made me feel more scared and it was difficult to trust adult men due to gender issues.

Considering that risk is socially constructed (Johansson, 2015), I identified that some risky situations that I noticed could probably be ignored or trivialised by local children or adults, such as gender dangers. For these reasons, as I mentioned, I took time to meet with key local actors, in order to find out how they worked with children in such areas. This helped me to have different ideas and strategies to face risky situations.

In addition to the risk of drowning or assault, I was also afraid of becoming ill. Such fear was related to my disgust about what I considered unhygienic in the neighbourhood. For instance, in the second phase, when I started to visit children’s homes, they sometimes offered me food. It was difficult for me to eat their meals because of the lack of sanitary conditions in the area. Similarly, when the river rose children used to play in the water, and they invited me to swim. I always refused that because I felt disgusted by the pollution in the water.

Feeling disgusted made me experience guilt, because I was feeling aversion for what the children obviously enjoyed. However, it made me more aware of what the children considered dirty and clean. I was more attentive to how they dealt with their precarious conditions. For instance, I noticed that children also identified that the water was dirty. After swimming, they usually took a bath with the water that their parents bought for drinking and bathing. In addition, as I said, I observed how they took various measures to protect themselves. I saw that they were not ‘poor children’ who lived in need, without capacities or abilities to identify and face their conditions.

By addressing and questioning my own bias, I was able to deconstruct my perceptions. However, doing fieldwork close to my home made it easier to compare my privileged situation to the children’s conditions. They were not lazy; nor was I. They were not poor people; nor was I. However, there were various differences, between us, which emerged continuously during fieldwork. To minimise bias in my research, it was important for me to reflect on how these differences could affect my data collection and its analysis (Graham et al., 2013).
3.6.2. My relationship with children: Addressing our differences

Ethnographic researchers point out the need to reflect on the generational differences between the adult researcher and the children participating in the research, because these differences can reflect power relationships, biases and an adult-centric perspective, which can affect the research (Ames et al., 2010; Emond, 2005; Konstantoni, 2012; Konstantoni & Kustatscher, 2015). In my research, I felt almost prepared to address this adult-child difference by considering children as protagonists. I was aware that my common ‘privileged’ position as an adult could make children behave ‘obediently’, as they assumed that adults have power over them, and that they may not be treated as equals (Punch, 2002), affecting the genuine participation of children. This privileged position not only responds to generational differences, but also to other sociocultural factors, such as the patriarchal culture that shapes Peruvian relations, especially if the participants are from poor and historically excluded areas, such as the Amazonian Peru (Ames et al., 2010; Cussiánovich, 2006, 2009). As explain earlier, I took measures to ensure the active role of children in the research and asked for their voluntary consent.

However, other features, such as my preconceived ideas (mentioned above) and our different social classes and culture, shaped our relationship. As suggested by other researchers (Abebe, 2009), I rolled out mechanisms to try to minimise such differences. I identified that it is common to see foreign adults in the city. There are many NGOs with international volunteers, tourists, and people from foreign evangelistic churches, and so on. Despite the fact that I am Peruvian, my physical appearance is not typical for the area and, therefore, I was seen as a foreigner.

Children and adults usually called me ‘teacher’ or ‘sister’ (because of the Church). As time went on, some children called me ‘friend’ or ‘classmate’. At the beginning, I made an effort to contradict them, and clarify that I was not a teacher or a sister. Then I realised that the ‘researcher’ identity was difficult for them to understand. Consequently, I took the decision to not to contradict them, but to emphasise my role. Regardless of the label, I was interested in participants knowing that I was a
‘different teacher’ (e.g., the one who did not teach), or a ‘different sister’ (e.g., I did not come from any church or give them presents). By doing so, I did not mean to erase my status as a ‘foreign adult’, but added the label of ‘different or atypical adult’ (Punch, 2001; Abebe, 2009), an adult who wanted to spend time with children to learn from their experiences.

Another strategy used by researchers to reduce the differences between them and the participants is to change clothes or modify their appearance (Abebe, 2009). I also did this subconsciously. The children made me notice that I used the same old clothes when visiting them. When I realised this situation, I considered that to reduce the difference, I did not have to be ‘equal’ to them. I decided to be more authentic and more open in sharing information with them, as long as I felt comfortable.

In conclusion, I had to reflect on my position as a foreign adult researcher—to be aware of my preconceived ideas about the population, as well as the ideas that children and their families had about me (Emond, 2005; Sinervo, 2013). Since my arrival in the city, I noticed that people living in flood-prone areas were stigmatised as a ‘vulnerable population’. Therefore, I had to be aware and question my own framing of the children as vulnerable (because of their age and the fact that they were living in poverty). This helped me to recognise them as individuals with agency and capacities, congruent with the protagonist paradigm, instead of seeing them as ‘poor children’.

3.6.3. My personal experiences doing fieldwork: Emotionally flooded

When using ethnographic methods, relationships between the researcher and children can become close and strong (Emond, 2005; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). This can trigger memories for the researcher of their own childhood, or the researcher can be impacted by the children’s experiences (Gaskell, 2008). As mentioned previously, as a researcher, being reflective of my emotions and reactions contributed to my awareness of the dynamics in my relationships with the participants (García-Santesmases Fernández, 2019; Gaskell, 2008). As I explained earlier in this section, I experienced emotional reactions that influenced my
perceptions of the children’s living conditions and, therefore, my relationship with them. However, these emotions also affected me personally, and I had to be aware of this, not only to reduce the impact of these emotions on my performance as a researcher, but also for my own wellbeing. Fortunately, I had different spaces in which to discuss the data collection and my personal wellbeing. I had meetings with my supervisors and with local peers, as well as with my own psychologist. However, because leaving the fieldwork does not mean leaving behind the emotions and experiences, what is presented in this thesis must continue to be debated and reflected during the writing of the thesis.

As discussed, the anger in the first phase shaped my perceptions about the children’s environment. From a psychoanalytic point of view, anger can have different roles. Anger appears if a person feels discomfort or annoyance, because someone or something threatens something important to him/her, either at a concrete or on a symbolic level (Lauro, 2009). Therefore, anger ‘contributes’ to eliminating those issues that are irritating. Even though I identified adults as the focus of my anger, I also recognised that what really annoyed me was the children’s living conditions. Therefore, being angry with the adults could have helped me to not feel ‘too’ attached to the children or overwhelmed (flooded) by knowing how the children felt or the impact of their living conditions.

Hunt (1989) points out that it is common for researchers who experience such emotions to make omissions or inadvertently distort the data as a defence mechanism. In my case, I felt tired and found it difficult to remember certain details when I was taking notes. Moreover, I lost my USB at the end of the first phase of fieldwork. Fortunately, I had most of the information backed up on my computer and in my notebook. This ‘casual loss’ forced me to take a step back and rethink what I was doing and the role of my anger.

Engaging in ethnographic research involves both ‘being there’ and ‘standing back’ (Tamboukou & Ball, 2003, p. 11). As a researcher, I benefited from distancing myself at the end of each phase of fieldwork, to rethink what I had done and how I was
feeling, and to identifying emerging topics. Because doing this alone can be hard, I looked for other people to discuss these things with. As Gaskell (2008) suggests, it is important for the researcher to have discussions in which emotions can be expressed openly, without being judged. As mentioned, besides my own therapist, I had three more spaces in which to discuss my research. I had the meetings with my supervisors, in which I could discuss my procedures and emotions. I also wrote reports introducing analytic end emerging ideas, because it helped me to ‘discharge’. As I continuously doubted my performance, I felt the need to write ‘something’ else, other than just reporting activities. I also had meetings with key actors, with whom I discussed the research process without revealing the identity of the participants. In these meetings, I found myself asking questions to ‘validate’ my feelings. For instance, in the rising stage, I found that I was continuously asking others if it was dangerous to walk on the bridges when it was raining. To explore my own process, besides the emerging topics, I benefited from the discussions with my colleague. I chose this person, because of our previous amical relationship and her expertise on children’s rights, therefore, I felt confident that our theoretical and ethical discussions were appropriate.

To sum up, doing research involves individual and collective processes that begin with writing the proposal for the research and continue until the end of the dissemination of the findings. Analysing my own emotions protected me from being ‘flooded’ and also made me more able to ‘observe’ and gather children’s perspectives.
Chapter 4. Setting the context

As lived citizenship cannot be detached from the places where it is practised, in this chapter, I present the main features of the neighbourhood studied, to allow a better understand of the analysis in the following chapters. Firstly, I present the geographical characteristics of the neighbourhood. Then, I provide information on contextual aspects, such as health, education, and protection. I draw on information that I collected from the participants, as well as existing data from institutional reports. Following the ethical guidance on privacy and confidentiality, I avoid certain specificities so that the precise neighbourhood cannot be identified.

4.1. The neighbourhood
The neighbourhood is located in an urban floodplain of an Amazonian city surrounded by three main rivers. A floodplain is a low relief earth surface positioned adjacent to freshwater (like a river or lake) and is subject to flooding (Tockner, 2013). Floodplains are particularly abundant in areas adjacent to large rivers, like the Amazon river, and cover about 2% of the land surface (Tockner, 2013). To select the floodplain for data collection, I looked for information from the local government. I was informed that floodplains in the city are usually located in peri-urban settlements. They also explained that such areas are considered ‘non-mitigatable areas’, which means that is not possible to prevent flooding in the area. I visited some flood-prone areas and found that when children and adults talked about their neighbourhoods, they did not commonly use terms like ‘flood-prone area’, ‘flood’ or ‘flood-plain’. Instead, they tended to use the word ‘alagar’, which means ‘to fill with lakes or puddles’ (Real Academia Española, 20 April 2021). The annual cycle of the river produces seasonal floods, which usually occur from January to April, and the locals call this the ‘rising stage’. When the water decreases, the locals call it the ‘falling stage’. Between these two stages, there is a transition period, characterised by rapid change, as seen in the following photographs (Figure 4), taken over a few
days in the ‘transition period’ the photographs show the level of the river increasing and the neighbourhood flooding in just over a week.

The settlement is located 10-minutes distance from the city centre, and around 150 metres from a main avenue. To reach the neighbourhood from the city centre, public transport can be used until the crossing between the main avenue and an alley. After walking through the alley, people have to cross an area where there are no houses. During the falling stage people can walk and, during the rising stage, there is a bridge.

The settlement consists of one main street with approximately 150 houses, located on both sides of the street. Houses are constructed in the common building style used in the floodplains of the Amazonian: that is, they are built with wood and corrugated
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metal roofs. As it can be seen in Figure 5\textsuperscript{5}, the houses have high stilts that protected them from floods, with stairs to reach the first floor. I observed that, depending on the water level, sometimes it was necessary to change the stilts for higher ones and reinforce the house infrastructure.

The number and use of the floors in the house changed depending on the level of the water in the area. During the falling stage, families used the ground floor as a socialising space, to store their belongings, to put animals in corrals, and to place tables to sell food. This space was also considered part of the public space at times. During the rising stage, as the ground floor was covered with water, families used the ‘first floor’, which during this stage turned into the ground floor. Public spaces were, thus, reduced, reducing the space for socialising. During this stage people usually socialise in the vestibule or on the stairs or bridges. I understand public space as the spaces in a city where inhabitants have the right to transit freely, such as the street, in contrast to private space, which belong to an individual or a group, who regulate its use (Alguacil, 2008). During fieldwork, the divide between public and private spaces was not always clear to me, and it varied over time. I witnessed that such divides did not correspond to physical divides, but depended on how they were used by people. For example, sometimes people had belongings on the ground floor, such as hammocks or tables with chairs. If the owners were using them, I noticed that people avoided walking by or being around the space, unless they were a friend or an acquaintance and joined the activity. Another example is that people sometimes carried out activities that can be understood as ‘private’, such as taking a bath; in such situations other people did not approach the house.

4.2. Education, health, and child protection in the neighbourhood

The neighbourhood shared common aspects of other urban settlements in the region, such as a high level of poverty, and many challenging living conditions for children and their families. Such conditions were exacerbated by the risks and inherently vulnerable conditions of living in a flood-prone area, with deficient urban

\textsuperscript{5} I took the photograph of Sandra’s house after she requested me to do it so and I asked for her consent to show the photograph when disseminating my findings.
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planning and lack of preventive risk management policies. The interviewees from the local government recognised that the policies related to urban planning and risk management were deficient in the city, particularly for settlements located in flood-prone areas. In fact, because of the label ‘non-mitigatable’, the local government tended not to allocate resources for infrastructure or services in the area, because the aim was to develop a plan to relocate people to a non-flood-prone area. During the flooding season, the local government provided the locals with wood for building bridges; however, as children’s families told me, the resources were generally insufficient.

Regarding early childhood education, the neighbourhood had a PRONOEI, a non-formal community pre-school programme. This type of centre focuses on children aged 3 to 5-years-old from marginal urban and rural areas. The people in charge are locals who receive training from professionals from the Ministry of Education. The community provides one physical space for its operation. The PRONOEI in the study location operated in a house borrowed from one of the neighbours. While the region in which the neighbourhood is located, is ranked as one of the regions with highest levels of poverty in the country and low early childhood school attendance (UNICEF, 2019), I witnessed that all children from 4 to 5-years-old in the neighbourhood attended this PRONOEI or the one in the nearby road. However, children below 3 did not attend regularly.

The neighbourhood did not have proper sanitation services. The Amazonian Peru is one of the regions where the population has major difficulties in accessing safe drinking water and sanitation services. In 2016, only 41.6% of the population had access to proper sanitation services and 55.3% had access to water (UNICEF, 2019). Such conditions lead to a high prevalence of health issues in children and their families, like diarrhoea and intestinal parasites.

Insecurity is also a high concern in the area. The city has high rates of sexual abuse and sex trafficking (UNICEF, 2019). During the fieldwork, children talked constantly about robberies and even sexual assaults. As I mentioned in the ethical
considerations, I took measures to protect myself. I noticed that corporal punishment is also common in the area. According to a national survey, the percentage of mothers who use corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure dropped between 2014 and 2017 (from 14.7% to 10.8%); however, it is still highly used by families (UNICEF, 2019).
Chapter 5. Exploring, playing and resting to become familiar with the living context in an urban flood-prone area

As discussed in Chapter 2, lived citizenship relates to individuals' subjective daily experiences of citizenship. This involves the ways in which people give meaning to and negotiate the components of citizenship—such as rights, participation, responsibilities and identity—in their living contexts (Lister, 2007a). Thus, lived citizenship is not a pre-determined status, but rather an ongoing and evolving process that relates to the contextual features in which the experiences take place, as well as to the relationships among individuals (Lister, 2007a; Olsson, 2017; Warming & Fahnøe, 2017).

In urban spaces, scholars suggest exploring how the features of cities shape children's experiences of citizenship, and how children relate to their cities, by appropriating and using city spaces, as well as their role in transforming these spaces (Borja, 2010; Correa, 2010; Sugranyes & Mathivet, 2010). In this chapter, I explore how children become familiar with the geographical and sociocultural features of their neighbourhood, and how such processes relate to the dimensions of lived citizenship described in Chapter 2. I discuss the fact that children learn about their context, including the risks, weather dynamics and characteristics of the Amazonian region, while exploring, playing and resting outdoors, usually with other children, without direct intervention by adults. This group of activities fits under the concept of 'children's independent mobility', which is defined as children's everyday travels within their cities, to play, walk and explore outdoors by themselves (Alparone & Pacilli, 2012; Cook, Whitzman, & Tranter, 2015; Hillman, 1990; Murray & Cortés-Morales, 2019; Prezza, 2007; Prezza, Alparone, Renzi, & Pietrobono, 2010).

In this chapter, I consider how children's independent mobility provides them with opportunities not only to relate to their spaces, but also to use their cities and enjoy
their citizenship rights (Cook et al., 2015; Tonucci, 2005, 2020). During fieldwork, I found that, when children were in the neighbourhood, they usually spent their time at home, at the PRONOEI (pre-school), and outdoors near their houses. I witnessed that when children were moving outdoors, children’s independent mobility included everyday travel, walking to their school, exploring nearby areas, and playing with other children in the neighbourhood. I also found that children took time to rest, during which they spent time observing the river or looking around where they were. Children’s mobility within the neighbourhood changed over the year, due to seasonal changes; therefore, in this chapter, I also provide examples of children’s mobility in the two main seasons, the falling stage of the river and the flooding season.

5.1. Exploring to become familiar with the geographical features.

In this section, I analyse two examples of children’s usual daily journeys, which occurred at different times of the year. In the first example, I analyse Juan’s journeys from the PRONOEI to his house during the falling stage. I decided to join Juan because he was one of the children who lived in area ‘C’ of the neighbourhood, which is the farthest area (see Figure 2, Chapter 3). Therefore, it allowed me to transverse a larger physical area and observe other children who lived in houses located along Juan’s journey. In the second example, I analyse a canoe journey with Jazmin and Ana. I chose this example, because it is an illustration of a common journey made by many of the children and their families during the flooding season.

5.1.1. Juan's daily walk: From the PRONOEI to his house during the falling stage of the river

At the end of the day at the PRONOEI, Juan said to me that he lived on the ‘other side’ (referring to an area located far from the main street of the neighbourhood). I asked him if I could accompany him. He looked at the teacher, likely asking for her permission; she smiled and said yes. Juan told me, "Yes, Miss Karina, come on; I will show you which path you have to follow to go to my place".
Juan anticipated that we had to walk a lot because he lived in the farthest area. We walked along the main street from sector B (see Figure 2, Chapter 3). Juan pointed out other children’s houses, the church, the sawmill, and other spaces. We passed by the primary school, where a group of women were sitting at the main door. They told Juan: "Juan, go straight to your home, your mother was here, but she has already left". When they said this, I felt that there might be bit of mistrust about my presence, so I introduced myself and explained to them who I was and why I was walking with Juan.

We continued walking and cut down a path between two houses. We crossed a very narrow space, under the roof of the houses. I thought that it could be dangerous to walk there, particularly at night. I also felt like we may be entering other people’s property.

During the journey, Juan explained to me where to walk. He said things like, "This is the way you have to walk because there are several people, over there; there is nobody this way, only animals", and "Walk here, the boas can come in that way". We crossed an area that floods during the rising stage of the river. He said, "This part will flood, you won’t be able to walk, so to go to my place, you have to walk over there". Juan pointed to the sawmill, which was located at the end of the street; "There you have to walk with a lot of care because there are thieves". (Field notes, October 2018).

During the falling stage of the river, most of the children went to the PRONOEI (the pre-school) or school by themselves, or with their older siblings or neighbours if they were studying in the same school. For instance, Daisy and Sara, who were sisters, went together to the PRONOEI. Once Sara started primary school, sometimes Daisy went by herself or with Ana, who lived next to her. As did the rest of the children, Juan usually walked to the PRONOEI by himself during the falling stage. When
analysing the data, I realised that this journey was key for the research because it allowed me to understand some of things that happened in the following months, as it was representative of children's ways of exploring and connecting with their neighbourhood.

Although I decided to join Juan because I wanted to explore the neighbourhood myself while walking with him, it was Juan who guided the exploration. Juan helped me to explore the area by sharing his knowledge. Throughout our walk, Juan not only showed me the path, but also provided me with very detailed information about the neighbourhood. With every step we made, he gave me new information and described the places we saw. For instance, Juan pointed out other children's houses, the school where his siblings studied, the store where the children usually bought candy, and the local sawmill.

Juan also included information about the risky places, including those with garbage on the floor or where there may be dangerous animals, like boas, as well as the unsafe areas due to the presence of thieves. When doing this, he advised me of the risks not only along the path we were following, but also with alternative routes. For instance, Juan talked about the nearby sawmill and explained that I would have to walk through that area, during the flooding season. He added that I should be careful when I do it so because there were thieves in such areas. Juan also shared information about how the neighbourhood changes during the flooding season. For instance, he explained to me that the path we were following would be covered with water during the rising stage, and he showed me the alternative path that I should follow at that time.

I suggest that the detailed information Juan shared with me is evidence of how familiar he is with the neighbourhood. During our conversations and the interview, I explored how he had learnt about such aspects. For instance, I asked Juan how he knew that the sawmill was dangerous, and he told me that he knew it was because he went that way once on his way home. In his explanation, he said that one day he diverted from his usual path and went to this area; I presume that when he did so,
he felt or saw something that made him feel insecure, because he was warning me to take care. An alternative or further explanation could be that other children or Juan’s mother told Juan about the area’s risks, so he went to explore it, and then passed the information on to me.

As discussed in Chapter 2, research on children’s independent mobility has been linked to the dimensions of lived citizenship and the findings of this research provide further evidence of such connections. Firstly, similar to other research, (e.g., Cook et al., 2015; Gülgönen & Corona, 2015; Rissotto & Tonucci, 2002), Juan’s explanation suggests that walking through the neighbourhood allows children to explore it and become familiar with it; which in turn increases their opportunities for appropriating and using their cities. As I explained, Juan not only shared information about how to get to his house, he also shared detailed information about the places we passed, risks, and environmental changes. During the interview, Juan shared a further description of the places and how they have changed over time, explaining that he learnt about the changes when he walked to and from school. As I explained in Chapter 3, I used props during interviews, for instance I used a neighbourhood map to talk to participants about the neighbourhood. When I showed the picture to Juan, he immediately recognised the neighbourhood. "I know this street", he said, and pointed at the road on which he usually walks to go to the PRONOEI. Then he started to recall some parts of the path. For instance, he mentioned the house where the path led us under the roof, which I have described in the excerpt above. He said, "Here there is a lady who grows watermelons. Do you remember?"; I said that I did not remember, and he replied, "Yes, I showed you when we came together; here is the kitchen where we went through". He reminded me that we went through the narrow space between the houses because it was dangerous to walk in the other part of the street. I suggest that Juan’s explanation, then, shows that by walking along the path he also becomes familiar with the neighbourhood’s changes. I am saying this because the watermelons usually grow in a different part of the year than when we crossed together, which probably means that he walked the area at other times after our walk.
My findings provide evidence that becoming familiar with their spaces allows children to connect with the spaces and with others (Prezza et al., 2010; Rissotto & Tonucci, 2002), which enables them to make decisions about how to use their cities (Rissotto & Tonucci, 2002). As I described, Juan made decisions about how to walk safely; he also advised me how to walk safely to his home during the rising stage. Also, as I will explain in Chapter 7, Juan, and the other children who participated in this study, took actions to face such risks and other challenges in order to use the public spaces in the area. Like supporters of the right to the city argue, using the city is a citizen’s right; it allows individuals to reach places and access services to enforce their rights, fulfil their responsibilities, and participate in society. The access to and inclusion of individuals in their cities depends on different interrelated aspects, including individual aspects such as gender and age, as well as contextual aspects such as the level of insecurity where individuals live (Falú, 2009; Villena Higueras & Molina Fernandez, 2015).

As the literature suggests, I found that some children had more opportunities to explore and play outdoors than other children, depending on their gender and age, as well as their caregiver's perception of the risks, among other things (e.g., Alparone & Pacilli, 2012; Fenster, 2005; Prezza et al., 2001). As discussed further in Chapter 7, I noticed that boys had more freedom to explore and play outdoors than girls. All of the caregivers perceived the neighbourhood as risky; however, those who perceived children as having little ability to face the risks tended to limit their children's mobility more than those who were confident about their children's abilities. During the fieldwork, I observed that Juan had less opportunities to explore and play outdoors compared to other children. For example, I rarely saw Juan playing outside his house. My field notes record some reasons for this limitation. Juan lived in area C, the farthest part of the neighbourhood, which was more challenging to access. His mother explained that she did not allow Juan to play outdoors as much as the other children, because of the fear that someone or something may hurt him. She also explained that, during the flooding season, he does not attend the PRONOEI unless she walks him there, because of the risks
inherent in the season, and because Juan did not know how to swim. Furthermore, a few weeks after we took our first journey a motorcycle hit Juan, so his mother decided to further limit his time outdoors. During the rising stage of the river, his mother limited Juan’s mobility even more, due to the risk of drowning.

In line with the literature, my findings suggest that children with more freedom of mobility in their cities have greater knowledge of their environments, more room for exploring and using their cities, and more opportunities to reach places where they can enforce their rights (Prezza et al., 2010; Rissotto & Tonucci, 2002; Rudner, 2012). As explained, Juan did not attend the pre-school on several occasions, because of mobility issues, particularly during the flooding season. I also did not usually see him playing outside or hanging out with his peers. I suggest that such limitations could have influenced Juan’s knowledge of the neighbourhood.

When I discussed how Juan shared with me detailed information about the neighbourhood during the interview with Juan, I noticed that he was familiar with the spaces along the journey between the pre-school and his house, but that other children had more knowledge about other spaces in the neighbourhood. During the interview, when we talked about the neighbourhood map, Juan recognised the places along his journey between his house and PRONOEI, and the usual places where children socialised, such as the church and the primary school. Other children, particularly boys, in addition to the more usual places, also identified spaces located in more distant areas in the neighbourhood, such as ‘La Punta’, an area on the far side of the neighbourhood. Those boys explained to me that they learnt about such spaces, because they went there to play and hangout with their friends. This suggests that exploring and playing in wider areas provides children with more opportunities to learn about their spaces and, therefore, to make use of and appropriate these spaces. As discussed in Chapter 7, boys aged 5-years-old and above had more room for exploring areas far from their houses during the falling stage. The knowledge they gained from this allowed them to know where to find soil and dry spaces to play safely during the flooding season. In other words, becoming familiar with the geographical conditions of the neighbourhood, allows children to
learn how to move around their neighbourhood, hence, to reach the spaces in which to enforce their rights, and, as elaborated in the following chapters, to practice their responsibilities as well as to appropriate and use public spaces in the neighbourhood.

As discussed above, children usually went to familiar places within the neighbourhood by themselves and made their own decisions about how and where to walk, without direct adult supervision. Supporters of the concept of children's independent mobility emphasise children’s independence, which is understood as without adult supervision or company (Murray & Cortés-Morales, 2019). However, the term ‘independence’ is contested and has led researchers to rethink its meaning in children’s daily lives (Mikkelsen & Christensen, 2009; Murray & Cortés-Morales, 2019). For example, Mikkelsen and Christensen (2009) assert that researchers usually understand children's independence as children without the physical presence of adults. Furthermore, the authors state that researchers usually overlook other ways of accompanying children, such as virtual or communicative co-presence (e.g., using mobile phones) (Mikkelsen & Christensen, 2009).

I also found that children usually moved around outdoors with other children, without the direct involvement of adults, but this did not mean that adults were not present. I found many different ways in which adults were present, albeit not physically, during these activities. In the excerpt discussed in this section, when Juan and I passed by the primary school, we found a group of mothers who said to Juan that his mother was at his home, waiting for him and that he should go there. As I explained, as I was new to the neighbourhood, I felt that they were letting me know that they were watching Juan and that his mother was waiting for him. I argue this is because this kind of warning did not happen on other occasions, after people from the neighbourhood got to know me more.

In line with the existing literature (Cook et al., 2015; Olsson, 2017; Rissotto & Tonucci, 2002; Tonucci, 2015), in this sub-section, I provided evidence that children's mobility within the neighbourhood allows them to become familiar with the main
features of their neighbourhood, including the most frequented places, the risks and the changes due to the environmental characteristics of the area. I also discussed the fact that children’s independent mobility is related to the dimensions of children’s citizenship, namely, rights, responsibilities and participation. Becoming familiar with their spaces allows children to exercise their right to use their cities and their right to play, as well as to take on responsibilities and participate to contribute to their closest surroundings, as discussed further in Chapters 6 and 7.

5.1.2. Jazmin and Ana: A canoe journey

Using canoes was useful during the flooding season and part of the transition period, particularly in the months when the river reached its maximum level, and when the bridges were damaged or unfinished. During the fieldwork, I witnessed how children and their families used canoes for various purposes. Locals used the canoes to reach other parts of the neighbourhood, e.g., going from the main street to the neighbourhood entrance. This was particularly convenient when families, mainly mothers, went to the local market to buy groceries or bottles of water, because these products were heavy for the mothers to carry back over the bridges. Children also used the canoes to reach school (those who studied in the school located on the main road) or to go to church. Some families used canoes to cross the river to bring wood to build the bridges, firewood for cooking, to fetch carry water, or to reach distant areas of the river to take a bath. Jazmin explained to me that the water is clearer and less polluted in such places. Some children also used canoes as a social space to play in or hang out with older siblings or close neighbours.

However, not all families had a canoe. There was a service called ‘llevo-llevo’ (Carry-Carry), which transported people from the neighbourhood to the main road or other areas within the neighbourhood. This transport consisted of canoes piloted by male adolescents and boys aged older than six years old. It cost 50 cents per person.

---

6 The currency in Peru is the Peruvian Sol; 50 Peruvian cents is approximately £0.10.
decided to take a **llevo-llevo** to explore the neighbourhood, as I describe in the following excerpt.

During these days, there is a group of children with their canoe at the neighbourhood entrance. Today when I arrived, one of them offered to transport me to the house of Shirley. They knew that I usually start my visits around her house.

I asked the canoe pilot, a boy who seemed to be 7 or 8 years old, to go a bit further from where Shirley lived, at least until the end of the street. He hesitated at first, but then accepted. We passed by Ana's house. She was playing with Jazmin. They asked where I was going, and if they could join me. I accepted and asked for their caregivers' permission. They [Ana and Jazmin] jumped happily into the canoe. Ana jumped more cautiously than Jazmin. While Ana was jumping, the canoe pilot told me that she had almost drowned and that Shirley, her cousin, had saved her. Ana confirmed it. She said, "I almost [drowned], but she saved me". She sat next to me, holding my legs, and Jazmin sat in front of us.

In some parts, we had to bow our heads to avoid being hit by the bridges. The girls were talking about the state of the bridges. They mentioned that some of them were already damaged and that some neighbours had not built their bridges yet.

We started paddling on the river at the back of the houses. The girls talked about how the neighbourhood was covered with water. They also identified certain homes and showed me which houses had a bathroom. They spoke about the animals that come with the water: dolphins, mermaids, boa constrictors and other snakes. We went to the end of the street, and we saw some old boats. We took pictures. When we were in the middle of the river, Ana was a little scared and sat next to me. She told me that she still could not swim ‘there’, referring to the deepest
Ana said, "Ay, here is deeper!" She mentioned that she was not going to swim where the water is deep: "I do not take a deep bath; where it is there [deep], I no longer take a bath".

We passed by the back of the PRONOEI. They talked about its damage. Jazmin said that she was not going there anymore; she was going to start primary school. Ana seemed a little confused. She said, "She was going there. I went there too... but I do not know what is going to happen now. Do you know?".

A motorised canoe approached us. A drunk man who offered to take us to the Amazon River piloted it. The situation scared me, and I asked our canoe driver to return to the main street.

(Field notes, January 2019)

The excerpt above describes a canoe journey that took place in January 2019. As mentioned, my initial plan was to explore the neighbourhood by myself; however, this turned into a spontaneous journey in which the children (Jazmin and Ana) and the canoe driver directed the route. Similar to the previous excerpt involving Juan, both girls pointed out the features of the flooded neighbourhood, including the risks. Jazmin and Ana described places we passed. For instance, they identified children’s houses and provided details about them.

In addition, when we were paddling in the deepest area of the river, they talked about aspects related to nature, such as animals and mythical creatures like mermaids. They shared with me that with the rise of the water in the river, some animals appeared, like dolphins, big fish, and mermaids. During our trip, both girls were looking forward to seeing those animals. During the fieldwork, I noticed that children explored some areas to determine if those animals lived there. As I will discuss later in this section, my findings suggest that children recognised some animals, such as aquatic animals, as belonging to the Amazonian Peru. Espinosa (2009) suggests that the close relationships between individuals and elements of nature, such as animals, is a key feature of the Amazonian identity. Therefore, the findings indicate that exploring
their spaces allowed the children to become familiar with particular features of their part of Amazonian, which suggests that exploring their spaces also plays a role in developing their identity and a sense of belonging, as seen in other research (Olsson, 2017).

In line with other research (Gülgönen & Corona, 2015), my research found that children’s mobility in their cities allows them to build their knowledge and use such knowledge to become involved in activities for the sustainability of their spaces, as part of their participation, as citizens, in the transformation of their cities. During our canoe journey, both girls shared with me information on how the neighbourhood had changed over the previous week and the preventive measures that families were taking. As described in the excerpt above, we had to bow our heads in some parts to avoid being hit by the bridges. When we passed such parts, the girls explained that the locals could only use the canoes for a few weeks, because later, when the water level increases further, it drags plants and sticks into the area, which makes it difficult to use a canoe. In fact, this was the reason for the canoe pilot’s initial hesitation when I asked him to transport me across the main street. Passing under the bridges encouraged the girls to start a conversation about the progressive construction of the bridges. They identified and compared the places where it was necessary to build the bridges first, pointed out the bridges that were already damaged, and the ones that needed to be made higher. As I will evidence in Chapter 6, the children took an active role in the preparation and response activities.

Just as Juan had done, the children decided on the path. Juan decided where to walk to reach his place, and the girls and the canoe driver decided where to paddle. In comparison to the journey with Juan, I felt that the canoe trip was a conversation, rather than a guided trip. In the previous sub-section, I explained that Juan taught me where to walk and provided detailed information about this and the places we passed; furthermore, he started our journey by saying that he would show me how to get to his place. In the case of the girls, they also provided me with detailed information about the neighbourhood; however, I felt that in addition to sharing their knowledge, the girls established a space to ask for each other’s views and
experiences. I argue that this difference corresponds to the kind of people involved in each trip. In the case of Juan, the participants were a child and a ‘common adult’, while in the case of Ana and Jazmin, they were children and a ‘different or atypical adult’ (Punch, 2001; Abebe, 2009) (see Chapter 3 for more discussion about my relationships with the children). In the case of Juan, I was new in the neighbourhood, and even though I had interacted with him on the previous days, we were not close, and I was a ‘common adult’ for him. As Juan saw me as a common adult, his perception about me was potentially shaped by the usual models between adults and children, characterised by vertical relationships. In contrast, my journey with Ana and Jazmin took place four months after my arrival in the neighbourhood. As I explained in Chapter 3, as time went by, my relationships with children turned more trusting and closer, and some children even called me their friend; thus, I turned into a ‘different or atypical adult’. I argue that this scenario made the girls feel more confident to share information with me and ask each other’s views on different aspects while we were paddling. For instance, when we passed the back of the PRONOEI, the girls talked about its damage and expressed concern about when they would be able to return. Jazmin was about to start primary school; however, Ana did not know where she would study. The girls also talked about common concerns among children related to the hazards during the flooding season, including drowning, the instability of the bridges, and the risk of injury caused by animals and garbage dragged by the water. Jazmin and Ana also shared their concerns about the lack of bathrooms and the difficulties that this created for families.

Children established a participatory space in which they expressed and shared their views and concerns. Such spaces are relevant not only because they allow the children to exercise their right to participate as citizens, but also because during fieldwork I noticed that it was not usual for adults to encourage children to express their opinions or inform them about the issues that concerned them. For example, after the first week of classes, the teacher informed me that classes would be cancelled. I learnt that she had spoken with a group of mothers, however, the children were not clear about the cancellation. Furthermore, I noticed that when
adults talked to me and children gave their opinions, the mothers told them to keep silent, using a common phrase in the area: "When adults speak, children keep silent". When interviewing government workers, they informed me that there were few existing spaces for children's participation and even less for children aged under five. The municipal office in charge of citizen participation said that there were participation spaces for adults, where adults could express their needs, mainly in relation to the neighbourhood infrastructure. Similarly, the officer in charge of urban design informed me that they did not have strategies for neighbourhood participation. I found a lack of spaces where children could express their views, at home, at school, or at the municipal level. However, as explained, just as with Ana and Jazmin in the canoe trip, I found that when children were socialising with their peers, the children found spaces in which to listen to others and be listened to. This provides further evidence that children not only have insights and ideas, but are able to express them and listen to others. Furthermore, children are able to create the spaces in which to do so. Therefore, the findings of this research support the existing literature that children in their early years have the skills and abilities to participate in different levels of society. Establishing areas to promote the participation of children in the design and development of cities contributes to the exercise of their citizenship (Danenberg, Doumpa, & Karssenberg, 2018; Gülgönen, 2016; Gülgönen & Corona, 2015). Scholars agrees that listening to and including children's opinions and proposals in urban planning guarantees the establishment of safe and inclusive spaces where children can exercise their rights to make full use of their cities (Borja, 2010; Danenberg et al., 2018; Tonucci, 2020; Tonucci & Rissotto, 2001).

Another topic in my conversation with Ana and Jazmin related to the challenges to their mobility in the neighbourhood during the flooding season. They talked about the damage to the bridges and their unstable infrastructure, which was a continuous hazard for children, their families, and myself. The girls also talked about the incident with Ana. As described, while Ana showed excitement about the idea of going around in the canoe with me, she was also cautious when she jumped into the canoe. Then, I realised that this caution had resulted from her experience of falling into the water.
and almost drowning. The girls explained to me that Ana was playing on the bridge and it was slippery, because of the rain and dog excrement, so she fell down. She also explained that Shirley saved her by helping her to get out of the water. During the fieldwork I witnessed that the elevated risk of drowning was recurrent in the neighbourhood, not only because of the weak structure of the bridges, but also because they get slippery when it rains or due to animal excrement, as was with the case with Ana. Because of such risks, during the flooding season I noticed that children’s mobility becomes even more challenging than in the falling stage, limiting children’s access to their usual places, like the school. In fact, during this stage, the teacher cancelled classes for three months and, when classes resumed, the children attended less. The teacher herself sometimes did not show up because of the heavy rains, or because the bridges were not finished yet.

As other studies carried out in similar areas show, the risk of drowning during floods is significantly higher for young children, because they are less skilled at swimming than their older siblings or adults (Biswa, Rahman, Mashreky, Rahman, & Dalal, 2010; Save the Children, 2006; Walker, Whittle, Medd, & Burningham, 2010). However, I found that the lack of skills not only related to children’s age, but also to their gender. When we were paddling in the river’s deepest area, Jazmin and Ana talked about their ability to swim, explaining that they could only swim in the shallow areas. I also saw a similar pattern in other girls. For instance, I rarely saw Sara swimming and I only saw her taking baths on the raft. Jimena also only swam near her house, and only when her older sister accompanied her. I noticed that boys spent more time playing in the water and on the bridges, where they have more opportunities to learn to swim. Girls had more restrictions on playing outdoors, limiting their opportunities to learn the needed skills to mitigate the risks during the flooding season. In fact, I noticed that during the flooding period, I interacted more with girls than with boys, because I visited children in their houses in order to avoid staying outdoors, due to safety reasons.

While it is true that the scenario possesses real risks for all people in the neighbourhood, caregivers perceived that the risks were higher for girls and younger
children, than for boys. Similarly, studies around children’s mobility have found that caregivers’ perceptions about risks leads them to limit children’s freedom and autonomy, particularly for girls and younger children (Alparone & Pacilli, 2012; Prezza et al., 2001; Mitra, Faulkner, Buliung, & Stone, 2014; Rudner, 2012). As Rudner (2012) highlights, caregivers' perceptions of urban risks not only depend on the existing hazards, but also on their perceptions of children's skills to face these risks. Caregivers tended to perceive girls and younger children as being less skilled, and girls and younger children also expressed more fear about playing in the water. Interestingly, boys also shared with me their fears—even those who had more swimming skills expressed concerns about drowning or being hurt by animals. However, they took the risk and continued swimming and playing in the water. On the contrary, girls were more cautious about swimming and playing in the water, especially after two episodes: one girl who attended the primary school drowned while she was playing in the water and a man, who did not live in the area, was found dead floating in the water. I argue that caregivers' perceptions that girls and younger children are less able to deal with the risks could affect children's own assessments of their abilities to cope with risks. For instance, I experienced this myself. I was inexperienced when it came to walking during the flooding season; when the mothers alerted me to the dangers, I felt that they transmitted their fear to me, and I ended up feeling more scared. In contrast, when the children alerted me to the risks and taught me how to face them, I felt safer.

The gender limitations mentioned in the previous sub-section are even more rigid during the flooding season. As mentioned, studies on urban areas suggest that gender has major implications for girls’ mobility: girls experience more limitations and constraints than boys in relation to traversing or being in public spaces (Alparone & Pacilli, 2012; Falù, 2009; Fenster, 2005). During the flooding season, the accessible public spaces changed, with children usually playing on the bridges, with their canoes, and in the water. The restrictions for girls not only limited their opportunities to play outdoors, but also to explore and develop the necessary skills—like swimming—to adapt to their environment and move independently. Consequently, they ended up
making more use of private spaces in comparison to boys, as discussed in Chapter 7. In contrast, boys had more opportunities to find dry and safe spaces to exercise their right to play and to reach other areas in the neighbourhood during the flooding season, which provides evidence on how the gendered limitations on children’s mobility can influence their lived citizenship, particularly the exercise of their rights and their participation in public spaces.

Children and their families used canoes during certain months of the year to move around the neighbourhood. I found that children created ways to explore the neighbourhood during the flooding season, learning at the same time to face the risks involved in their mobility during this stage. Similar to the previous section, when analysing children’s mobility, I discussed some of the dimensions of citizenship discussed in Chapter 2, such as their right to use their city, for example, to reach their school. Besides learning about the characteristics of their neighbourhood in order to learn how to move around it, while exploring the neighbourhood children also connected with aspects of Amazonian nature and wildlife, which could be linked to the development of a sense of belonging and construction of their identity as Amazonian citizens. Furthermore, while exploring the neighbourhood and hanging out with the children, I found that they established participatory spaces where they expressed and discussed their opinions, showing children’s abilities to be involved in civic participation. As discussed in Chapter 6, children not only had knowledge about the characteristics and needs of their families during the flood, but also took a key role in preparedness and response activities.

5.1.3. Playing to learn how to face risks

I arrived in the neighbourhood and saw Paula at the end of the street; she was crossing the street walking towards the river. She had a small bucket (which seemed like a toy) and a cleaning brush. I approached her after a few minutes. She was playing with two of her neighbours on a raft. [...] I asked them if I could join them. Patricia introduced me to her neighbours as her friend and classmate, emphasising that I was not her teacher
[...]. I asked her what she was doing, and she said that she went there to wash her sandals because "they were full of mud".

Me: "The last time I came, there was more water [referring to the water level]."

Paula: "Yes, it has gone down. However, it is going to rain, and everything is going to fill with water. It is not deep yet."

She got up to collect water in her bucket to wash her hair ribbon and threw herself into the water. The other boy pretended to help her carry water, but he ‘fell’ into the river, that is to say, he threw himself into the water as a game. They were playing for a while in the water, testing where it was deep.

Then, she came out of the water and asked me for my bag and sandals to clean them. She took out the coloured pencils, the pencil sharpener and the eraser. She took the pencil sharpener and told me, "Let’s see if it sinks. Here, where it is not deep yet. If it sinks, I can go in and take it out. Maybe it will sink because it has this little metal inside, let’s see?"

After that, the heat became intense, and Paula invited me into her house. She said that we should go to her house "to rest and shelter".

(Field notes, January 2019)

When I saw Paula, she was crossing the street alone, going from her house towards the river. She had cleaning supplies in her hands, including a bucket and a brush. As I approached Paula, I noticed that she was on a raft with two other children, her neighbours. Some families, like Paula’s family, built rafts and placed them on the river, in front of their houses. Neighbours use ‘balsa’, a local wood with floatation qualities, for building the rafts; families tied balsa logs together in parallel with a special rope. Families use these rafts for various purposes, including carrying water
from the river, washing clothes, and socialising with others. For example, Paula went to the raft to wash her ribbon and her sandals and to play with her neighbours.

In the excerpt, the children were playing. I noticed that when the children played outdoors, it usually meant free play and hanging out with friends, in line with the definition by Thomson and Philo (2004). This was the first time I had met Paula’s friends, because they had arrived just a few days before this encounter. When I asked Paula and the other children if I could play with them, they did not reply immediately. Paula introduced me first by saying that I was her friend and classmate. She also clarified that I was not the teacher. After saying this, children looked at each other, and then Paula said to me that I could hang out with them. Her emphasis made me consider that Paula and their friends wanted to play only among children, without the presence of an adult. As discussed previously, I developed strong bonds of trust with the children who participated in the study, who considered me a non-typical adult. For this reason, Paula stressed to the children that I was not the teacher, but her friend, just like them. Thus, the boys did not reject my presence. I decided to join the children, because I felt welcomed by them; they started to ask me questions about myself and showed me that they knew how to swim. I believe that the children’s hesitation and Paula’s clarification suggests that they would have preferred to hang out with only other children, without direct adult involvement because they probably felt that they had more freedom to behave and express their thoughts when adults were not present. Similar to the previous excerpt in this chapter (section 5.1.2), I noticed that when children were hanging out with their peers, they expressed their views and shared opinions, more than when they were with adults; that is, they established a participatory space for themselves. Again, this provides further evidence that children have opinions and create spaces to exchange their knowledge and to learn more about the things that concern them.

During children’s play, I observed that they played games that helped them to learn how to protect themselves from the risks related to the flooding season. Paula and I started to talk about how the neighbourhood began to flood. I pointed out the drop
in the water level, and she replied that the water would rise more in the following days. People’s knowledge of the flood forecast was limited. Although the area was a so-called ‘flood-prone area’, the locals did not have much information about the predicted flood flow, height, or duration. However, the children shared with me their knowledge about which parts of the neighbourhood would flood and dry first, as well as the depth of the river. Just like Paula, I noticed that by playing and exploring their neighbourhood children collected information that helped them predict future flooding and, hence, anticipate how to move around and reach places that they needed to, while avoiding the risks during the rising stage.

Playing in the water can be conceptualised as risky play, because it encompasses "thrilling and exciting forms of play that involve a risk of physical injury" (Sandseter, 2009, p. 3), including the high risk of drowning and injury. While adults tended to protect children from risks, I found that risky play provides children with opportunities to develop their skills to adapt and protect themselves during the flooding season. Olsson (2017), in her research on lived citizenship and risks, concluded that children’s independent mobility provides them with opportunities to learn about the risks in the neighbourhood. She suggests that risks are often associated with challenges, adventure, play and an active life, but also with learning processes and developing cognitive and physical skills. She added that this knowledge allows children to enact their citizenship in their daily contexts, as they learn how to move and act independently, as well as how to challenge and contest (adult) rules and boundaries to enforce their rights. In Chapter 7, I elaborate further on how children challenge existing rules that limit their lived citizenship.

It is worth mentioning here, that despite adult’s common views on children as only risk-takers, I observed that children also took measures to protect themselves during risky play. For instance, at some point, Paula needed water to wash her ribbon, and one of her companions offered to help her. He started to carry the water in the bucket and then he pretended to fall and jumped into the river. I assumed that he was pretending, because he smiled when he said, "Oh I'm falling", and he also smiled
when he came out of the water. Paula also explained that he did not fall down, that he was pretending. She emphasised that her friends usually swam in the deepest part of the river, unlike her, as she only swam in the shallower areas. One of the games that Paula and her neighbours played was jumping and diving into the water. When Paula’s friend jumped into the water, I noticed that he went a bit further every time he jumped. Paula did the same, but she remained closed to the raft. I noticed that this was a usual game, particularly for boys, who usually played in the water in front of their houses. Paula spent a significant amount of time in the water in comparison to other girls in the neighbourhood (I will discuss this difference further in Chapter 7). One day during the flooding season, she asked me to join her to play in the water. She said to me that we would not play where the raft was, explaining that she was able to play there in the previous days, but not anymore because the level of the water had increased there. I noticed that the children identified the deepest areas by jumping and diving, which they tested and then identified because they did not reach the bottom with their feet or hands. That is, children were able to identify the risks during their risky play to take protective measures, while at the same time learning how to face future possible risks.

My conversation with Paula raised questions for me about how children knew the depth of the river and how they perceived the evolving course of the floods. During fieldwork, I witnessed similar situations where children were playing in the water or outdoors, and had conversations about the evolving floods. For instance, one day in April I was playing with Heidy and her sisters near their bridge. Heidy told me that the water level had begun to decrease near the primary school and that, in her street, it would probably start to decrease in front of her house first. The girls concluded this because they remembered a small hill where they used to play in the dry season: therefore, they knew that one part under the water was higher than the rest of the area. From these findings, it can be deduced that exploring and playing in their neighbourhood during the falling stage, as well as in the transition period, helps children to identify how the water will cover the area, as a kind of forecast about the floods. As mentioned, I noticed that the locals had limited official information about
forecasts in the flooding season, such as the potential height the river would reach each year. They took measures based on their knowledge of the river’s behaviour in previous years. The findings show that children have the ability to use their own strategies to obtain information about the river’s rise.

As discussed previously, the risks for children walking not only depended on geographical hazards. Similarly, the risks during play not only depended on the environmental characteristics, but also on individual characteristics, such as the body and motor control of the children, the speed of their movements in the play, and their focus on the danger of the situation (Sandseter, 2009). As children spent more time in the water, they developed more skills for swimming and the ability to identify other hazards while playing in the water. As mentioned, Paula and her friends jumped into the water and, if it were not too deep, they went further next time. In addition to testing, they also shared the information with the others, so that the other children could be aware of the depth of the water and assess where they could play safely, depending on their own skills.

Literature about play agrees that by playing children develop skills to adapt to and face challenges in their environments, because it promotes children’s physical, social and cognitive skills, which in turn enhances their adaptive capabilities and resilience (Fearn & Howard, 2012; Lester, 2013; Lester & Russell, 2010). Fearn and Howard (2012) analysed the role of play in extremely adverse conditions, by studying three cases: refugee children in Beirut, abandoned children in Romania, and street children in Rio and Cali. The scholars suggest that play contributes to the growth of resilient and adaptive systems, empowering children to meet challenges. Similarly, I observed that when children played, they not only learnt to be aware of the depth of the water, but also learnt which objects sink and which float. I observed that this learning helped them to be safe during the flooding stage. As the excerpt describes, Paula asked me to give her my bag because she wanted to wash it. When she took out my belongings, she asked me if she could test whether my belongings would sink. For example, she tested and then realised that the pencil sharpener did not sink because it was made
of plastic, as she explained to me. She added that objects with a greater proportion of metal would sink. Interestingly, she explained to me that she would run this testing in shallow area so that she could go and collect the objects if they sank. As well as Paula protecting my belongings from getting lost in the water, her care also protected her from being exposed to risks.

After playing for a while with Paula and her neighbours, the heat became intense. Paula invited me to her house to rest and find shelter. Like Paula, during fieldwork other children asked me to go to their houses to take shelter several times. For instance, when the heat was intense or when it was raining, they asked me to play in their houses, particularly around noon. I have recorded in my field notes various moments when I rested with children, not only inside their houses, but also under the roofs of their homes during the falling stage of the river. In the next sub-section, I will explain why these moments also allowed children to become familiar with their neighbourhood and intensified their relationship with nature.

In this sub-section I provided further evidence on how children learnt about the main risks in the neighbourhood, and how to face them, by exploring and playing. I have described how play, particularly risky play, provides children with possibilities to learn how to avoid existing and future risks, particularly those associated with the flooding season. I also provided evidence that children were able to create their own strategies to learn more about how the floods evolved. Such learning contributes to children’s lived citizenship, as it allows them to move, use and appropriate spaces.

As I will discuss in the following chapters, the evidence suggests that children use such knowledge on risks to enforce their rights, to take on responsibilities, and to participate in their context, while protecting themselves, as well as to challenge adults’ social norms if necessary. For instance, I have explained how children tested materials to see whether or not they would sink. I observed that this knowledge contributed to children participating in preparedness and response activities. For example, collecting belongings from the water during the flooding season was a typical activity. As explained in Chapter 4, the houses in the neighbourhood had
wooden floors, and the boards usually have some space between them, so things can easily fall between the floor boards. I noticed that children and other members of the family often dove into the water to collect the belongings. I also observed that children did not do so when the object was more likely to sink. Like Andy, when he saw that his neighbour’s watch fell into the water, instead of jumping to collect it, he asked his older brother to do so. He explained that he did not want to collect it, because the watch was made of metal, therefore, it would sink, and he might drown. Just as Paula did, I observed Andy playing in the water to see which objects sank, which made me suppose that he has also learnt that metal objects sink.

5.2. Resting to strengthen bonds with nature and social practices

Figure 6 shows Carlos resting and observing the river, while sitting on the floor under the roof of his neighbour’s house. I took the picture in June, on one of the last days of the flooding stage. Before I took the picture, I was playing with Carlos, Sara and their older sister in their house on the opposite side from where the photograph was taken. At some point, which I did not notice, Carlos crossed the street and sat down in the soil. After a few minutes, I saw him, and I approached him and took the photograph. When I showed it to him, he looked at the picture and smiled; then he continued observing the river, and I joined him for some time. A boat passed by and
Carlos said, "Look at the boat Miss Karina", and continued observing the river for a while.

When children talked about ‘taking rest’, I learnt that they included sitting or lying on the floor, either in their houses or on the soil under a roof. During the fieldwork, I registered various moments when children were taking rest. When talking with people from outside the neighbourhood, they shared a common belief about people living in flood-prone areas, which is that people lie down because they are lazy. This perception shaped my prior understanding of such moments, particularly in the first stage of the fieldwork. When I joined children, I registered our encounter as if we did ‘nothing’; what is more, I even wrote down that I was bored (for a discussion of these feelings, see Chapter 3, section 3.6).

Children and their families often talked about taking rest. During the interviews, I asked children and adults about their daily routines. Children included taking rest as one of the activities, which they usually did after school during the afternoon. As I started to join children during these moments, I realised that taking rest contributed to children's lives in many ways. I identified that taking rest played a crucial role in children's physical and emotional wellbeing. Like Paula in the previous excerpt, children lay down on the floor to shelter from the intense heat. I also experienced that lying down made me feel cooler and lowered my body temperature. In addition, when talking with children, they explained that rest helped them feel relief after a distressing event. For instance, Sandra told me that when children are sad, they should take rest to feel better.

As I described, I was playing with Carlos and his sisters at their house. Without prior notice, Carlos stopped playing with us and left. After a few minutes, I saw that he had gone to sit on the side of the river. A reading of his behaviour could be that he went to rest and seek shelter from the heat. Without denying this possibility, I believe that the fact that he advised me about the boat, and the contemplative attitude that can be observed in the photograph, added another element to my analysis. Like Carlos, I also observed other children taking a break from their usual activities to rest. For
example, children stopped their play or activities at the PRONOEI to sit or lay on the floor. I realised that when they took time to rest, they took time to observe their neighbourhood, particularly the river, animals, and people doing activities on the river, such as fishing. During the interviews, children mentioned such things as enjoyable and recognised them as characteristics of the place where they live.

Figure 7 illustrates what children consider as enjoyable about living in their city, in the ‘jungle’, as they called it. During the interview, Angel did the drawing when we were talking about what he liked the most about his neighbourhood. He explained to me that in his drawing there was a house next to the river, a sun because of the heat, a cloud because sometimes it rains, and a tree with fruit. This illustration echoes other children’s expressions. Carlos mentioned "[I like the neighbourhood] because there are fish, my father fishes and brings aguaje [a local fruit]". Children also recognised that these aspects are particular to their context. For instance, playing with my earrings became a common activity; once Shirley said, "These are earrings from the jungle". I asked her why, and she said, "Because it has this little green circle, and this is made from fish" (Field notes, October 2018).

The literature recognises the connection with nature as a key element of the Amazonian identity (Anderson, Torrejón, & Zúñiga, 2016; Espinosa, 2012; Ludescher,
The children who participated in this research not only identified and enjoyed those elements, but also recognised them as aspects that belonged to their city, which was located in the ‘jungle’, as they said. For instance, Paula said she likes where she lives "because there are fish, in comparison to Lima, where there are not fish, but there are churches and dressed dolls". Similarly, Tito mentioned, "[here] there are sardines, piranha, and dolphin; in Lima there are not". Children then identified Amazonian elements and compared them with the elements of other cities.

I contend that these times to rest and observe the nature could be a key element in the development of their connection with the Amazonian Peru and their attachment to it. As Scannell, Cox, Fletcher, and Heykoop (2016) suggest, children’s attachment to the place they live in is a key element of the development of their identity. In line with this, considering Cuenca and Aguilar’s (2009) ideas, I suggest when children take quiet time for enjoyment and rest, they also have an emotional time that facilitates connections with the self, with others and with the environment. In line with the existing literature, I suggest that children’s independent mobility permits them to explore and become familiar with their neighbourhood, which could allow them to develop a sense of place and a feeling that they belong to their spaces (Engwicht, 1992). I argue that such activities are a key ingredient in children’s lived citizenship, as they contribute to their identity as inhabitants of the Amazonian Peru. As explained in Chapter 2, identity and belonging to society are the building blocks of lived citizenship, which includes not only legal recognition, but also subjective relationships and a sense of belonging and attachment to the places where citizenship takes place (e.g., Cussiánovich, 2010; Lister, 2007b; Novella, Agud, Llena, & Trilla, 2004).

5.3. Chapter conclusion

In this chapter, I explored how children interact with their spaces, by analysing how they relate to and learn about the main features of their neighbourhood, and how this process can be link to children’s experiences of citizenship. As suggested in the
literature, the features of cities shape citizens’ experiences, because they influence the way in which individuals relate, appropriate and make use of their urban spaces (Borja, 2010; Correa, 2010; Sugranyes & Mathivet, 2010). As explain previously, lived citizenship is a relational and continuous process, that take place in everyday interactions and socialisation processes, with themselves and others (Delanty, 2003; Warming & Fahnøe, 2017).

I noticed that children’s walks, and moments for play and taking rest were important for the children. Thus, these activities fit into the concept of children’s independent mobility. Similar to other research, I found that children’s independent mobility contributes to the practise of dimensions of lived citizenship. (e.g., Cook et al., 2015; Gülgönen & Corona, 2015; Rissotto & Tonucci, 2002; Tonucci, 2020), as it allows them to become familiar with their spaces and to exercise or claim their citizenship rights, as well as to participate and fulfil their responsibilities.

Firstly, I have discussed that while exploring their neighbourhood, children learnt how to move and use the spaces in the neighbourhood. They learnt about the spaces where they can access services and exercise their rights. They also learnt how to reach these places, including how to face any risks involved. For instance, they learnt about the safe spaces for playing and taking rest, as well as how to move around their neighbourhood, which was particularly useful during the flooding season.

Secondly, when children explored, played and took time to rest among other children they establish a participatory space in which they shared their views and opinions with their peers on matters in their neighbourhood. This space is valuable for children, not only because they can express their thoughts, but also because they can listen to others’ experiences and views and, thus, increase their knowledge and make it more nuanced. As such, the findings provide further evidence that children have opinions and knowledge about how to contribute to their society, as well as the skills to participate and to create strategies to obtain knowledge on matters of their concern. As discussed in the literature, children need to play an active role in shaping the development of their societies, and must be able to participate in decision-
making processes, not only at a formal level, but in other social settings and relationships as well (Cockburn, 2005a; Liebel, 2002). Considering that cities are usually planned and designed by and for adults, in line with other researchers (Tonucci, 2005; Whitzman, Worthington, & Mizrachi, 2010), I argue that promoting safe spaces for children’s mobility provides children with participatory spaces and increases their possibilities to learn and build their knowledge using their own codes and assessing their needs from their own perspectives, and not from those of adults.

Thirdly, I suggest that children’s independent mobility provides children with opportunities to learn about the main social and environmental features of Amazonian Peru, particularly when they take rest. Thus, this could help children to build their relationship with and attachment to their living spaces, as part of their social identity as citizens of the Amazonian Peru.

To sum up, I suggest that children become familiar with their geographical and social features by exploring, playing, and taking rest. From this knowledge, children can build and replicate social structures in their relationships with others inside and outside the neighbourhood. As I will discuss in the following chapters, what children learn about their living spaces shapes their lived citizenship experiences, including the actions they take to fulfil their responsibilities and participate as citizen (Chapter 6), as well as their acts of citizenships, to transgress social norms that limit their rights (Chapter 7).
Chapter 6. Performing citizen actions while playing, exploring and resting in a flood-prone area

In the previous chapter, I discussed how children’s mobility within the neighbourhood provides them with opportunities to become familiar with their physical and social environment. I explained, for instance, that children identify geographical and social risks and needs. This chapter focuses on the ways in which children perform their citizenship while playing, exploring, and resting as a response to such risks and needs.

As discussed in the literature review, Larkins (2014) based on Isin’s work, suggests that citizens engage in ‘citizen actions’ when they carry out actions, as part of the existing practices that enable subjects to be citizens. In this chapter, I address how children perform such citizen actions through their care actions in order to foster wellbeing in their families and mitigate risks (physical and social) for themselves and others. I analyse and explain why I argue that children’s care actions are citizen actions.

Care is a contested concept within Western feminist studies, influenced by the seminal work of scholars such as Gilligan (2013) and Tronto (1993). In Latin America, the interest in discussing care began 20 years ago, with a particular focus on understanding the tensions related to women’s role in the labour market and care in private and public spaces (Anderson, 2020; Batthyány, 2020). A recent review carried out by Batthyány (2020) on the theoretical development of care studies in Latin America found four approaches to care: the care economy, care as a component of social wellbeing, care as a right, and the ethics of care. These four approaches are not exclusive, but complementary, in understanding the complexity of care in Latin America (Batthyány, 2020), and will inform the discussion in this chapter, particularly on the ethics of care.
The ethics of care considers care as a moral activity that seeks to contribute to the daily welfare of members of society. Tronto (1993) proposed four elements as relevant for analysing care: attentiveness, which means noticing the need to care; assuming responsibility for care; competence in care-giving as a moral notion; and responsiveness, meaning the response of that which is cared for to the care. As care is a complex practice, exploration and research into care, such as how to measure care and identify what counts as care, can be challenging (Batthyány, 2020). In this chapter, I analyse those actions that the children who participated in this study identified as care, as well as those actions in which I observed children supporting and expressing concern about others regarding their development and wellbeing in their daily lives (Arango & Molinier, 2011; Batthyány, 2020). As explained in the methodology (Chapter 3), the analysis of the data was a continuous process; this allowed me to better understand and identify children’s activities as care activities. As recognised in the literature on childhood and young people, the care approach may have some limitations in terms of understanding children’s lived experiences (Cockburn, 2005b); hence, in this chapter I also reflect on such limitations and provide insights to contribute to the discussion.

This chapter is split into two parts. In the first part, I analyse children’s care of themselves and others in their neighbourhood. In the second part I look at children’s care of their environment and their community by participating in the preparation and responses to the flooding season. This is followed by a brief chapter conclusion.

6.1. Children’s involvement in the wellbeing of their families

During fieldwork, I found many ways in which children participated in caring for themselves and other members of their communities. In this section, I provide and discuss the most common examples. Firstly, I discuss how children foster wellbeing by meeting the physical and emotional needs of themselves and others. Secondly, I address children’s participation in household chores and the family economy. The third sub-section presents how children care and contribute to enhancing the
capacity of others to face risks in the neighbourhood. In each section, I explain why these actions can be understood as citizen actions.

6.1.1. Children’s care actions: Fostering wellbeing

On 25 April 2019, I visited the neighbourhood in the morning. As it was the morning, some children were at the primary school, so I decided to visit the houses of those who attended the PRONOEI. As I explained previously, the teacher had cancelled classes at the PRONOEI during the first months of the school year, because the rains had damaged the building. I saw Sandra (4-years-old) playing with some toys at the door of her house. I approached and asked if I could join her. At this stage, I usually socialised with children in their houses, because the neighbourhood was flooded. We usually played together in the homes that faced the street. As with Sandra’s house, some houses had a space that served as a hall and a balcony, which was the continuation of the bridge (see Figure 5 for an example of a typical house in the neighbourhood). I sat on the balcony and Sandra (4-years-old) remained inside: one of the reasons for this, she explained, was to avoid her toys falling into the water. Sandra asked me to take a photograph of her sick monkey (see Figure 8).

Figure 8. Sandra’s sick monkey
(Photograph taken on 25 April 2019)
As Figure 8 shows, Sandra placed the monkey sitting and facing the street, so that the monkey could look at the neighbourhood. She explained that the monkey was sick, so she had thoughtfully made sure that her monkey had everything he needed. Sandra wrapped the monkey in a blanket and placed a jar of water and coloured pencils next to him. I will describe further Sandra’s actions, to illustrate and discuss how children assume responsibilities for caring themselves and others.

As I explained in Chapter 3, poverty and lack of access to basic services, in combination with sociocultural factors, generate high rates of health issues in the region. The region has a high prevalence of childhood anaemia, acute respiratory diseases, and acute diarrhoeal diseases (UNICEF, 2019). Vector borne diseases, like malaria and dengue fever, are also recurrent in the Amazonian Peru (Anderson, Torrejón, & Zúñiga, 2016). Understandably, children and their parents often got sick with colds, stomach illnesses, and skin conditions.

Taking care of others when they were sick was one of the ways in which children contributed to their families. Children’s acts of care can be considered to be citizen actions, because by caring children express concern about the needs of others and take action to meet these needs, as part of their duties in society, which are part of an individual’s responsibilities as a citizen (Larkins, 2014). Further, as I will discuss, children’s care actions fulfil the dimensions proposed by Tronto (1993) within the ethics of care approach, in which caring is a moral activity oriented towards the wellbeing of others in society (Batthyány, 2020; Ocampo Talero, París, & Delgado, 2008; Tronto, 1993) and an essential part of social reproduction and the daily welfare of people (Batthyány, 2020).

Sandra’s play is a representation of how children are aware of the needs of others and take actions to meet those needs. Sandra took on the pretend responsibility of caring for her monkey, taking numerous actions on the monkey’s behalf. She ensured the monkey’s physical wellbeing by wrapping him with a cloth that served as a blanket to keep the monkey warm. She also gave him water to maintain his fluids. In those days, due to the high temperatures combined with heavy rain, many children
and adults were sick with colds. Hence, care for others when they were sick was a common practice in the neighbourhood, and children, as Sandra illustrated, contributed to doing so.

Analysing this according to the four elements proposed by Tronto (1993): Firstly, when Sandra took care of her sick monkey, she was both attentive and responsive to the physical and emotional needs of the monkey. Similarly, although I took preventive measures, I also got sick several times. When children noticed that I was sick, they offered me massages with ointments to relieve my symptoms. Also, whenever children asked me to join them to play in the water, I usually replied that I did not want to catch a cold. In response, children often said that they would take care of me, by giving me water to drink or taking me to the nearby health centre. During interviews, caregivers also recognised this contribution. For instance, Saul’s mother said, “When I am sick, he passes me water or my pills, he accompanies me to take rest”. I observed, and the children also shared with me, their experiences when they received the care of others or took care of their siblings or parents when they were sick.

When children took actions to meet others’ needs, they also showed they were competent to do so. For example, when children offered to massage me with ointments, they used their knowledge of local remedies to treat health issues. An interesting aspect is that when children offered to take care of me, I had not asked for such care. Similarly, when I witnessed how they took care of their younger siblings, I did not witness any explicit external request to do so. These voluntary offers can also be understood as children expressing their responsibility towards the wellbeing of others. In the next sub-section (section 6.1.2), I will provide more evidence on how children in the study area carried out activities to take of others, as a genuine desire to foster wellbeing in others, without receiving an explicit instruction or request to do so.

As Tronto (1993) asserts, responsibility, as an element of care, “is embedded in a set of implicitly cultural practices, rather than a set in a formal rules or series of
promises” (pp. 131–132). As such, I argue that children assumed that they are able to, and should provide, care if needed. Citizen actions encompass acts in which individuals practise their responsibilities and involve themselves in society's matters, within the existing practices (Isin, 2008). As mentioned, due to the high rates of illness in the region, care for others when they are sick is a common activity. Children’s contributions included basic care and traditional practices, like massaging the feet and the front of the head with ointments, fitting within existing practices, behaviours and habits.

Common assumptions about children as only dependent challenge the recognition of children’s citizenship, placing children as merely objects of care (Cussiánovich, 2009, 2010; Wihstutz, 2017). In addition, care is usually associated with the action of supporting a child or a dependent person in their development and wellbeing in their daily life (Batthyány, 2020). However, the analysis of children’s care actions to foster the wellbeing of their families shows the interdependence between children and their societies, rather than only dependence, which has also been argued by other childhood scholars (e.g., Bartos, 2012; Cockburn, 1998; Cussiánovich, 2009; Lister, 2007b; Moosa-Mitha, 2005). As Bartos (2012) asserts, care is a political concept, that draws attention to interdependence, connections, and relationships that are key aspects of individual and collective wellbeing. Children are not only cared for when they are sick, but they also provide care to their caregivers and others.

The interdependence between children and their caregivers was also expressed in their emotional support for each other. When Sandra took care of her monkey, she not only sought to meet the monkey’s physical needs, by keeping him warm and hydrated, but also took care of the monkey’s socio-emotional needs, by giving him coloured pencils to use and placing him facing the street so that he could see the neighbourhood. Similarly, I witnessed numerous times when children offered emotional support to other children and their caregivers. For example, children usually accompanied their caregivers in their activities outside the neighbourhood, even if this meant that the child did not attend the pre-school. For instance, in one of my visits to the PRONOEI, I noticed fewer children than usual and asked the teacher
about this. She answered me, “Well, Sandra is with her mother, there is a funeral, and they went there. Carlos is with his mother in the other part of the city; she is working taking care for a house, he’s probably coming the next week” (Field notes, March 2019).

I registered in my field notes many times when children were absent from the neighbourhood, because they accompanied their female caregiver to the local market or to visit relatives, their male caregiver to fish or fetch firewood, or, as in the case of Carlos, because their caregiver was away from the neighbourhood for some days. During my conversations with the children’s mothers, I explored this further. They explained to me that they took their children with them, because otherwise the children would be home alone, which could be risky. The mothers also told me that they did not want to go alone and wanted company. It appears that while the mothers were taking care of their children, the children were also providing care and company for their mothers. During interviews, adults highlighted the fact that children in their early years provided emotional support when needed. For instance, caregivers agreed that when children saw them worried or ill, they asked about their feelings and verbalised their love. Similar to Larkins (2014) in her research on the understanding of citizenship, I found that adults also depended on children’s contributions to care. Moreover, adults recognised that caring in this way is a particular characteristic of younger children. As Andy’s father explained during the interviews, “because as soon as they get older, boys even more so, they get into their things and forget to say I love you”.

To sum up, children are ‘active citizens’ (Isin, 2009) when they contribute to meeting others’ physical and emotional needs through acts of care. Children’s acts of care foster the wellbeing of others, as part of their participation in and responsibility to their families, within existing social practices. Children in the study area demonstrated being attentive, responsive, responsible, and capable when providing care to others, particularly when they were sick or required emotional support. Caregivers in the neighbourhood recognised the crucial role of children in this matter.
6.1.2. Contributing to family activities: Household chores and the family business

While caregivers and children recognised children’s contribution in fostering family wellbeing, I also witnessed many other forms of children’s participation, which caregivers usually overlooked. I recorded many situations in which children participated in family activities. I identified at least the following as activities in which children took part: caring for younger children, cleaning (e.g., washing dishes, sweeping the floor), cooking, running errands in the neighbourhood (e.g., fetching water from the well, going to nearby shops), running errands outside the neighbourhood (e.g., fetching water or wood from the opposite side of the river), and supporting the running of the family business. When I interviewed children, some of them included doing such activities as part of their usual tasks: like Jazmin (5-years-old), who said, “I get up by myself, I take a bath by myself, I cook fish, I go to school, [then] I come [to my house], I eat, I wash the plates or my clothes, and then I play”.

Similar to Punch (2001), I found that while there is a marked gender social distribution of household responsibilities, such distribution depends on many other factors as well, such as age and the composition of the family. Interestingly, I also found differences between children’s and adults’ perceptions, expectations and ongoing practices.

In families with only girls, the distribution of tasks depended more on age, skills and number of family members, rather than gender alone. For example, in the case of Clara (5-years-old) and Daisy (3-years-old), they lived with their three older sisters, father and mother. I observed that the cleaning activities, as well as running errands in and outside the neighbourhood, were assigned and carried out mainly by their older sisters. I also observed that Clara sometimes contributed to the cleaning activities in the house; however, I mainly saw her taking care of and playing with Daisy. I also witnessed how Daisy and Clara were left in the house when their older sisters had to run errands outside the neighbourhood.
Ana (4-years-old) and Shirley (4-years-old) were cousins living together in the same house with their mothers, grandmother, Ana’s 1-year-old brother and Shirley’s 7-year-old sister. I observed that the adult women in the house relied mainly on the support of the older girls to run the household. However, as I will describe later, in contrast to Clara and Daisy, Ana and Shirley also contributed to the cleaning activities and running errands inside the neighbourhood. In this regard, I noticed that when there were more members in the family, younger children undertook fewer household chores.

My sample included only one family with only boys. Andy (4-years-old) was the younger sibling, and he had three older brothers, who were almost always outside the neighbourhood, either at school or working in the nearby port. I observed that Andy sometimes contributed to cleaning activities and, as he lived next to his cousins Ana and Shirley, he sometimes took care of Ana’s younger brother. Andy’s family frequently relied on Andy’s grandmother when it came to preparing meals, and Andy helped her by fetching water and running errands. In this case, gender influenced the distribution of the responsibilities of adults and adolescents in the family, but Andy contributed in the same way as Ana and Shirley did.

I observed that in families with both boys and girls, gender may play a more important role. Saul (5-years-old) and Heidy (3-years-old) had two older sisters and two older brothers. In this case, any time I went to the house, I observed that the older sisters were mostly in charge of household chores, particularly, cleaning and cooking. Besides taking care of Heidy, I observed Saul fetching water from the well and running errands outside the house, for which tasks Heidy, his younger sister, joined him.

As I described, the distribution of household chores depends on different variables; however, taking care of others was carried out by all children in the sample. Children’s contributions to household chores were commonly overlooked by adults and the children themselves. When I explored children’s and caregiver’s perceptions about the roles in the family, they said that household chores were undertaken mainly by female adults and adolescents, while economic support, including working
outside the neighbourhood, were perceived as the responsibility of male family members (adults and adolescents). When I interviewed caregivers on children’s responsibilities and participation in their families, caregivers mentioned that children aged less than 5-years-old had the responsibility of going to school and the right to play and take rest. They added that children who attended primary school were the ones who mainly contributed to household chores and the family business. For instance, one mother told me that “they [children below 5-years-old] can help us with small tasks, but they are usually playing; the older ones, yes, they do help us with more household chores, my daughter (10-years-old) cooks with me” (Angel’s mother during the interview). Common adult-centric perceptions of children, particularly younger children, as lacking competencies make it difficult for adults to recognise their contributions to their families and society. As evidenced in the following excerpt, I noticed that caregivers commonly minimise children’s contributions or assume that they are only part of their play time.

I visited Ana and Shirley; they were washing their underwear in a washtub. When I arrived, her grandmother told me that Ana was crying because she wanted to wash her clothes, but her mother did not allow her to do so. Ana’s mother argued that she only wanted to play, and therefore she would do the laundry incorrectly. Ana’s grandmother then intervened and let the girls do it, arguing that the girls will learn how to do it. (Field notes, May 2019)

I observed Ana and Shirley washing their clothes in their house. When I arrived, I sat next to them, and they kept washing their clothes. I noticed that Ana had watery eyes, and I asked what had happened. Then her grandmother explained to me that Ana and her mother had argued. She told me that Ana’s mother did not allow Ana to wash their clothes because, in her view, Ana only wanted to play and, therefore, the laundry would not be done properly. So, the grandmother’s intervention did lead to Ana undertaking the laundry—although it was presented as practice for the future—despite the fact that Ana did, in the end, do her laundry.

I assert that children’s—particularly girls’—involvement in household chores is also a citizen action, as it contributes to the sustainability of their families, within their
common social practices. Children’s involvement in household chores also encompasses elements of moral care, showing that children are attentive, responsive, capable and responsible (Tronto, 1993) when it comes to household needs.

Although I did not witness caregivers requesting children to undertake household chores, I saw numerous instances when children, particularly girls, performed the tasks at their own initiative. They did this as part of their pretend play, as well as part of their usual responsibilities. In the excerpt mentioned above, Ana’s mother was doing the laundry, and Ana and Shirley expressed their desire to contribute to this process, by washing their own clothes. Likewise, in the excerpt discussed in the previous section, Paula washed her ribbon and her sandals, combining this activity with games with her neighbours. In both examples, the children were attentive to the need to take actions to meet the needs. Carrying out activities while playing has also been found in other research in similar contexts, where children mix their activities, like taking care of animals, with play (Ames, 2013; Punch, 2000).

In my field notes, I recorded many observed instances of children competently contributing to chores around the house. I noticed that they had the skills to do so, particularly in relation to washing clothes and footwear. Children's clothing would get dirty continuously due to various factors. For example, children sweated a lot because of the intense heat, which caused the sweat to permeate their clothes. As children walked and played in the soil or mud on the main street, their clothes and sandals got dirty quickly. On various occasions, I saw children washing their belongings, and they even offered to wash my sandals and cloth bag.

Some women caregivers, such as Ana’s grandmother, permitted children, particularly girls, to help them with small tasks while cooking or washing clothes, as a learning process. For instance, Paula’s mother gave Paula small tasks. During the interview, she mentioned that Paula already knew how to cook eggs and wash her school bag. As Cussiánovich (2006) suggests, adult caregivers usually see these contributions as
a way of developing skills to fulfil their role in the future, but do not necessarily recognise them as citizen actions in the present (Cussiánovich, 2006). This perception of caregivers is in line with the concept that play offers children opportunities to practice future tasks (Lester & Russell, 2010). Ames (2013), in her research on children’s transitions in rural Peru, found that children’s participation in family activities is gradual and includes observation and learning through play. She found that children imitate, practice, and explore the activities, thereby learning and enhancing their skills.

In my research, children were not only developing skills for the future, I witnessed that children, particularly girls, were also already supporting their families through concrete actions. Even if children conducted the activity as play, they often used real objects, not as in pretend play; therefore, the products they produced were usable. For instance, Paula wore her ribbon after washing it. Likewise, Ana and Shirley put their clothes out to dry to use later. When the children helped me wash my sandals, it enabled me to walk with clean sandals and removed the stones that were stuck in my footwear, hence, avoiding injury. Thus, the children were active citizens, as they contributed to the wellbeing of their families as well as building their ability to undertake more complex tasks in the future.

The way in which individuals assume their responsibilities relates to social behaviours, not only to legal rules (Tronto, 1993). While I have shown that boys and girls in my research contributed to the household chores, in children’s and adult’s perceptions, the household chores were a female responsibility. Therefore, adults demanded greater fulfilment of such roles from girls and female adolescents in comparison to boys. For instance, Jazmin and Luis lived in nearby houses: usually when I visited Jazmin, Luis and his sister crossed the street and joined us or vice versa. On many occasions, when we were playing, and it was time to prepare meals, Luis’s mother called Luis’s sister, Maria, to help her. I saw that Maria went to her house in response to the mother’s call, and Luis remained playing with us. On the contrary, when we were playing at Luis’, and Jazmin’s mother called Jazmin’s sister, both girls went to their house to help her mother. Girls, then, contributed to their families
according to the existing gender social practices in the neighbourhood. By carrying out household chores, they shared this responsibility with other women in the household, thereby lessening the burden of these women. It can also be said that girls were responsive to the possible burden on their mothers and sisters, helping to reduce it. In this case, girls replicated the common gender social norms, which associated care with female figures. However, as children are not passive agents, they also challenged such gender arrangements and meanings (Thorne, 1993), as I will discuss in Chapter 7.

I also observed that when the family had a small business, children also supported the running of it. As described in Chapter 4, a family’s income usually relied on adult males working outside the neighbourhood. However, some families also had small family businesses, usually run by women who set up a table outside their house to sell local fruit, vegetables, fish or prepared food. I witnessed that adult women and adolescents were in charge of selling the products. I also noticed that younger children were usually playing nearby while their mothers or siblings were tending the stall. I observed that, while children were playing, they also helped attend to the customers.

For instance, Angel’s mother sold fruit from her house. During interviews, we talked about her family economics. She explained that her adolescent sons worked in the nearby port and that she and her daughter ran the neighbourhood's food business. Regarding the family business, she said, “Yes, as you have seen I sell mangos, bananas or whatever I find in the market; my daughter helps me to sell because I have to do other errands. And Angel—my wee child—joins his sister, he is always with her”. Just as Angel’s mother said, I often saw Angel playing around and accompanying his sister while the food was prepared and sold. I observed that Angel was actively helping his sister. For instance, I saw him fetching water to wash the utensils, running to the house to bring plastic bags or coins for the change, among other things. He did this when his sister asked him to do so, as well as when he noticed the need to do so.
Similarly, I saw Andy participating in running his family’s business. Andy’s family had a small store during the falling stage. I observed that when a customer came to the store, the boy went to advise his mother that a new customer wanted to buy something. Sometimes, when his mother or his older siblings were not around, he even sold things by himself. Andy’s family sold things on credit, so when Andy knew the neighbour, he gave them the purchase, and then told his mother who had bought what. His parents did not always welcome Andy’s proactive response. I witnessed how Andy’s mother reprimanded him, saying that he had sold something at a wrong price or given a faulty product. However, he was not praised when he did sell correctly. This, suggested to me that Andy’s contribution was not always recognised as positive.

Children’s economic and physical dependence curtails their recognition as citizens (Alfageme, Cantos, & Martínez, 2003; Cussiánovich, 2006; James, 2011; James, Curtis, & Birch, 2007; Lister, 2007b, 2008). However, my findings show that children are not entirely outside of the process of obtaining economic resources. While, in the view of most caregivers, running the family business was not the children’s main responsibility, children contributed to it. In both examples, children were aware and responded to the family’s economic needs. As Tronto (1993) proposed, being competent is a key element of the moral quality of care; however, depending on the context, the resources available can limit the caregiver’s competence. In both cases, Angel and Andy showed the capacity to contribute. However, some activities performed by Andy required more complex skills, including knowing prices and doing mathematical operations. As citizenship is an ongoing process, developing the skills to deploy citizen actions in more complex arenas is also a continuous learning process (Delanty, 2003).

In this sub-section I have provided evidence of how children continuously support their families, either as part of the duties assigned by adults or due to their genuine desire to contribute to their family’s activities. The examples discussed show that children are attentive to their family’s needs. Such attentiveness is one of the moral
aspects of caring, as care requires the recognition of a need and the desire to take care of the need (Tronto, 1993).

Interestingly, I also found that, even when children were in other spaces, different from their own houses, they were also aware of and attentive to their family’s needs. For instance, it sometimes happened that when I was playing with Saul, he stopped the game and ran to his house to fetch a bucket, and then went to the well to draw water (Field notes, December 2019). He usually did this without providing an explanation or advising me about the change in our activities. The well was located under the house of one of the neighbours and, while it was for public use, the children told me that the house owner did not like others drawing water. For this reason, like Saul, some children were watchful for the moments when the neighbour left his house, so that they could use the well. I witnessed other occasions when Saul’s mother asked him or his siblings to fetch water, without necessarily noticing the neighbour’s presence. However, while playing, Saul was aware of the appropriate time to fetch water, which was in the neighbour's absence. It may be the case that Saul not only fulfilled this responsibility when his mother asked him to do so, but also without an explicit order.

I witnessed another similar example when I was playing with Paula and Sandra, in Sandra’s house. Their mothers were chatting outside the house while we were playing inside. After some minutes, I noticed that the mothers were talking about something that was happening near Paula’s house. The girls also noticed what the mothers were talking about, and Paula stopped colouring and left the house rapidly without saying a word. I was intrigued about why Paula had left and asked Sandra what had happened; she told me that a neighbour had arrived and was about to pass by Paula’s house. Sandra’s mother added that they had seen a teenager who sometimes stole their belongings. Therefore, Paula went to her house because her mother has left her wallet on the table next to the door (Field notes, May 2018). This situation made me suppose that Paula—and Sandra—had knowledge of who the adolescent was, and as soon as they heard about his presence, Paula ran out to secure
their house. Similar to Saul, when Paula learnt about the risky situation, she decided to protect her family’s belongings, without an explicit adult order.

In the examples mentioned above, children took action to meet their families’ material needs, such as safe water and protection of belongings, without an explicit request. I also found that children were constantly aware of the emotional needs of others, particularly of younger children, as evidenced in the following excerpt and picture.

I was in the pre-school classroom. In front, in Ana’s house, her 5-month-old brother started to cry (he was lying on a blanket on the floor; his grandmother was in the kitchen). I saw through the window that Andy (6-years-old) went out from his house and went to see what was happening; he moved the baby and went to call their grandmother.

I crossed the bridge, and I went to visit Andy. The baby started to cry again, and I saw Ana at the pre-school window with a mask yelling, “Oscar! Look at me, baby! Don’t cry!” (Field notes March, 2019)

In the previous passage, both Andy and Ana separately provided care for the baby, after hearing him cry, without an adult’s presence. Andy was at his house, and he went to cuddle the baby. When I crossed to Andy’s house, he explained that the baby

Figure 9. Ana with a mask, playing with her brother who was in the house opposite her
was crying, and he went to move and calm him. I inquired why he did this, and he said that it was because his brother is a baby. Ana was at the PRONOEI and the door was closed (See Figure 9). During the few days that the school operated during the flooding season, the teacher usually closed the door to protect children, so that they could not get out when she was not looking, as they commonly did during other months of the year. However, this limitation did not stop Ana from taking care of her brother. She took a mask and played with her brother; as did Andy, she showed concern for the baby’s emotional needs. As mentioned, responsibilities in a society involve not only responding to legal norms, but also to social practices (Lister, 2007a; Tronto, 1993) and emotional bonds (Batthyány, 2020). In this example, the children displayed their citizen actions to foster the wellbeing of the baby and to contribute to meeting the needs of others.

To sum up, similar to other research, I found that, from their early years, children perform citizen actions in their families, by fostering wellbeing, supporting household chores, and contributing to their the family economy (Alderson, 2007; e.g Alderson, Hawthorne, & Killen, 2005; Ames, 2013; Bartos, 2012; Fichtner & Trân, 2020; Jans, 2004; Larkins, 2014). However, as James (2011) asserts, because of the age-based distribution of rights and responsibilities, the ability of young children to assume responsibilities can go unnoticed and, thus, their citizenship is not recognised. The findings of this research show that children carry out such citizen actions with attentiveness, responsiveness, responsibility and competency, not only after an adult has command them to do so, but also on their own initiative. Furthermore, I noticed that children’s actions towards others not only foster the other’s wellbeing, but also enhance the children’s skills, as discussed in the next section.

6.1.3. Caring and sharing knowledge

One of the first days after I arrived in the neighbourhood, I was talking with a group of girls, including Shirley, a 4-year-old participant. The girls asked me questions about myself, such as
the house where I lived, my clothes, etc. They asked questions about my family and the people whom I lived with. For instance, they asked me about the ñañitos and ñañitas. Shirley (4-years-old) asked me, “Does your ñañita comb your hair for you and take care of you?” (Field notes, October 2018)

It is not common for women in the region to live by themselves or with friends, as I do. Therefore, the children were curious about where I lived and with whom, as in the field note above, when the girls asked me about who I lived with, and if my ñañita combed my hair and took care of me. Depending on the region in Latin America, the word ñañito/ñañita has different meanings; it can refer to children, friends, or siblings. I am from a city located in the north of Peru, where the term usually refers to children in their early years. For this reason, I was a bit confused about Shirley’s question. My answer to the girls was that I had no ñañitas and that I combed my own hair and took care of myself. The girls looked at each other, smiling and with an expression of surprise in their faces. Ana replied, “Her ñañita, Liz, takes care of us”. I asked who Liz was, and the girls told me that she was Shirley’s older sister. Shirley’s question made me aware of the roles that children had in relation to their brothers or sisters.

The relationships between siblings often caught my attention during fieldwork. Although the participants in my research were aged 3 to 5-years-old, their siblings who attended the primary school were almost always present during our interactions. Particularly during the flooding season, due to the mobility restrictions, children spent significant amounts of time in their houses, so that they spent their time with their siblings, playing or resting. As seen in the excerpt above, children said that older ñañitos/ñañitas [siblings] were the ones who cared for them. The findings show that children from 3 to 5-years-old replicated these care actions with other people who required them and that these care practices also configured learning and socialising spaces.

I witnessed how children were constantly aware of younger children’s needs, such as having materials to play with, or protecting them from risks. For example, due to the
lack of resources in the PRONOEI, most of the time only children aged 4 and 5-years received the working materials; sometimes there were not enough for the 3-year-olds (Rita, Daysi, Sara and Ines). In such cases, I observed how older siblings obtained materials from the teacher and then shared their own supplies with their younger siblings. In public spaces, I observed that children were particularly aware of the care of the youngest children, in terms of protecting them from injury during the dry season or drowning during the flooding stage. For instance, Saul and Luis often ensured that their 3-year-old sisters (Heidy and Sara) were wearing sandals while walking through the neighbourhood to avoid injury. Andy, who lived next to Ana and Shirley, was always watching Ana’s baby brother (as explained in the previous section) and ran to his house if he saw a danger of the baby falling into the water.

Considering the age distribution of care responsibilities, in which older children are expected to take care of the youngest, it is possible that caregivers gave children the responsibility of caring for the younger ones. However, the person who possibly gave the order was not necessarily present when children cared for their younger siblings; therefore, children were the ones who were attentive and responsive to the needs of younger ones. In line with Isin’s (2008, 2009) proposal, children enact citizenship actions, consistent within existing social norms, by caring for their younger siblings and contributing to their wellbeing. Theoretical contributions from the ethics of care perspective allow us to analyse how children promote the wellbeing of others, through their moral care actions, when meeting younger children’s needs (Bartos, 2012; Tronto, 1993; Wihstutz, 2017).

The findings of this research suggest that when children protected other children from risks in public spaces, they established a process of sharing knowledge. Children shared their own knowledge on how to face the risks and enhanced the expertise and skills of those receiving the care. As I explain, children did this with younger children as well as with others (like myself) with fewer skills to move safely around the neighbourhood. For instance, children recognised that I was afraid of walking in certain areas, particularly during the rising stage, as exemplified by the following excerpt:
I can no longer walk. I reached the main street with a canoe because the bridge is not finished yet [...] I sat for a while on a concrete wall today, to figure it out how to continue walking. After a few minutes, Andy approached me. He showed me the path to reach his house. He did this by testing the parts where there was less water. (Field notes, January 2019)

When I arrived in the neighbourhood on the day that this excerpt was written, it looked completely different to me than on the previous days. I remember that I was afraid, because I did not know how to move safely. The main bridge was not yet finished, and the existing ones were unstable. Andy was playing in his canoe when I arrived; he saw me and approached me where I was sitting. He sympathised with my feelings and offered to show me how to reach his house. I did not see Andy until he was in front of me, and when I saw him I felt relief. While I could try to test how deep the water was by myself, I did not do so, because I was afraid and I did not feel safe. As I explained in Chapter 5, I learnt that the children usually assessed the scenario before taking risks, which made me feel relieved and confident to follow their advice. Andy explained to me in detail how to walk in the water until reaching the bridge. When he did this, he tested the water level and showed me the path to walk. When testing the water, he ensured that the path he showed me had the minimum water level, even less than the path he followed. Furthermore, when we were on the bridge, as it was unstable, he gave me his hand to help me to balance.

As with Andy, children constantly showed me the path to follow, making me aware of the safest way to visit the neighbourhood. For instance, during the transition period, children taught me how to deal with the mud and how to walk in the water when possible. In the flooding season, children showed me how to walk on the bridges, and offered to teach me how to swim. My relationship with the children was like children’s relationships with their older siblings. For example, as I explained in Chapter 5, during the flooding season, they spent time together under the care of older siblings, and they learnt how to swim by observing and playing with them.
The analysis of children’s care as an exchange of knowledge challenges common critiques by childhood scholars of the care discourse. The care discourses usually focus more on the perceptions of the carer, with less attention to those being ‘cared for’; furthermore, care discourses can fall into the trap of replicating structural relationships of power and powerlessness (Cockburn, 2005b; Wihstutz, 2017). In the case of children, because of adult-centric views, children are often seen as ‘natural’ subjects in need of care, maintaining the relationship of dependence with their caregivers. While children are dependants of care by their adult caregivers, they are also carers of others. What is more, the findings of this research suggest that by exchanging knowledge on how to face risks with others, children do not create dependent relationships with their care receivers, but help others to learn how to protect themselves. The transmission of knowledge then, equips others with the resources to move around the neighbourhood and, thus, allows them to use their spaces, for their own social integration, and to develop a sense of place and belonging to their places (see Chapter 5). Consequently, I argue that this transmission of knowledge is a citizen action, not only because it responds to the needs and fosters the wellbeing of others but because it also allows other to perform their citizen actions or—as will be discussed in the next chapter—their acts of citizenship.

Furthermore, analysing children’s exchange of knowledge as a citizen action, can be understood as citizenship, as a process that strengthens the collective and personal experiences of being a protagonist in citizen practices (Cussiánovich, 2009, 2010; Delanty, 2003). This understanding of citizenship aligns with the protagonist approach, in which citizenship is not only an individual process of learning, but also a relational concept, as it implies the recognition of the ‘other’ as an equal protagonist (Cussiánovich, 2010).

The intersubjective and performed aspects of these examples illustrate how children are actively shaping the world around them, fostered through close relationships in families and communities in everyday life. The affective dimension of these is also significant as children’s caring relationships and friendships underpin much of how children and young people understand, experience and express their citizenship.
Children's care actions are not exempt from replicating asymmetrical power relationships or from violence. As suggested in the literature, care relationships are shaped by structural social relationships and involve emotional dimensions (Anderson, 2020; Batthyány, 2020; Wihstutz, 2017). I witnessed various situations in which children limited younger children’s mobility to protect them from risks, just as adults limited theirs, sometimes using violence. I witnessed children hitting younger children when they were at risk or because they had disobeyed some rule. Interestingly, while children recognised that I was also a care receiver, who needed their support to face risks, they never restricted my mobility or used violence. Although I was a non-typical adult, I still was an adult to them. Because of the social norms that suggest that children should obey and respect adults, it was unlikely that they would use violence with me. However, they did use violence with younger children, replicating the social norms that allow the use of violence as a disciplinary measure. Similarly, I found, that despite boys and girls taking on different roles in household activities, their expectations about who should fulfil such responsibilities were shaped by hegemonic gender roles. For example, when children asked about my household activities, they took it for granted that my mother cooked and took care of me, and that my father worked outside the house to bring in money. I also witnessed this gendered perception in our pretend play. When I interacted with boys and girls, we usually played chase games or pretended we were selling food. When we played selling food, the girls took the role of cooking and setting the table for selling the food, and sometimes they received the money; whereas the boys collected the stones or leaves to represent the money and received the money. In this type of game, I never observed boys fulfilling the role of preparing food, perhaps for fear of being socially reprimanded by their peers for doing tasks associated with female figures. Similar to Blakemore (2003) in her search for children’s knowledge of and beliefs about violating gender norms, in my field notes of my visits to the PRONOEI, I observed that boys received more social reprimands.
than girls when they had belongings with characteristics traditionally associated with the opposite gender. For example, I saw that when boys attended the PRONOEI with pink clothes, school supplies, or breakfast cups, other children made fun of them saying phrases like "you must be a girl, not a boy".

As I mentioned, both children and adults did not recognise children’s contributions to the care of younger children and others. For instance, children did not include these tasks when I asked them about their daily activities. Besides the age-based social structures that curtail the recognition of younger children as subjects with the ability to assume responsibilities (James, 2011; Lansdown, 2005), I argue that the under-recognition of children’s care activities relates to the overlooking of care more generally as a key activity in society. According to the existing literature, the social norm in Latin America is to perceive care as a natural and inherent role played by female figures. Therefore, it does not merit the same value as paid work (Barrientos & Muñoz, 2014; Batthyány, 2004; Batthyány, 2020). I found that children also undervalued care. For example, when I asked children during interviews about their caregiver activities, all of them attributed ‘work’ to men’s activities, because they earnt money for their families. In turn, children had narratives that their mothers did ‘nothing’ or ‘only cooked’, even when their mothers had small businesses, like Angel’s mother.

In this section, I provided evidence of how children performed their citizen actions by caring for others, particularly to diminish the risks related to environmental changes. I argue that children's caregiving constitutes citizen actions, not only because they contribute to others when meeting their needs, but also because they share their knowledge and enhance the skills of care receivers. I also discussed the fact that children support others in adapting and facing risks in the neighbourhood, hence, ensuring their independent mobility, which equips others to perform their lived citizenship, as discussed in Chapter 5.
6.2. Children’s participation in environmental care: Caring for nature and involvement in risk management

In 2011, the World Organization for Early Childhood Education carried out research in 28 countries to look at children’s thoughts, comments and understanding of the environment and sustainability. Most of the participants (aged 2–8-years-old) showed considerable knowledge and understanding of people's responsibility to care for the Earth and had ideas about what action is required (Engdahl & Rabušicová, 2011). Similarly, in this research I found that children had proposals and took action to take care of their environment by taking care of animals and other elements of nature, as well as participating in risk management procedures for floods.

6.2.1. Care of animals

As I explained in Chapter 5, animals were often present in children's conversations and experiences in the study area. I talked with them about, and saw how they related to, their pets (e.g., cats and dogs), corral animals (e.g., chickens and ducks), and wild Amazonian animals, including those that live in the water (e.g., fish) and on land (e.g., monkeys and insects). I found that children played an essential role in caring for animals, particularly animals that belonged to their family. As explained in Chapter 5, some families had corral animals, like chickens and ducks, during the falling stage of the river. Households used the corrals, usually located on the ground floor of their house, to keep the animals safe at night, but let them roam freely during the daytime. Caregivers, usually mothers, asked their children to help gather the animals at night. Sometimes children did this as part of their play, as evident in the following excerpt:

Luis (5-years-old) warned me that the sunset had begun, so he should put his chickens in the corral. I joined him. He asked his younger sister, Sara (3-years-old), to help him. He challenged her to a race. He said to her, “Who can locate the chickens quicker?” As soon as Sara gazed at a chicken, she pointed to it
with her finger, and Luis ran to catch it. (Field notes, November 2017)

Before this instance, I had witnessed other situations in which Luis’ mother had asked him to put the chickens in the corral. Sometimes, they did this together and, on other occasions, Luis asked Sara to help him. On this occasion, Luis was the one who was aware of the timing to gather the animals. He explained to me that if they did not do so, thieves could take the chickens. Luis asked Sara to help him in a particular way. He asked her to perform a game that required noticing the chickens faster than the other. I noticed that Luis and Sara complied with the responsibility of getting the chickens into the shelter while enjoying the activity. Besides being aware of the time at which they should put the chickens in the corral, Luis was also aware of the risks for the chickens (that thieves could steal them). The care of animals can be considered a citizen action, because Luis took on this responsibility and, thus, both he and Sara contributed to their family’s sustainability, by ensuring the wellbeing of the animals.

Based on Larkins (2014), children’s care for their animals is a citizen action, because in doing so they are fulfilling their responsibility, and contributing to others’ welfare: in this case, the welfare of the animals and their family. Firstly, they carried out the responsibility assigned by their caregivers. It is possible that this order was based on the need to protect family resources. Families usually bought corral animals to eat or to sell to generate economic resources. Therefore, by taking care of the animals, children were contributing to their family’s sustainability. A second aspect is that children’s citizen action contributed to the wellbeing of animals, like in the case of Luis and Sara, who gave the animals shelter and protected them from being stolen. I argue that the children’s citizen actions were not only because of the care responsibilities that were assigned by adults, but also because the children had developed strong bonds with the animals and this affection led the children to act to protect them.
As the literature remarks, emotional connections between children and animals is a key motivation in the children developing knowledge about and concerns for animal welfare (Muldoon, Williams, & Lawrence, 2016). As I explained in Chapter 5, children tended to have strong bonds with animals, developing affection for them. I suggest that the strong ties of affection between children and their animals also influence children to engage in care actions towards them. I have registered in my field notes various occasions when children spent time with their pets or corral animals. It is claimed that part of the Amazonian identity is the development of strong and respectful relationships with animals. For example, some indigenous communities consider that animals have spirits and locate them on a superior level to humans (Espinosa, 2012). The children who participated in this study showed excitement when talking about and interacting with Amazonian animals. For instance, some of the children’s fathers fished in nearby areas. The fish was often for family consumption, but at other times sold at the market. Sometimes, fathers found other mammals, like tortoises or small monkeys, which they took home. During the period that the animals were in the house, the children were the most excited family member about their presence and took care of them. When this happened, children showed me the animals with emotion and showed me how they fed them. The environmental citizenship perspective implies that individuals must be empathic and compassionate not only to other humans, but also to the non-human world (Hayward, 2020; Latta, 2014).

Children performed acts of care, by fulfilling responsibilities and displaying other elements of moral care, including attentiveness, responsiveness, and competence (Tronto, 1993). As explained, caring for animals implies that children are aware of and responsive to both the needs of the animal and those of their family. I also observed that children had the skills to feed and protect the animals. For instance, Luis demonstrated excellent physical abilities to put the chickens into the corral. As there were numerous chickens, he needed help, so he proposed the game to Sara. This game was a useful strategy, because while Sara looked for the animals, he had time to put a chicken into the corral, and then run to catch another one, following Sara’s
advice. I also registered situations when children talked with me about the type of food that animals needed. For example, during the flooding season, children explained that families fished for small fish to feed the ducks.

While I witnessed that children were competent and had knowledge about animals’ needs, their caregiving was not exempt from problems. Economic hardship, combined with the weather conditions, made it challenging to meet all of the animals’ needs. For example, Paula shared with me a sad story that made her learn about how to take care of dogs:

Paula: *I had a dog last year, a little one.*

Paula’s sister: *But she killed him because she bathed him too many times, and he died. She bathed him in the morning, in the afternoon and at night. Too much!*

Paula: *Yes, I bathed him too much, because it was hot. I thought he was hot; I will not do so anymore if I have another dog.*

*(Field notes, March 2019)*

In this excerpt, Paula, her sister, and I were chatting about dogs. Paula told me that she would like to have a dog, but her father did not want her to. The girls shared with me what had happened with their previous dog. Paula explained that she had been trying to care for her dog, but she failed because she bathed her dog many times, causing death, perhaps from a cold.

Like Paula, I saw other similar situations where children and their families failed to meet an animal’s care needs. Paula tried to identify her dog’s needs based on her own needs. As she was hot because the heat was intense, she presumed that the dog was also hot and, therefore, needed a bath to cool down. Just as children did when the heat was intense, she submerged the dog in the water many times. While Paula did not mention it, I assumed that nobody had guided her on how to take care of her dog. Having pets was not the norm in the neighbourhood. While I saw children making efforts to take care of their pets, I also saw various dangerous situations for
the animals, particularly during the flooding season, because of the risk of drowning. Due to the economic hardships during this season, adult family members often decided to get rid of the animals, as they did not have the means to respond to their needs. Sometimes, when families got rid the animals this involved violence, such as drowning the animals on purpose. I observed how families asked adolescents to do this, and that they carried out the task with younger children as witnesses.

The relationship between animals and children is usually mediated by various aspects, such as cultural and social beliefs, parental influence, and their own experiences with them (Selly, 2014). In this case, the models of animal care included challenges related to the economic scarcity in the neighbourhood, which led to neglect and violence; therefore, children’s care of animals sometimes failed to meet the animals’ needs. Hayward (2020) reflects on how a core element of environmental citizenship is that individuals develop a sense of embedded justice, whereby individuals actively practise decision making about fairness and equity in daily life, considering humans and non-human entities. I suggest that this process can be difficult for children living in a challenging context. The findings of this research show that while children recognised the importance of taking care of animals and had positive feelings towards them, the scarcity of resources in the neighbourhood and lack of positive care models made it difficult for them to ensure their wellbeing.

6.2.2. Children’s participation in preparedness for and response to floods

When I asked government workers about the policies related to disaster risk management in the neighbourhood, they informed me that the municipality would help the locals by providing wooden boards to build bridges every year. They also told me that the local government had labelled this area as a risky area for habitation and would like the people to move to other parts of the city; therefore, they did not carry out many activities to improve the conditions. Hence, strategies to prepare for and respond to the flooding season were mainly carried out by those living in the neighbourhood. I identified that the preparation activities included building bridges,
moving belongings located on the ground floor to the first floor, and reinforcing the houses. After the flood, locals were also in charge of cleaning, returning the belongings to the ground floor, recovering objects from the water, and repairing any damage to their houses. From my observations, I witnessed that in addition to children’s contributions to their families, those around them, and animals, children also participated in preparing for and responding to the flooding season.

As I explained, locals built bridges to move around the neighbourhood. This building process was gradual and coincided with the increase in water level. It also depended on the availability of human and economic resources. Residents brought wood from the neighbouring sawmill and organised themselves to build the main bridge that went through the centre of the main street. The construction and repairing of bridges that linked the central bridge with the houses depended on each family. When I talked with the children and their caregivers, I noticed that they assigned male members of the community to lead the construction and repairing of the bridges. While adult men led these tasks, I saw that both women and children played essential roles. For example, I saw Sandra supporting her dad when he was leading the repair of the main bridge, as described in the following excerpt:

I arrived at the neighbourhood, and I noticed that the water level had reached the same level as the bridge, that is the bridge was covered with water. A female resident saw me and suggested that I walk slowly because it was risky; she added that they were waiting for Sandra’s father to make the bridge higher. I walked carefully towards the PRONOEI, where I spent some time.

[...] At the end of my visit, I saw that a group of locals were repairing the bridge. I observed Sandra’s father, who was in the water. He asked me to wait for them to repair the bridge, because it was not possible for me to continue walking. I saw Sandra, who was sitting on a bridge of a neighbour’s house. She was with other
two girls, who seemed like they were the same age. I sat next to them to wait. I asked Sandra why she did not show up at the PRONOEI. She smiled, moved her shoulders up and pointed with her face towards her father. I noticed that while Sandra’s father was removing the wooden boards from the water and putting more wooden boards on the bridge, other women and men helped in different ways. The rest of the people held the wooden boards and advised other locals about the activity and to take precautions by not walking in such area. One of the mothers was also asking for money from other locals to help with the purchase of materials. When I heard this, I also gave some money to her. I saw that Sandra was observing what her father was doing, but she also helped them reach the nails or hammer when necessary. When I gave them the money, Sandra’s father told her, “With the money that your Miss Karina gave us, go and buy a soda for us to drink”. After they had repaired the bridges, Sandra’s father advised me that it was finished and that I could leave safely.

(Field notes, March 2019)

Sandra did not attend pre-school on the day described in the passage; when I asked her why, she smiled and pointed to her father. From her response and from what I witnessed, I understood that she did not go pre-school because she was with her father. While it is true that I mainly observed males guiding the process, I also witnessed women and children, like Sandra, participating in the construction and repairing of bridges. As described in the excerpt, I saw that it was a joint task and that all of the people who were there played a role. Some neighbours helped Sandra’s father to reach or hold the wooden boards while repairing the bridge. Other neighbours advised people, like me, to wait until the bridge was repaired. Others asked for money to buy the materials. Sandra and the rest of the girls were sitting, observing and ready to help. I observed that they supported the builders to reach
small materials, like the hammer and nails. When doing so, I noticed that they walked with caution on the bridge, as it was unstable, because it was under construction. Moreover, when I gave money, Sandra’s father told her to buy soda for the workers. Sandra went, and then one of the women distributed the drink among those who were participating in the work.

I also observed children taking part in other prevention measures, such as moving the family belongings to a safer place before the river level increased. Andy’s family, for instance, had a store on the ground floor of his house. When the water started to rise, his family relocated the store to the first floor, and Andy helped to do this. I saw how he grabbed products and put them in the new location. Jazmin’s family had their kitchen on the ground floor. I witnessed Jazmin and her sister helping their mother to move kitchen utensils to the first floor. Families did the reverse after the flooding season, and children also participated in this.

Most of the examples discussed in this chapter relate to children’s care of themselves and their families. However, in this sub-section, I analysed children participation in collective activities, which evidences children’s skills to participate not only at the family level, but also at a community level. When children played a role in mitigating the risk of the flooding season in their neighbourhood, they were caring for themselves and others. As environmental citizenship asserts, being involved in environmental sustainability is an expression of caring for both individual and collective concerns (Curtin, 2002; Latta, 2014). I argue that the children’s participation in preparedness and response to the flooding season is a citizen action. The children took part in collective activities to mitigate the risks related to the flooding season, promoting the wellbeing not only of their family members, but also of their communities. As the literature remarks, children’s citizenship implies the right to participate in the transformation and sustainability of their societies, and, thus, the common good (Invernizzi & Milne, 2005).

While this research provides evidence of how children participate in preparation for the flooding season, I identified that adults usually overlook this contribution. Similar
to Martin (2011), in her research on floods in Bangladesh, I found that adults thought that children were not able to understand their community’s concerns and should not be expected to contribute to preparedness or response measures. Besides the belief that children do not have the skills to participate, I argue this under-recognition has similarities with the under-recognition of women’s participation. At the start of the excerpt, a woman advised me of the bridge’s instability; she also explained to me that they were waiting for Sandra’s father to build the bridge. During the interviews and in other conversations with women, they said that adult males were in charge of these activities and did not comment on women or children’s contributions. However, on at least two occasions, I observed women performing the actions that men usually did, to reinforce the bridges that connected the main bridge with their houses. For instance, Ana’s grandmother borrowed Andy’s family canoe to go to the nearby sawmill to buy wooden boards. However, during interviews, both regretted that there were no adult males in their families, disregarded their own achievements. I argue that, as the existing beliefs dictate that this is a male responsibility, women and children under-value their own contributions.

As citizens, children have the right to take an active role in their societies and, therefore, to participate in the decision making and be involved in activities towards the sustainability of the places where they live (Cockburn, 2005b; Liebel, 2007). This participation should occur not only at the formal level, but in the wider arena, and children’s needs and differential characteristics should be considered in the process (Cockburn, 2005a). From an environmental perspective, young children should have the right to be involved and contribute to the sustainability of their societies, particularly in areas affected by climate change related disasters (Bartlett, 2008; Berse, 2017; Hägglund & Johansson, 2014).

Participating in prevention and response activities for emergencies and disasters, for instance, is not only their right as citizens, but also enhances children’s participatory skills (UNICEF & Plan International, 2011). For example, participating in such activities improves children’s status in their communities and increases their sense of belonging and self-confidence in fostering community wellbeing; in addition, young
people who participated actively as children are more likely to be elected as youth leaders (UNICEF & Plan International, 2011). Hart, Fisher, and Kimiagar (2014) concluded that when children take part in activities to address environmental problems it helps “them to feel more in control, more hopeful and more resilient” (p. 93), contributing to their psychological protection.

Considering that children’s capacity to cope with disasters rests largely on their parents’ coping strategy and support (Ronan & Jhonston, 2005), observing and participating in inadequate preparedness activities can hinder their future involvement in more sustainable and safe activities. In line with recent literature, I consider that children’s perceptions of the flooding season and its risks can affect their assessment of the situation, minimising the need to develop more robust preparedness measures than the ones they already have (Berse, 2017; Lara, Garcia, Bucci, & Ribas, 2017).

I also consider that the poor knowledge about the flood forecast, the temporary nature of the floods, as well as the ambivalent assessment of its impacts could affect children’s perception of the risks and, hence, the identification of measures needed to prevent and respond to flood risks. Firstly, as I explained, children and their families had little information about the duration or intensity of the floods. Their knowledge was based on their experiences in previous years. As seen in Chapter 5, children engaged in certain activities that allowed them to have more information about the water level and how it will increase. However, as some caregivers told me, it would be useful to have more precise information, which would allow them to make decisions, for instance, about the height of bridges.

A second aspect relates to the ambivalent perception of the impacts of floods. Research carried out in flood-prone areas shows that one of the consequences is the experience of loss and increased risk for children (Stanke, et al., 2012; Walker et al., 2012). Children experience not only concrete losses (e.g., toys, school supplies, houses), but also reduced or even total loss of their spaces, both for socialising and private matters (Banks & Weems, 2014; Mort, et.al, 2018; Stanke et al., 2012; Walker
et al., 2012; Walker, et al., 2010). It was evident that there were various losses in the neighbourhood, not only physical (e.g., their belongings fell into the water), but also loss of access to public services (e.g., classes at the PRONOEI were cancelled and they lost safe spaces for play) and even a human life (e.g., a girl died). As I discussed in Chapter 5, children also identified many risks for them during this stage, including the increased risk of drowning or being hurt by animals.

Children’s narratives on the floods not only included risks and losses, but also its usefulness and gains. For example, Carlos said that floods brought opportunities for “swimming and bathing”; Jorge said, that floods helped by “washing away the garbage”; and Juan told me that floods helped their mothers, because “God is throwing water [...] because our mothers always carry water to water their plants”. Hence, children also recognised gains during and after the flooding season, including enjoyable activities during the rising stage (e.g., swimming). During the transition stage, it was common to observe children looking for objects in the water, as can be seen in Figure 10 and Figure 11, which show some of the treasures that children found in the water. I call them children’s ‘treasures’, not only because I saw the children enjoying the toys when they found them, but also because they asked me to take photographs of the objects. In the water, they found new objects to play with, cookware, and so on. Sometimes, they also found their own belongings that had previously fallen into the water. In these instances, children recognised that some of the losses and risks last for only a few months a year and in other months they would have gains, like their treasures.
The floods in Amazonian Peru are slow-onset disasters, because the annual cycle of the river has seasonal rising and falling stages. In addition, they pose an extensive risk, which means “exposure to a repeated or persistent hazard condition of low or moderate-intensity” (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2005, pp. 15–16). I argue that such features, combined with a lack of appropriate policies to enhance the knowledge and resources to cope with the flood season, have led to the precarious preparedness measures used by locals.
Certain studies about flood-prone areas have explored the impacts of floods on children; however, they have done so solely from an adult-focused perspective, rather than working with children themselves (Walker et al., 2012). Until recently, research tended to perceive children only as passive victims of disasters (Berse, 2017). However, the findings presented in this section show that children are able to enact their citizenship, by participating in preparedness and response activities, thereby contributing to mitigating the risks for their families and others in their neighbourhood.

6.3. Chapter conclusion

As Cockburn (2017) suggests, children can replicate relationships of dependence, however, they also can, and do, challenge existing relationships. In line with this statement, I have discussed how children are not only care receivers, but are constantly engaging in care actions in different spheres, including the care of themselves, their families, and their animals, as well as caring for the sustainability of their communities.

I evidenced that children’s actions fitted within the understanding of care under the ethics of care approach, as children were attentive and responsive to other’s needs and responsible and competent in meeting such needs. Paraphrasing Tronto (1993), a supporter of the ethics of care approach, children displayed a moral attitude towards the wellbeing of themselves and others in their communities. Therefore, considering Larkins’ (2014) and Isin’s (2008) contribution, I have argued throughout this chapter that children’s care actions can be seen as citizen actions. I claimed that when children care for themselves or others, they are participating and undertaking their responsibilities as citizens, within the given social structures, thereby contribute to the common good.

As mentioned, children in this research not only contributed to the welfare of themselves and their families, but also to their communities. This research adds to the existing evidence about children having the skills to offer practical and creative ideas to help their families and communities to cope with and recover in flood-prone
settings (Jabry, 2005; Mort et al., 2018; Walker et al., 2010; Walker et al., 2012). Children in the study area played a role in preparing for and responding to the flooding season. They participated in the construction of bridges, activities to adapt their house, and the recovery process. However, the existing precarious mitigating practices and lack of adequate policies for disaster risk reduction, as well as children’s perceptions of the floods, could affect their perceptions of the risks and, therefore, limit their involvement in seeking more sustainable measures.

In addition, as seen in other studies, this research found that children’s contributions are usually overlooked or minimised, not only by adults, but also by children themselves (Alderson et al., 2005; Ames, 2013; Martin, 2011). This under-recognition, combined with the assumption that citizenship is only performed in public spaces, reduces the recognition of children’s citizenship. Highlighting children’s actions of care as citizen actions, provides further evidence of the need for an inclusive difference-centred approach to citizenship—a notion of citizenship that includes not only participation in public and formal decision-making spaces, but that also considers the various forms of citizen participation in private spaces. This chapter presents evidence of how children are able to assume their responsibilities as citizens and participate for the common good of their communities and those in their close environment, considering the characteristics and resources of both children and their contexts.

As recognised in the literature, caring also involves an emotional dimension (Anderson, 2020; Batthyány, 2020). The act of caring implies recognising and being attentive to the needs of others, with a moral desire to promote their wellbeing (Tronto, 1993). It would shed some light on this issue to understand how the bonds between human and non-human entities facilitate the development of actions to promote their wellbeing, that is, citizen actions towards the wellbeing of others.

Caring as an expression of citizenship implies fostering the welfare and wellbeing of others, but also potentially enhancing the skills of care receivers to be active citizens themselves. I argue that children’s caring contributes to the recognition of others as
equal protagonists. By caring, children promote the exchange of knowledge, which equips others to overcome the limitations on their independent mobility, thus supporting others to perform their own lived citizenship.

Finally, in this chapter I discussed how children’s actions of citizenships are located within existing social practices. As such, sometimes children replicate social norms that include violence to others or limit the rights of others (such as by hitting younger children or harming animals). However, my research also found that children are able to challenge such social norms, as discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter 7. Children’s acts of citizenship

As described in Chapter 3, lived citizenship relates to how people enact their citizenship in their daily lives. According to Larkins (2014), citizens perform their citizenship through their citizen actions as well as through their acts of citizenship. In the previous chapter, I analysed children’s ‘citizen actions’. In this chapter, I analyse children’s ‘acts of citizenship’, that is to say those acts by which children challenge existing social norms that limit their possibilities to exercise their rights and responsibilities as citizens. In order to consider an action as an acts of citizenship, Isin (2008, 2009) proposes the following considerations: there must be a need for recognition; the acts need to challenge traditional structures and transgress the usual scripts of being a citizen; and there must be a need to change people’s opinions or attitudes.

During the fieldwork, I witnessed various moments when children found ways to enjoy their rights, overcoming the challenging conditions of living in a flood-prone area. As seen in Chapter 5, the geographical features mixed with sociocultural aspects, limit the fulfilments of their rights, such as the right to play in public spaces (when they are flooded) or the right to go to school (when it is damaged by rain). In this chapter, I present children’s actions and discuss how these actions encompasses individual and collective transgressions that challenge social norms. Scholars generally agree that such social norms are beliefs about what other people do and what others think we should do, upheld by social approval and disapproval (Fry, Hodzi, & Nhenga, 2016; Mackie, Moneti, Shakya, & Denny, 2015). Social norms influence behaviours, dictating “what people in a group believe is a typical (normal) and appropriate (approved) behaviour” (Institute for Reproductive Health, 2020, p. 9).

In the first section, I analyse children’s individual transgressions of social norms. Drawing on Tito’s (5-years-old) and Diana’s (4-years-old) examples, I illustrate how children transgress social norms related to common beliefs about childhood and gender. The literature about citizenship identifies such norms, based on adult-centric
and patriarchal dynamics, as limitations on the recognition of children and women of all ages as citizens (Lister, 2007a).

As discussed in Chapter 5, the fieldwork location has geographical and sociocultural conditions, often found in urban settlements, that cause challenges for children to use their cities fully, limiting their experiences of lived citizenship (Bartlett, 1999; Cook, Whitzman, & Tranter, 2015; Larkins, 2014). For instance, I describe the risks children face when playing in public spaces, I also discuss how adults tend to restrict children’s mobility during the flooding season. In the second section, I analyse children’s collective acts to overcome such limitations. I found that children’s actions include transgressions aimed at finding ways to play and use their public spaces. The collective transgressions show that children use and appropriate their spaces, by transgressing norms: for instance, using public spaces under children’s rules instead of following those set by adults.

7.1. Children’s individual acts of citizenship

Considering the four aspects proposed by Isin (2008, 2009), this section is split into two parts. Firstly, I present Tito and Diana’s cases, analysing the rights they are claiming, and how their claims are produced in a different way than in traditional spaces for citizenship. In the second subsection, I analyse how Tito and Diana’s acts transgressed existing social norms, and produced shifts in people’s behaviours.

7.1.1. Children claiming their rights individually

To considering an act as an act of citizenship, there must be a need for recognition, which motivates individuals to claim their rights (Isin, 2008, 2009). As discussed in Chapter 2, societies tend not recognise children as citizens per se, and the information collected from the interviews with adults confirms this trend. The interviewees in this study recognised children’s rights to play, to be educated, to contribute with small tasks in their houses, and to receive care and protection, but citizenship was associated with being an adult, having an ID, and having a job. The following excerpts describe situations in which Diana and Tito enforced their rights: in the case of Diana, her right to be educated, and in the case of Tito, his right to decide how to participate...
in the research. Tito and Diana’s behaviours have other components that make their demands unusual and different than the traditional ways of claiming rights, which led me to analyse their acts as acts of citizenship.

7.1.1.1. The right to be educated: The case of Diana

Diana (4-years-old) began attending the PRONOEI (the preschool) during the last weeks of the school year. The teacher explained to me that Diana’s mother did not let her attend the preschool. To start attending, Diana went to the PRONOEI and asked the teacher if she could go to the PRONOEI while her mother was working. (Field notes, December 2018)

During the interview, I explored how Diana made her decision. “Nobody took me (to the PRONOEI), I have slipped away, and I went by myself...”, she said. She added that she liked the preschool, and that she went to the PRONOEI to learn and when she was sad. (Interview with Diana)

Children’s attendance at the preschool was irregular. As time went by, more children joined the class. Diana was 4-years-old when I first met her, and she joined the PRONOEI three weeks before the end of the school year. Her presence caught my attention, because I usually saw 5-year-old children joining the class at the end of the year, rather than 4-year-old children, as the older children needed the certificate for finishing preschool in order to be enrolled in primary school. The excerpt describes how Diana (4-years-old) arranged to attend preschool despite her mother’s decision to keep her at home. The teacher explained to me that Diana came to talk with her, asking to attend the PRONOEI while her mother was working outside the neighbourhood. She accepted Diana informally, under the condition that Diana would bring her ID to register herself formally for the following school year. The teacher added that she agreed because Diana was usually alone at her house, or playing around the PRONOEI, so she did so as a protective measure. During my interview with Diana, I asked her about it, and she said that she did not know why her mother did not want for her to go preschool. Diana said, “I do not know why... I wonder why,
when she [her mother] goes to work, sometimes I go with her, or I stay at my place”. Diana also explained that she took the decision by herself and went to ask the teacher. She recognised that she “slipped away” to do it so.

During recent years, the enrolment rate in pre-schools in Peru has increased (81.3% in 2014 to 90.2% in 2017) (UNICEF, 2019). In line with what Ames (2012) found in other parts of the country, most caregivers showed positive attitudes towards education for children in their early years. During interviews, parents recognised that children had a right to be educated and that caregivers were responsible for ensuring children’s attendance at school. Despite the difficulties (e.g., lack of economic resources to buy education supplies and mobility issues, particularly during the flooding season), parents usually encouraged children to go to school. In fact, although their attendance was irregular, almost all children aged four and above in the neighbourhood were registered in the PRONOEI or nearby pre-school settings.

Thus, I chose Diana’s case to analyse because it was an unusual situation, and how she asserted her right was also unusual. When I talked with Diana, she said that her mother did not want her to go to the PRONOEI. Usually, caregivers were the ones who went to the PRONOEI to register their children. Perhaps, before going to the PRONOEI, Diana spoke with her mother to ask her to do so, which would have been a traditional way of claiming her right. However, as Diana mentioned, the restriction remained, and she decided to "slip away" and go herself to talk with the teacher. Diana behaved in a way that was different from what is expected of a child. She disobeyed and took the initiative to go by herself to negotiate her right.

Once the teacher accepted Diana’s request, Diana attended almost all days. When she did not show up, she explained that she did not want to go to school because she preferred to go to the market with her mother or stay at home. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, the number of children attending school varied considerably every day. The reasons behind this were not only related to caregivers’ decisions. Just as with Diana, when I asked other children why they did not show up, their answers included both adults’ and children’s decisions. In the case of children, I found that the
reasons included that they wanted to sleep more, the heat was intense, or they wanted to accompany their caregivers in their activities (see Chapter 6). It is worth mentioning that I did not observe children being punished for deciding by themselves not to show up. As seen in Chapter 6, sometimes mothers asked their children to join them on their trip to the market. Mothers also used the same reasons as children to justify their children’s non-attendance. However, the situation was different in the primary school: children who did not attend primary school were labelled ‘vaqueros’, a common negative word for children who skip classes.

Diana found ways to enforce her right. She managed to enrol herself at the PRONOEI and, as other children did, she took decisions about her daily attendance. Diana not only enforced her right to be educated, but also to foster her own wellbeing. Considering Diana’s explanation, she not only wished to attend school to gain further knowledge, but she also participated in the PRONOEI as a way to deal with sadness. She said, "when I am sad, I go to school". During my visits, Diana and other children warned me about some issues in her family. She talked about illnesses and alcohol problems of some members of her family7. In my field notes, I registered that every time I socialised with her I met her at her neighbour’s house, and that her neighbours usually provided Diana with food when her mother was not home.

Similarly, Fichtner and Tràn (2020), in their ethnographic research with three children aged below six from families classified by the German asylum regime as having limited prospects of permanent residence, analysed children’s individual behaviour and identified that children enacted their lived citizenship by claiming their rights and their space to play, according to their needs and their perceptions of wellbeing. The researchers explained that children can behave in ways that are different than expected, challenging existing rules set by adults. In tune, with this analysis, I analyse Diana’s act as an act of citizenship, as she claimed her right to be educated, through an action that could be understood as ‘misbehaviour’, rather than from a ‘traditional

---

7 Following the ethical considerations, I maintained constant communication with the Children’s Ombudsman for the city, to alert the Ombudsman of risky situations. In this case, I alerted the Ombudsman about Diana, so that the office could take action.
site’, as defined by Isin (2009). Such ‘traditional sites’ included: asking the teacher to talk to her mother or talking with her mother herself. Sometimes, children asked me to talk with their mothers to obtain permission for them to play at their neighbour’s house, for example.

7.1.1.2. **Enjoying the right to participate: The case of Tito**

When I interviewed Tito (5-years-old), he was one of the three children who did not allow me to audio record the interview [although he did consent to be interviewed]. I explained to him that, just like the audio, I would not show his drawings to others in the neighbourhood. At the edge of the folder where I had the drawings, a paper protruded revealing a small part of one drawing.

Tito asked me: *Whose drawing, is it?*

Me: *It is from another child. As I told you, I cannot tell anybody to whom they (the drawings) belong.*

Tito (smiling): *Ok, but I already saw a little bit of one. It would be better if you store them well. When I give you mine, you will keep it safe. Ok?*

Me: *Oh, it was a test! Yes, you are right. I will store the drawings better.*

The previous excerpt describes how Tito responded in the process of obtaining his consent to be interviewed. I usually socialised with Tito in public spaces: he never invited me to play with him in his house. As I conducted interviews in children’s houses, I was a bit concern about whether or not he would agree to being interviewed. The day before the interview, I asked Tito and his mother if he could take part of the interviews; he agreed and told me to come the next afternoon. I arrived the next day, and he had prepared a table and school supplies. He invited me to come into his house and let me know that he would close the door so nobody could interrupt us. I explained to him the purpose of the interview, the privacy and
confidentiality, and I asked if I could record the interview. He indicated that he did not want the interview to be audio recorded, and then he asked questions about the confidentiality of the drawings produced during the interviews.

Tito’s behaviour may not seem surprising, considering that he was responding to what I offered. I said to the children that they could agree or not with my requests and that they could ask anything they wanted. As a response, Tito acted in a way that allowed him to decide and express himself freely. However, considering the common relationships between adults and children in which children have little room for free decision-making, I argue that Tito performed an act of citizenship. Considering Isin’s (2009) statements, Tito’s act was thought-provoking because it was unusual, and, thus, his exercise of his rights was also different from common practices and behaviours.

Firstly, he refused my request to audio record the interview. While he was not the only child who did that, he was the only one who said so explicitly. Sandra, for instance, looked at me and smiled, without responding whether or not she accepted. I had to ask her a couple of times more, and she kept smiling and moving her shoulders like saying “I don’t know”; then, I asked her directly if she preferred to not be recorded, and she finally nodded in agreement. Tito’s behaviour was consistent across time: anytime I asked him about consent, he replied directly. For example, when using the magnet technique in the PRONOEI (see Chapter 3), he was the only child who put his picture on the ‘X’ side and kept it there all the time. Other children who did not want to interact with me placed their picture on the ‘✓’ side, however, when I approached them to play or sat around them, I observed non-verbal signs that they did not want me to be around. For example, Sara put her photo on the ‘✓’ side on one occasion, which meant that I could interact with her. However, when I sat next to her, she looked at me, and I noticed her discomfort. I asked her if she preferred that I sit somewhere else; she looked at me and said yes, smiling.

Considering the ethical procedures in a longitudinal research in Peru, Ames and colleagues (2010) warned about the challenges involved in obtaining the genuine
voluntary participation of children in research. They explained that, although there is a growing tendency to ask children directly for their consent, it is not usual for researchers to do so in Peru. These scholars also pointed out that the common belief that children must obey adults makes it difficult for children to refuse to participate in an activity (Ames et al., 2010). However, Tito refused to interact with me in the PRONOEI and also refused my request to audio record the interview. My field notes registered many times how he expressed directly how he should interact.

Secondly, he asked questions and verified my measures to store the drawings. I had the drawings inside a plastic folder, but he could see a small part of the drawing of another child. Tito alerted me to this and gave me suggestions to better store the drawings. After he was sure that I would keep his drawings safe, he continued drawing. Again, Tito expressed his concern and even questioned my behaviour, which is unusual in interactions between children and adults. While I gave all the children the opportunity to decide how they wanted to participate in the research, as seen in other research, power relationships and other dynamics made it challenging for most children to express their decisions freely. However, Tito expressed his decisions, and he even complained and demanded measures to ensure his confidentiality and privacy.

Based on Isin’s ideas, I assert that Tito claimed his right to decide how to participate and expressed his ideas freely from different ‘sites’ than the traditional ones. One of the existing implicit rules in the neighbourhood is that children must obey adults, without questioning. During the interviews, when I asked about children’s responsibilities, caregivers said that children should obey their elders, for their own good. They also explained that being obedient was a characteristic of a ‘good’ child. In fact, when children did not want to play with me, other children and the teacher categorised such acts as ‘misbehaviour’. I argue that Tito behaved ‘outside’ this common norm, paraphrasing Isin (2007), from different scripts than those socially established. I will explain this further in the next sub-section.
7.1.2. Transgressing adult social norms individually

Similar to Olsson (2017), I found that children’s citizen actions created a complex dynamic that included transgressions and negotiations (Olsson, 2017). As illustrated earlier, despite the challenging living conditions, children in the neighbourhood took actions to exercise their rights. I chose to highlight Tito and Diana’s experiences of practising rights, because I identified an additional component; they transgressed social norms in order to enforce their rights. Although I perceived many situations in which children challenged rules, most of the time, those transgressions were collective. Therefore, Diana and Tito’s behaviours were unusual, as they were individual transgressions and consistent over time, in comparison to others.

I identified that children’s transgressions included actions that challenged common social norms associated with how children should behave. In the follow sub-sections, I analyse how children challenged the belief that children must obey adults and follow adults’ rules without questioning. I also discuss how these transgressions included children negotiating with adults to assert their rights.

7.1.2.1. Transgressing the social norm: ‘Children must obey adults’

In Peruvian society, the shared believe exists that children must obey their elders, particularly adults. A recent study, carried out countrywide, interviewed 1,574 males and females aged 18-years and above about parental practices. The vast majority (86%) of interviewees responded that a child must obey their parents, instead of children being responsible for their own actions (IOP-PUCP, 2017).

In the case of Diana, she contravened her mother’s decision not to let her attend the PRONOEI. Diana’s mother usually went to a market located outside the neighbourhood and instructed her to stay at home. Sometimes I saw Diana in one of her neighbour’s houses, and sometimes she was at home by herself. As I explained, the girl told me that she did not know why her mother did not want her to go to the PRONOEI. Her mother simply gave Diana the order not to attend. However, despite this order, Diana decided to ignore her mother’s instructions and go to the PRONOEI.
In Tito’s case, the implicit social norm to ‘obey adults’ implied that children should participate in the research, and in the ways proposed by adults. Besides asking children for their consent to participate, I also asked caregivers for their written consent for the participation of children. When asking adults, I explained that even though they gave me their consent, if their child did not want to participate or be involved in certain activities, I would prioritise the child’s decision. However, it was common to hear mothers telling their children that they must play with me and do what I say. Tito ‘disobeyed’ and acted according to his own decision, which was not to take part in some activities, i.e., deciding how to be involved.

In both cases, the children enacted their citizenship by contesting and navigating the usual social norms, in order to claim their rights. Paraphrasing Isin (2008), children performed their citizenship through their acts of complaint and demand, including transgressing the usual script when it limited children’s citizenship. According to the existing literature, social norms often influence people's behaviours and are maintained by social approval or disapproval (Bicchieri, 2005; Fry et al., 2016; Mackie et al., 2015). The social norm that children must obey adults could have influenced the children’s behaviour within the consent process in this study. As highlighted by other researchers using a similar method, children’s ‘explicit consent’ does not necessarily mean that they want to be involved (Kustatscher, 2014; Kyritsi, 2019). Sometimes, children accept participating because they do not want to disobey the adult researchers, so as not to attract the disapproval of their peers or adults for being ‘disobedient’ (Ames et al., 2010). For example, when children decided to put their picture on the ‘X’ side, some children reacted with surprise and criticised their behaviour, telling the teacher (another adult) about the child’s ‘misbehaviour’. It is possible that this disapproval influenced other children to put their picture on the ‘✓’ side, as if they wanted to interact with me, but then expressed the opposite view through their behaviour (like Sara). However, Tito consistently directly expressed his decision, even if this meant being reprimanded by the teacher, his parents, or his peers.
7.1.2.2. Transgressing the social norm: ‘Children must follow adults’ rules without questioning’

In both examples, Diana and Tito transgressed the social norm of being obedient and the social norm that says that children cannot question adult decisions. In the research mentioned previously about parental practices in Peru, a substantial majority (92.6%) stated that a child must have respect for their elders (IOP-PUCP, 2017), instead of thinking for themselves. Such beliefs relate to the idea that children should follow their elders’ rules, without expressing their opinions or ideas.

As mentioned, Diana’s situation was unusual, because both her mother’s restriction and Diana’s transgression were unusual. Despite the difficulties with the quality of education, all of the other caregivers involved in the research recognised that their children must attend the pre-school. As mentioned, Diana was not clear about why her mother did not want her to attend. Although Diana did not comment on having asked her mother or questioned her mother’s decision verbally, Diana’s behaviour challenged her mother’s order. During the interview, Diana told me that she liked going to school and decided by herself that she would go: that is, she did not accept her mother’s decision and took the opposite decision, which was to attend the PRONOEI.

Tito challenged me by questioning my method of storing the data (drawings) and protecting participants’ privacy. When we started the interview, I told him that I would store the drawings properly to safeguard the children’s privacy. However, I failed to do so and he saw a small part of a drawing of another child. His questions tested the validity of the information I had provided. Then he asked me to be more careful with the drawings in the future. I suggest that because I recognised my mistake, validating his opinion, it allowed him to feel comfortable to recommend that I be more careful in the future and to continue with the interview.

Both Diana and Tito’s negotiations with adults (the teacher and myself) would not be surprising if the aforementioned social norm about ‘not questioning adult rules’ did not exist. The common perception of children as incapable and lacking power, in
comparison to adults, reduces their possibilities to express their ideas, even less when such ideas contradict adults’ views. As Jenks (2005) mentioned, when children challenge adult norms, particularly about having respect for their elders without questioning, they expose the fragility of adult power; in response, adults tend to use violence against children.

Diana and Tito acted individually to exercise their rights and, in doing so, they transgressed social norms about how children should behave. In light of Isin’s (2008, 2009) contribution, I argue that these acts of citizenship responded to their perceived need to claim their rights, requiring them to contest the traditional structure and to transgress the usual scripts of being a citizen, specifically those related to how children should behave.

Tito and Diana’s transgressions involved negotiation with ‘unusual’ adults. In the case of the PRONOEI teacher, children saw her as a "kind and playful" person, as opposed to the primary school teacher, who "only gave them homework and sometimes yelled at them" (Interview with Jorge). In my case, they usually called me ‘Miss Karina’, as if I were a teacher, recognising that I was an adult. Still, they also appreciated my kindness, playfulness, and willingness to share my belongings with them. Thus, both the teacher and I were ‘atypical’ adults for them, because we had more ‘childish’ characteristics that made our interactions enjoyable. I suggest that such characteristics led to a more equitable, horizontal relationship with the children, different from the common hierarchical, vertical dynamics between children and ‘common’ adults. I argue that these horizontal relationships facilitated the children’s transgression of the common social norms for how children should behave. In Tito’s case, the magnet technique did put forward the idea that children can decide freely, and that they would not be reprimanded for their decisions. This could have encouraged Tito to openly express his desire not to participate. Likewise, Trell and van Hoven (2020), in their research on young people and citizenship in Estonia, found that when children have familiar and friendly structures, “it is possible to glimpse young people’s citizenship imaginations at play—observing, caring, critiquing, and
(re)imagining their community with the aim of shaping the society” (Trell & van Hoven, 2020, p. 440).

In Diana's case, she negotiated with her teacher to attend the PRONOEI. When Diana went to find out if she could go, she made it clear that her attendance would include a lie to her mother. The teacher told me that Diana warned her that her mother would not let Diana go and that Diana would attend when her mother was not in the neighbourhood. Diana, then, had the teacher's agreement, which probably contributed to Diana transgressing the instructions of her mother. Paraphrasing Isin (2009), Diana created a scene to perform her citizenship, questioning and challenging an adult order to exercise her right to education.

In both cases, children's acts of citizenship generated changes in the practice of their rights and, in some way, in the behaviour of the adults involved. Both Diana and Tito managed to exercise their rights. I respected Tito's decision not to participate in the research at the pre-school and not to have the interview audio recorded, and validated his questioning of my methods. Although, my respect towards children's decision was based on ethical guidelines, Tito's behaviour influenced me to reflect on the consent process and initiate new actions to ensure that children's participation was genuine and that they felt free to go against the adult norm of child compliance. In Diana's case, the teacher herself joined her in her transgression. The teacher behaved according to the rules established by Diana by taking part in the transgression created by the girl to exercise her right.

As described in the previous chapters, despite the challenging living conditions, I witnessed numerous occasions when children exercised their rights, such as attending school, playing, and accessing health services. In this section, I have analysed Tito’s and Diana’s experiences in practising rights through acts of citizenship. Tito decided whether or not to participate in the research and how to be involved. Diana managed to exercise her right to attend the PRONOEI. As mentioned, I selected Tito’s and Diana’s acts to discuss, because they were unusual in transgressing strong social norms about how children should behave.
Both children performed acts of citizenship by transgressing social norms to enforce their rights. In this way, the children’s navigated social norms related to how children must behave, including the belief that children should obey and follow adult’s orders without questioning. By doing so, they created their own way of asserting their rights, rather than following adult norms (Isin, 2009; Larkins, 2014). I have analysed Tito and Diana’s behaviours as individual actions, however both children negotiated with other adults in order to enforce their rights, particularly, in the case of Diana, who made her teacher part of the transgression of her mother’s (adult) norm. Thus, acts of citizenship were observed to be carried out by individual children, although these acts required negotiations with others (adults). Both children performed acts of citizenship by transgressing social norms to enforce their rights.

7.2. Children’s collective actions

This section addresses children’s collective actions. Similarly to the previous section, I will use Isin’s (2008, 2009) and Isin and Nielsen’s (2008b) definition of acts of citizenship to analyse children’s collective actions. In the first section, I address the need for the claiming of rights and, in the second section, I address how the children in this research claimed their rights in a different way than the traditional way of doing so.

7.2.1. Children claiming their rights collectively

I was playing with a group of children. They were running and I had to run behind the children to catch them. The heat was intense. A group of children decided to play on the ground under a roof where there was a hammock.

Me: “Can we use the hammock?”

Andy (4-years-old): “It [the hammock] belongs to my aunt and my aunt does not yell at us.”

The children were playing, taking turns using the hammock for a while. After some minutes, the hammock’s owner shouted: “Children, get out of here! It’s always the same!”
The children looked at me and started to run, laughing.

(Field notes, November 2018)

This excerpt recounts a typical situation in which the children and I were playing outdoors. We started playing a game of chase in the middle of the street. After some minutes, without me noticing, we changed our setting to play under the ground floor of a house. The children used a hammock under the house for a while. They organised themselves by setting up an order in which to use the hammock. Also, to ensure that every child was able to use it for the same amount of time, they counted from 1 to 10. However, the hammock owner yelled at us for using it without her permission. In response, the children ran away laughing.

The children in the excerpt were exercising their right to play. Despite the different understandings of play, as I explained in Chapter 5, considering the features of children’s play in the neighbourhood, I categorise it as ‘free play’, which includes hanging out with friends and being in a place where they could see and be seen (Thomson & Philo, 2004). Although the right to play is recognised under Peruvian law (Código de los niños y adolescentes ACT Nº 27337), and some caregivers also referred to this right during the interviews, geographical and sociocultural conditions limit children’s opportunities to play, particularly in public spaces. For instance, as discussed previously, because of the risks related to insecurity, as well as those inherent to a flood-prone area, caregivers tended to limit the time that their children spend playing in public spaces.

By playing in the street and under their neighbours’ houses, the children were also practising their right to inhabit and enjoy their public spaces. Such a right has been widely discussed by scholars in the field of geography and by those who promote the right to the city (Borja, 2010; Lefebvre, 2016; Sugranyes & Mathivet, 2010). Children have the right to make full use of their city, just as adults do, particularly for playing and accessing public spaces (Tonucci, 2005). While the right to the city is not established as a legal right under national or international law, both Peruvian law and the UNCRC provisions have related rights. For example, the Código de los niños y
adolescents (ACT Nº 27337) includes the right to live in a healthy environment and the freedom of movement. Likewise, the UNCRC includes the right to essential services (Article 24), the right to play and leisure (Article 31), and the right to freedom of expression (Article 13). I observed that children’s use of their public spaces had constraints, not only because of the risks, but also because, as I will explain later, public spaces had implicit social rules that assign adults and adolescents as the main users. The findings support the idea that children and their needs are under-represented in cities, as cities are mostly designed and planned by adults to cater for adult needs and interests (Carroll, Calder-Dawe, Witten, & Asiasiga, 2019; Correa, 2010; Gülgönen, 2016; Kyttä, 2004; Sugranyes & Mathivet, 2010; Tonucci, 2005; Whitzman et. al, 2010).

As mentioned, the deficient urban infrastructure in the neighbourhood has led to a lack of safe public spaces for playing and socialising, during both the falling and rising stages of the river. There were no playgrounds or parks especially designed for socialising, either for adults or children. I noticed that adults, adolescents, and children used public spaces in different ways. Adults usually used public spaces to socialise with other adults or as a space for their family business. Adolescents usually used them to play volleyball or hang out with other adolescents. I observed that there was only one place that neighbours recognised as a ‘designated’ public space for socialising, which was one part of the street where adolescents and adults played volleyball. During the interviews, adults recognised that children could play everywhere, but identified the street and the schools located in the area as the places where children play the most. The existing spaces also failed to respond to children’s needs. For instance, there were few spaces where children could play protected from the intense heat, as seen in the excerpt. There were also few spaces that responded to children’s need to play in a safe space: for example, I observed children complaining of the risk of injury when playing on the ground floor because of the garbage.

In line with the existing literature, I witnessed how children had many skills to face the geographical and sociocultural challenges and found ways to play and explore in
public spaces (Arrunátegui, 2018; Carroll et al., 2019; Lester & Russell, 2010; Thomson & Philo, 2004; Van Oers, 2014). Further, my findings support the idea that children can play anywhere and not only in those places formally designed for this purpose, such as playgrounds (Carroll et al., 2019). The neighbourhood lacked *places for children*, that is spaces for children designed and thought of by adults (Rasmussen, 2004); however, I witnessed various *children’s places*, that is to say, spaces that are not designed especially for children’s play, but that children use for this purpose (Rasmussen, 2004). For instance, during the falling stage, children used spaces near their houses, including the main street, the ground floors of their homes, the edges of the river and their friends’ houses. In the rising stage, due to the reduction in public spaces, I observed children playing in the water as well as in their canoes.

I observed that the process in which children created their spaces in which to explore and play in public usually included an active learning process, led by the children themselves, on how to face risks (as seen in Chapter 5), and this process usually included children creating spaces to respond to their needs. Interestingly, I observed that such dynamics usually implied setting their own rules, and sometimes those rules even transgressed (adults’) social norms. For instance, in the previous excerpt, we were playing under the roof; I found out that children had changed our location because the heat was intense and they wanted to play in a cooler place. While we were playing, they also decided how to use the hammock to ensure that everybody could use it equally. This process included a group lie to me and the ‘illegal’ use of the hammock. A few days later, I learnt that the hammock owner was not Andy’s aunt and, as seen in the excerpt, she got angry when she found the children playing with her hammock. I will discuss these elements further in the next subsection.

Paraphrasing Isin (2009), children identify the need to struggle and make claims to enforce their rights. Children’s occupation and appropriation of their spaces to play according to their needs can be understood as a practice of citizenship, because they were enjoying their rights as residents of the city, producing and transforming their spaces (Borja, 2010). As I will discuss in the following section, children’s acts of citizenships included transgressions of both physical and subjective structures.
7.2.2. Transgressing to enforce collective rights

In the excerpt in the previous sub-section, I described how I was playing with the children, in the street at first and then under the roof of a house. The passage narrates a typical activity in which children played in public spaces during the falling stage. It is worth mentioning that during the falling stage, the ground floors of houses were considered part of the public spaces in the neighbourhood, where people usually hung out, played or walked. As I explained in Chapter 4, the divide between public and private spaces was not always clear to me, and it varied over time. I observed that such divides did not respond to physical demarcations, but depended on people’s uses of the spaces.

We moved from the street to the ground floor because the heat was intense. The children used small pieces of wood and stones to sit on and rest, and they asked me to share the water I had in my bottle. After a while, again without me noticing it, the children started to use the hammock. I knew that none of the children who were playing lived in that house, so that I asked the children if we were allowed to use it. Andy replied that the owner was his aunt and that she allowed them to use it. Hearing this, I decided to keep playing with children. They made a waiting list to use the hammock, taking turns to use it. It seems to me that the children made joint decisions about the time and order in which to use the hammock. Instead of having one clear leader who gave commands, they made their decisions as a group. My role was as referee, and the children complained to me when they felt that someone was exceeding the time of consensual use and asked me to intervene.

In the excerpt, the children trespassed different norms in order to play in the spaces that afforded protection from the sun. Those acts are the focus of this sub-section. Firstly, I address how children infringed social norms about the expected use of public spaces, which often excluded children, by occupying and appropriating their streets and public spaces. Secondly, I discuss children’s collective transgression of the social norms relating to how children must behave. Thirdly, to end the section, I analyse how gender influences the dynamics of children’s transgressions.
7.2.2.1 Transgressing (adult) norms about how to use public spaces in cities

During the falling stage, it was typical to find children playing in the street, as described in the previous sub-section. Despite the commonality of this practice, I found that such behaviour usually transgressed social norms related to the usual or accepted (adult) use of public spaces in cities, on account of the children creating their own rules and transgressing gender social norms.

In the excerpt mentioned above, the children and I were using a hammock although we did not have the authorisation to do so. Even though we were occupying a usual space for socialising, that is to say the ground floor of a house, children applied their own codes, which contravened adults’ rules. Over the time of fieldwork, I witnessed similar situations in which children appropriated spaces and the objects placed there, by using their own codes and rules.

Even though I was part of their play, I felt like a ‘follower’: the children gave me instructions about how to play with them. As Larkins (2014) points out, play allows children to create their own world, with their own citizen practices, sometimes hidden from the adults. As mentioned, I did not notice how children decided to change our play location. I was running all over the street and I just noticed it when all of them started to run towards the house, and Andy said to me, “Come on, Miss Karina”. When we were resting under the roof of the house, I also did not realise how they decided to use the hammock. I noticed it only when they were already using it, and they asked me to fulfil the role of referee. Their decision-making process was almost invisible to me, but understandable to them. This makes me wonder if the children had an internal communication system with their own codes, which I was not able to readily understand as an adult.

The way of using spaces under children’s rules also changed over time, due to the environmental features of the flood-prone area. I witnessed how children adapted their appropriation of spaces and objects in response to these geographical and environmental features. When analysing my field notes, I identified many times when children used the spaces according to ‘children’s rules’, and this was most frequent
when the weather conditions made it hard for them to find areas in which to play or to explore with their peers. These kinds of situations happened particularly during the flooding season, when the water covered their usual spaces for socialising.

As mentioned, adults in the area said that children usually played in the street or at school. However, I identified many other non-usual places. One of the children’s places meaning a space that was not initially designed for children’s play, but which children appropriated and used for this purpose (Rasmussen, 2004), was an abandoned house, which according to Jimena, belonged to a neighbour who was visiting another city. I took the following photographs of the abandoned house in different months across my fieldwork. As seen in the photos, children made different use of the same location depending on the stage of the river.

The way of using spaces under children’s rules also changed over time, due to the environmental features of the flood-prone area. I witnessed how children adapted their appropriation of spaces and objects in response to these geographical and environmental features. When analysing my field notes, I identified many times when children used the spaces according to ‘children’s rules’, and this was most frequent when the weather conditions made it hard for them to find areas in which to play or to explore with their peers. These kinds of situations happened particularly during the flooding season, when the water covered their usual spaces for socialising. Figure 12 shows children playing under an empty house in the transition period when the level of the water was increasing and it was difficult to move and play on street,
because of the heavy mud. Children in this photograph were sitting in the motorcar talking and drawing. The motorcar belonged to a neighbour who could not use the vehicle to go to work because of the mud; therefore, the owner used the ground under the house as a garage. Likewise, with the use of the hammock in the previous passage, children’s gathering finished when the owner of the motorcar yelled at us to leave the place. The children laughed and invited me to go to Jimena’s house.

I took the second photograph (Figure 13) at the beginning of the falling stage; the group of girls were playing under the roof of the ground floor of the empty house. Just as in the first excerpt in this sub-section, they were occupying the ground under the house as a public space in which to play protected from the direct sun and its heat.

![Figure 13 Girls playing in the grounds of an empty house during the falling stage (June 2019)](image)

![Figure 14 Children playing at the first floor of an empty house during the flood season. (February 2019)](image)
Figure 14 shows children using the same house, but on the first floor because the ground floor was covered by water. As it was an empty house, it did not have bridge to access it. The day I took the photograph, the children showed me how they climbed to the place from Jimena’s house who lived next to it.

Both the hammock excerpt and the photographs illustrate how children appropriated spaces that were not specially designed for children’s activities. Furthermore, the examples demonstrate how the children found ways to create their own spaces, under their own rules, in different ways than those set by adults, and depending on the environmental conditions. In the first excerpt, children used a prohibited hammock. The children also used a motorcar for playing, instead as a means of transport, as adults would use it, and an empty house as a space for playing. As other studies have evidenced, when a city lacks a child-friendly design, children usually appropriate their cities by using things differently than adults do (Arrunátegui, 2018; Carroll et al., 2019; Gülgönen, 2016; Gülgönen & Corona, 2015). As Isin (2000) remarks, the appropriation of the city configures spaces for struggle and to challenge existing social practices in order to claim rights. As such, children’s appropriation of their spaces constitutes an act of citizenship, as children apply their own rules and standards.

7.2.2.2. Transgressing social norms in public spaces

The literature from Latin America shows that the rapid and deficient urbanisation process, mixed with social and economic inequity, has had a negative impact on people’s citizen experiences. Such aspects limit citizens’ rights to use their urban spaces and participate in the construction and transformation of their cities (Borja, 2010; Molano Camargo, 2016; Schiavo, Gelfuso, & Vera, 2017; Sugranyes & Mathivet, 2010). In the case of children, as I explained in Chapter 5, the findings of this research are in line with the existing literature, which highlights the interplay among geographical, environmental and sociocultural aspects, limiting children’s mobility and the possibilities for their playing in public spaces (Alparone & Pacilli, 2012; Hillman, 1990; Prezza et al., 2001). When it comes to sociocultural aspects, I also found that, besides contextual risks, social norms about childhood and gender
shaped the use of public spaces (Falú, 2009a, 2009b; Gülgönen, 2016; Prezza et al., 2001).

Caregivers tended to limit children’s outdoor play, particularly during the flooding season. When exploring this aspect, caregivers stated that children who spend a lot of time playing on the street were seen as disobedient and a bad influence on their peers. However, I witnessed various situations in which children trespassed against adult norms, because they wanted to spend more time playing outside or in places where they were not allowed to do so. Sometimes, these transgressions drove adults to yell at children and limit their time for play even more. For example, in the previous excerpts, the use of the hammock and the motorcar as places to play finished when the owner yelled at the children. I assumed that they got angry because we were using their belongings without their permission and in a different way than they would use them. In both cases, the children laughed and started to run, as if they were enjoying the situation. When this happened, I was scared and expected the children to feel the same way or to stop transgressing and being ‘disobedient’. However, the children behaved in the opposite way. It is possible that being in a group and the feeling of taking a risk together could increase the enjoyment of the transgression, instead of decreasing it (Gülgönen & Corona, 2015; Olsson, 2017).

As described in Chapter 5, I found that another set of social norms that limit children’s mobility are those related to gender. According to the literature, gender social norms relate to shared beliefs about what is typical and appropriate behaviour for males and females of all ages (Alexander-Scott, Bell, & Holden, 2016). For example, I found that caregivers justified boys’ disobedience, because there was the perception that boys behaved that way due to their male nature. On the contrary, girls were perceived as more tranquil and were, therefore, required to behave in a more orderly fashion.

In my field notes, I recorded various situations in which children (boys and girls) contravened social (adult) norms to keep playing. Interestingly, there were important differences between boys and girls. The following pictures illustrate how social
gender norms shaped children’s uses of their public spaces, especially during the rising stage.

I took the photographs in Figure 15 and Figure 16 on the same day during the flooding season. Figure 15 shows boys playing outside, swimming in the water. Figure 16 shows girls playing inside a house, watching television. Both photographs illustrate a gendered difference between boy’s and girl’s mobility during the rising stage. Girls usually socialised in their homes, while boys had more possibilities to play outside. They even played in more distant areas of the neighbourhood, such as the dry area located next to the sawmill, which was selected by boys as the most enjoyable area of the neighbourhood during the interviews (see Figure 17).

I also noticed these gendered differences when I revised my field notes during the flooding season, and I spotted that I had recorded mainly interactions with girls. As
the risk increased during such season, I had limited my own mobility in the
neighbourhood and had decided to socialise with children only in their houses. To my
surprise it was difficult for me to find boys in their houses. When I interviewed
children, I asked boys where they typically played during the flooding season. Most
of the boys informed me that they went to play in a dry area outside the
neighbourhood, which was one of the reasons why I did not find them in their houses.

When I took the photograph in Figure 15, Andy’s grandmother told me that Andy
always wanted to play in the water and that his mother got angry, because he could
catch a cold. She also said that Ana, who was watching soap operas at Heidy’s house,
had run away without her permission. In both situations, Andy and Ana had
transgressed an adult social norm, because both had disobeyed their caregivers to
play outside their houses with their peers. However, they were also replicating
gender social norms that promote girls socialising in private spaces and boys in public
spaces.

As discussed earlier, such gender differences gave boys more opportunities to
enhance their skills to swim and walk on the bridges and, hence, to protect
themselves during the flooding season. Moreover, I found that girls who spent more
time in the water were perceived as having ‘masculine behaviours’. For instance,
Paula was one of the girls who spent large amounts of time in the water. Once I was
sitting on the bridge chatting with Paula’s neighbours, while Paula was playing in the
water. A man told me, “She [Paula] is not a girl; she seems like a boy; she always stays
in the water”. Paula was within earshot, and she laughed and said, “Yes because I like
it”. The neighbourhood added “She does not keep silent; she speaks aloud always.
Sometimes her father has to tell her to keep silent” (Field notes, May 2019). My
conversation with the neighbour about Paula shows that when girls transgress a
gender norm, they receive social disapproval and are assigned masculine features. I
witnessed, for instance, how girls received a similar condemnation from other girls.
For example, Cindy (5-years-old) and I were sitting on her balcony and Ana (4-years-
old) was playing in the water. Cindy commented “She is always in the water; she does
not listen to her mom; she is like a boy” (Field notes April 2019).
As Olsson (2017) remarks, lived citizenship is an action zone, with boundaries, boundary guards, negotiations, transgressions, identity, self-determination and situated agency. Its daily performance implies complex relationships between individuals, themselves, others and the features their context (Warming & Fahnøe, 2017). As evidenced in this research, social norms can limit both citizen actions and acts of citizenship. I noticed that children transgress such limitations when there are conditions that contribute to the process. For example, as explained in the previous section, the negotiation by children with non-common adults favoured the transgression of social norms so that they could exercise their rights. However, my findings suggest that gender social norms are difficult to transgress.

Considering that social norms are shared beliefs maintained by social approval and disapproval (Mackie et al., 2015), I suggest that transgressing gender norms is more complicated than transgressing those related to how children should behave. While social rules about how children should behave are closely related to gendered socialisation, it is important to differentiate between those norms that are based on conceptions about childhood and those based on gendered expectations about roles. The former determines, for example, that children should obey their elders and be silent when they talk, as discussed earlier. The latter determines how females and males should behave and what roles they should perform based on gender.

As I explained in the first section of this chapter, when I asked him for his consent to participate in this research, Tito transgressed the rule to obey adults with seeming ease. Also, despite caregivers asking children to interact with me as if I were a common adult, the children could establish a more horizontal relationship with me as an atypical adult. Some of them even called me ‘Karina’, instead of ‘Miss Karina’, as adults asked them to. However, when the children found that I was transgressing gender social norms, they made me aware of it, by expressing surprise and even reprimanding me. For example, they were surprise that I lived alone, as a woman, and did not have any kids or a partner. Sometimes, children reprimanded me, because I always wore trousers, instead of dresses, or when I was dishevelled. I point
this out because, as I explained previously, when girls infringed the expected gender behaviour, the disapproval came not only from adults, but also from their peers. In contrast, transgressing social norms about childhood, particularly through collective actions, could cause peer approval, like when children laughed and ran away after the hammock and motorcar owners yelled at them.

In this section, I have analysed how children appropriate their public space through their acts of citizenship. As I explained, children identified the risks and limitations on their independent mobility, including their right to play and explore their neighbourhood. When the children used and occupied their spaces, children disrupted adults’ structures. Children used non-usual spaces for play and used them according to their own rules, rather than those established by adults. Hence, as Isin (2009) suggests, children identified the need to take action to enforce their rights and, when doing so, they challenged existing social practices, establishing citizen performance under their own rules, creating their own ways of enforcing their rights, rather than follow adult standards. In this section, I also analysed how gender influences children’s acts of citizenship. By transgressing adult’s norms in order to play, children replicated the existing dominant gender social norms. Such analysis illustrates the complexity and contradiction of expressing citizenship in everyday experiences.

7.3. Chapter conclusion

As highlighted in the literature, lived citizenship relates to how people understand and negotiate their rights in their daily lives (Lister, 2007a, 2007b; Olsson, 2017; Warming & Fahnøe, 2017). In this chapter, I have analysed how children perform acts of citizenship to enforce their rights. In the first section, I analysed children’s individual actions, through which they enacted their citizenship. I focused on Tito’s and Diana’s experiences of practising their rights, the former to participate in the research and the later to attend pre-school. This section reflected on how those children found ways to enforce their rights, by transgressing adults’ social norms that require children to obey adults and follow adults’ rules without questioning. I also
discussed how children negotiate with other adults and include them as part of their transgressions.

In the second section, I reflected on the collective actions of children in the neighbourhood. I analysed how children exercised their collective rights and, in doing so, expressed and performed their citizenship in close interaction with each other and in their public spaces. I analysed how children transgressed social norms about the usual (adult) use of their public spaces, by occupying and appropriating them. As mentioned, children found ways to use non-usual spaces, and applied children’s rules rather than following adults’ rules.

The actions I have analysed in this chapter have also been highlighted in other theoretical and practical discussions, but not necessarily analysed as acts of citizenship. In some cases they were discussed as acts of independence and socially understood as misbehaviours. Understanding them as acts of citizenship allows us to recognize the needs and rights of children from their perspective, as well as their capacities to negotiate and create spaces to claim their rights. Understanding their actions in this way also provides further evidence of children’s active role in shaping and contributing to their societies.

As explained in the literature review, lived citizenship relates to how children negotiate their rights in their daily lives. In this chapter, I argue that children's transgressions are also acts of citizenships, because through these actions children are able to enjoy their rights. An act of citizenship needs to create a shift in people’s perceptions or beliefs. Hence, I have explored the different citizen expressions of children, including their transgressions, negotiations, and contradictions. Children in this study showed self-organization and claimed their rights in different ways than those accepted by adults; they challenged the adult/legal rules and norms of being a citizen (see also Isin, 2009). By analysing children's transgressions as acts of citizenship we can understand the construction of citizenship ‘from below’ through daily practices, not from adult-centric normative standards (Liebel, 2007, 2012; Moosa-Mitha, 2005), but as children finding ways to enact their rights.
In this chapter I also reflected on how gender social norms shape the lived citizenship of children. This analysis allowed me to discuss the contradictions intrinsic in the practice and experience of citizenship (Warming & Fahnøe, 2017). I identified that while children transgressed social norms related to how they must behave, sometimes they replicated dominant gender social norms. As a consequence, girls experienced more limitations on their independent mobility and, thus, on their lived citizenship.

Despite the significant improvements around the recognition of children as social actors, traditional views about what children are and what they can do, as well as the power dynamic between them and adults, makes it hard to recognise them as citizens (Liebel, 2007; Lister, 2007b). In addition, in all the examples I discuss in this chapter, children identified limitations on the exercise of their rights and, in response, took action to claim them.
Chapter 8. Conclusion

This study sought to explore lived citizenship in early childhood in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru. To address the aim, I proposed the following research questions:

Q.1. In what ways do children experience their lived citizenship in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru?

Q.2. In what ways do adults (families and communities) promote or limit citizenship in early childhood in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru?

To address these questions, I applied a qualitative research designed influenced by the interpretivist paradigm. I collected the data over a nine-month period, using ethnographic research techniques, which allowed me to obtain ‘thick’ data on children’s experiences of lived citizenship. Due to the long-term nature of ethnographic research, I was able to witness the variations in children’s experiences and the way in which they expressed their citizen actions/acts of citizenship across the year, and how these were affected by the cycle of the river. I conducted participatory observation at the pre-school located in the neighbourhood (study site), children’s houses, and public spaces. I also conducted semi-structured interviews with children and adults, including caregivers and government workers. This chapter begins with a summary of the findings of the research and then discusses the theoretical contribution of the research to the literature (on lived citizenship, risk management and climate change, social norms in early childhood, and research with children), policy, and practice. Finally, I discuss the implication for future research and present some concluding reflections.

8.1. Summary of findings

8.1.1. Research question 1

Q.1. In what ways do children experience their lived citizenship in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru?
This research found three expressions of children’s lived citizenship: (1) children appropriated and became familiar with their spaces, by exploring, playing and taking moments to rest; (2) children performed citizen actions, including taking care of themselves, others and non-human entities (animals); and (3) children enacted their citizenship through acts of citizenship by transgressing social norms to enforce their rights.

Exploring, playing and taking moments to rest outdoors fits within the umbrella concept of ‘children’s independent mobility’. In relation to this, the findings of this research are in line with other research in that I found that children’s mobility contributed to the practice of lived citizenship, as it enabled children to become familiar with their spaces; hence, it allowed them to exercise and claim their citizenship rights (e.g., Cook, Whitzman, & Tranter, 2015; Gülgönen & Corona, 2015; Rissotto & Tonucci, 2002; Tonucci, 2020) by performing citizen actions and acts of citizenship. I found that when children explored, played, and took moments to rest, they learnt about the geographical and sociocultural features of their neighbourhood. For example, they learnt the location of local services (such as the school and church), they identified the risks (geographical and social), and learnt how to face these risks. In line with the literature on the right to the city, I observed that this knowledge helped children to appropriate and make use of their urban spaces (Borja, 2010; Correa, 2010; Sugranyes & Mathivet, 2010). I also observed that what children learnt about their living spaces, shaped their lived citizenship experiences, including their citizen actions to fulfil their responsibilities and participation (Chapter 6), as well as their acts of citizenship that transgressed social norms limiting the exercise of their rights (Chapter 7).

Becoming familiar with the characteristics of their places was a continuous process that included individual and collective dynamics. Children created participatory spaces in which they shared their opinions with their peers on what they observed and perceived about their neighbourhood. Therefore, it can be inferred that children expressed themselves and built their knowledge not only from their individual perspective, but in a collective process by listening to other’s experiences and views.
Although further evidence is needed to understand how children build their identity as Amazonian citizens, my findings provided initial evidence for a discussion about how children’s mobility within their neighbourhood may allow them to establish bonds with key elements of their Amazonian identity, like a close relationship with nature.

Becoming familiar with their spaces allowed the children in this study to recognise the needs of others and the risks of their neighbourhood and to perform their lived citizenship. My findings show that children performed citizenship by practising their rights and responsibilities, and participating in their families and communities in ways that contributed to the wellbeing of themselves and others, as well as the sustainability of their families, communities, and society at large. Based on Isin’s (2008, 2009) work, I argue that children also perform ‘acts of citizenship’, meaning actions that transgress and disrupt existing social norms, in order to claim and exercise their rights. As citizenship relates to the social, political, and legal structures in place, I discussed how living in a flood-prone area and their relationships with others (including peers and adults) shaped children’s experiences of lived citizenship. For instance, I discussed how children learnt to face the risks associated with the flooding season, find ways to exercise their right to play, and contributed to the wellbeing of their families and others.

Regarding citizen actions, in Chapter 5, I presented evidence that children are constantly participating in different aspects of community life, including fostering the wellbeing of others, contributing to household chores, and contributing to the family economy (Alderson, 2007; Bartos, 2012; Larkins, 2014; Wihstutz, 2017). I explained, for instance, how children were attentive, responsive, and capable of caring for others, particularly when they were sick or required emotional support. Caregivers who participated in the study recognised these actions as part of children’s contribution to their families. I also witnessed examples of children contributing to the family economy by serving customers or preparing food in their family business. As I explained, caregivers did not always recognise or welcome these contributions.
In line with the existing evidence on children living in settings affected by environmental hazards (Jabry, 2005; Mort, Walker, Williams, & Bingley, 2018; Walker et al., 2012; Walker, Whittle, Medd, & Burningham, 2010), the findings show how children have the skills to contribute to the measures taken by their families and communities for flood prevention and response. For instance, children in the study area participated in the construction of the bridges assembled during the flooding season and in moving belongings to higher places (upper floors of their houses) before the flooding season and back after the floods had receded.

In Chapter 6, I analysed children’s individual and collective acts of citizenship by explaining how children showed self-organization and claimed their rights in different ways than those accepted according to the existing (adult) social norms (Isin, 2009). For example, focusing on Tito and Diana’s experiences, I discussed how children found ways to enforce their rights by transgressing (adults’) social norms that require children to obey adults without questioning. I also discussed how children transgressed social norms relating to the (adult) use of public spaces, by occupying and appropriating these spaces. Children did so considering their needs and according to their rules, rather than according to adults’ rules. As Gülgönen (2016) suggests, children’s appropriation of their urban spaces is a way of exercising their right to use their cities.

8.1.2. Research question 2

Q.2. In what ways do adults (families and communities) promote or limit citizenship in early childhood in a flood-prone area in Amazonian Peru

As discussed in Chapter 2, as lived citizenship is a relational and contextual concept, the characteristics of the environment where the experience takes place, including the socioeconomic, legal, and geographical dimensions, influence how children experience their lived citizenship. Furthermore, as James (2011) stated, children’s lived citizenship also relates to how others, mainly adults, attribute and recognise the capacity of children to be citizens. Accordingly, the second research question explored adults’ perceptions about the dimensions of children’s lived citizenship, and
ideas about how children enact their citizenship in their daily lives. As mentioned, I included caregivers because they are in the closest surroundings where children live, as well as government workers, in order to explore the official discourse around citizenship and how the topic of is understood and reflected in local policies.

Firstly, I explored adults’ perceptions about what ‘citizenship’ means to them. Both caregivers and government workers mentioned that citizenship relates to educated adults, with a job and an adult ID. Hence, children do not fulfil the requirements for citizenship. As presented in Chapters 5, 6 and 7, I collected adults’ views on how children exercised their rights and fulfilled their responsibilities and participated in their families and communities. In terms of rights, caregivers and government workers mentioned that children are bearers of rights: they particularly mentioned children’s right to be educated, to play, to being raised with love, and to be fed. Similar to Maclure (2014) in his reflections on children’s rights in Latin America, I discussed how, despite this recognition, the enforcement of children’s rights was challenging, ambiguous and ambivalent. For example, I discussed children’s right to play as a key component of their lived citizenship, which adults recognised as a right and an important activity for children’s development; however, I found that there are some geographical limitations as well as limitations imposed by caregivers on the exercising of this right. As other research has shown, caregivers’ perceptions about the risks in their cities often lead them to limit children’s free play, particularly girls (Alparone & Pacilli, 2012; Prezza et al., 2001; Mitra, Faulkner, Buliung, & Stone, 2014; Rudner, 2012). Similar to Rudner (2012), I found that such limitations not only responded to adults’ perception of urban risks, which increased during the flooding season, but also to their perception of children’s skills and how children should behave. Girls and younger children were perceived by adults as having less skills to face the risks; hence, they were more limited in their outdoor play.

When talking about children’s participation and responsibilities, similarly to Punch (2001), I found that while there is a marked gender-based distribution of work in households, the distribution and recognition of children’s contributions depended on
many other factors, such as age and the gender composition of the family. For instance, in families with only girls, the work was divided mainly between adults and older girls, whereas I observed that in families with boys and girls, gender might play a more important role than age. Caregivers recognised children’s participation in fostering the wellbeing of family members. Mothers, for example, mentioned that children provide emotional support to others, particularly when they are sick. However, children’s contribution to the economic activities of the family and in recovery and response activities in relation to the flooding season were overlooked.

Regarding participatory spaces promoted by the local government, government workers agreed that the region lacked spaces for citizen participation. Interviewees from the local government informed me there was a lack of spaces for children’s participation provided by the local government, and even fewer for children less than 5-years-old. For example, they recognised that the design of policies related to children, including urban planning, did not take children’s needs and views into account.

As discussed in Chapter 2, lived citizenship relates to the socialisation process through which citizenship takes place (Kallio, Wood, & Häkli, 2020). In the case of children and adults, their relationship with others is shaped by power dynamics, not only in terms of generational order, but also due to gender and other factors (Cussiánovich, 2009; Moosa-Mitha, 2005). This research found that (adult) social norms, meaning those shared beliefs about what is a typical (normal) and appropriate (approved) behaviour (Institute for Reproductive Health, 2020), influence children’s lived citizenship. The research found that social norms around childhood and gender limited children’s exercising of rights, as discussed in Chapter 6. For example, the social norms that say that children must obey their elders limit children’s right to express their opinions freely. While such social norms are influenced by patriarchal relationships, this does not mean that only adults establish and maintain them. Children also actively participate in replicating and challenging such shared beliefs.
Gender has emerged from the findings of this study as a cross-cutting theme, with a strong influence on children’s lived citizenship. The findings provide further evidence that gendered socialisation greatly shapes the ways in which children experience their lived citizenship and the ways that adults promote or limit children’s citizenship. Hence, the research expands theoretical and practical discussions to understand and promote more gendered notions of citizenship.

This research allowed me to witness how gendered socialisation typically led to limitations on girls’ citizenship experiences. Existing gendered norms about how boys and girls should behave resulted in dichotomised social expectations. I observed that adults and children expected boys to socialise and perform in public spaces – they were allowed to be rude and tough, and were expected to prepare themselves to protect and provide economically for their families. In contrast, girls were expected to socialise in private spaces and perform nurturing activities such as caring and household chores; both adults and children expected girls to be polite and accommodating.

As discussed previously, such gendered socialisation limited girls’ experiences of citizenship, particularly their opportunities to explore and become familiar with their neighbourhood. Adults usually placed more limitations on girls when they were in public spaces, in comparison to boys. Adults perceived girls as less skilled to deal with risks, such as those related to the flooding season and to crime and insecurity in the area. As a result, girls were more limited in learning how to face risks and being able to reach places and services to practice their rights, as well as in their use of public spaces, particularly during the flood’s rising stage.

I witnessed how these restrictions reinforced gendered stereotypes. The findings suggest that children started to learn and internalise those behavioural norms and build their own gendered social norms about how boys and girls should behave. This study also found that children who transgress gender social norms received social reprimands, not only from adults, but also from their peers, particularly when girls performed what were seen as ‘male’ behaviours. The gendered limitations on
children’s lived citizenship could lead to further disparities, as they create rigid ideas about masculinity and subordinate roles for females, as well as reproducing gendered public-private dynamics, which locate females in an unequal power position compared to males.

The findings of this thesis correspond to the gendered issues raised by feminist scholars elsewhere, as discussed in Chapter 2. An additional key contribution of this research is that it provides further evidence that gender is not an isolated variable, but one that interacts with other variables, such as age and physical and socioeconomic vulnerability to weather shocks. The mix of these variables influences the gendered experiences of children’s lived citizenship. For example, while all children were limited in terms of their mobility in the neighbourhood, younger girls and those less skilled in swimming were subject to more limitations.

However, the research also shows that children are not passive recipients of stereotypical gendered socialisation. On the contrary, I observed how boys and girls challenged existing negative gender norms thought their acts of citizenship. Based on these findings, later in this chapter, I propose recommendations for caregivers and policy makers to promote healthy relationships and provide more opportunities for girls and boys to practise their citizenship under more equitable conditions.

8.2. Theoretical contribution

In this section, I discuss the main theoretical contributions of this research. Firstly, I address the contributions to the literature on lived citizenship, providing information on how children experience their citizenship in their early years and understandings of lived citizenship in areas affected by natural hazards. Then, I present the contribution of this research to the literature on risk management and climate change, and social norms around early childhood, analysing the connection with children’s lived citizenship. To finalise, I discuss the contribution to the methods used to conduct research with children, particularly children in the early years living in areas affected by natural hazards.
8.2.1. Contributions to literature on lived citizenship

This study contributes to the evidence on how children from 3 to 5-years-old experience their citizenship in their daily lives. In particular, it makes three main contributions to the literature in this field: (1) evidence on the importance of risky play by children, as well as taking moments to rest, in enacting their lived citizenship, (2) evidence on how children in their early years contribute to the wellbeing of their societies (not only their families, but also at the community level), and (3) care as a key practice of children’s lived citizenship.

In Chapter 5, I discussed how play, particularly risky play, provides children with opportunities to use and appropriate their spaces, as children learn about the risks and how to mitigate them through such play. Risky play helps children to develop skills to face risks and build information that allows them to contribute to their families, as well as to the sustainability of others in the community. For instance, I explained that playing in the water or at the edges of the river can be understood as risky play, because it entails the risk of physical injury (Sandseter, Kleppe, & Sando, 2020) and even drowning. I shared examples of how children worked out how deep the water was and which materials sank, among other things, which allowed them to take measures to avoid the risks (of drowning or losing belongings). In turn, such knowledge helped them to become involved in activities like cleaning or finding spaces in which to play. Before embarking on risky play, I observed how children took precautions, such as testing the depth of the water and recognising their level of ability to swim. Hence, I suggest that play, particularly risky play, enhances children’s skills and knowledge to perform their citizen actions and acts of citizenship.

When discussing citizenship, the literature suggests that children have abilities and need to be actively engaged in their societies through their responsibilities and participation (Percy-Smith, 2020; Cockburn, 2005a; Lister, 2007c), or through their acts of citizenship (Larkins, 2014). While the findings of this research support such statements, it also found that taking rest plays an important role in children’s lived citizenship. Hence, besides active behaviour, this study found that it is important to
have moments of rest to contemplate, learn and connect with the environment and create space for reflection. The findings of this study suggest that such moments contribute greatly to children’s ability to undertake their responsibilities and participating in their families and communities.

Along the same lines, the findings of this research also provide initial insights to expand the discussion on the affective dimension of lived citizenship, that is, the emotional attachment associated with the experience of citizenship (Kallio et al., 2020). As explained in Chapter 5, I witnessed how children took moments to rest in which they contemplated elements of nature, like the river or animals, elements that they recognised as enjoyable aspects of living in the ‘jungle’ in Amazonian Peru. Hence, paraphrasing Cuenca and Aguilar (2009), I propose that taking rest to contemplate nature may facilitate children’s connection with themselves, others and their environment, and, as a consequence, rest contributes to children developing a sense of place, enhancing the bonds they have with their spaces.

Childhood scholars such as Liebel (2012) and Cussiánovich (2010) propose that children construct their citizenship ‘from below’ through their daily practices. The findings of this research support this statement and provide contributions about how children in their early years construct their citizenship ‘from below’, in which playing, exploring and taking rest all have a key role. The children who participated in the study had strategies to produce their own knowledge about matters of concern to them. They also created participatory spaces in which to share and listen to others’ opinions. Such spaces were promoted and led by the children themselves. Children also enhanced others’ abilities to face risks and move around the neighbourhood (including myself) by sharing knowledge, among other things, which is a key aspect of children’s lived citizenship.

This study also makes a theoretical contribution to understanding how children enact their citizenship in contexts with particular features, such as natural hazards, like Amazonian Peru. Throughout this thesis, I discussed how individual features (e.g., age and gender) intersect with interpersonal (e.g., adults’ perceptions and social norms)
and community level (e.g., geography and policies) dynamics. For example, I provided evidence that, while adults recognised that children are bearers of rights, the exercise of such rights by each child depended on different factors. Girls and younger children were more restricted in terms of playing outdoors, particularly during the flooding season, because adults perceived them as having fewer skills to face the risks associated with the floods. Children’s possibilities to express their opinions were limited by the existing social norms, such as the belief that children should obey their elders without questioning. Girls faced an additional challenge related to shared beliefs about how females should behave. For example, a neighbour compared one of the children, Paula, to a boy, as she played in the water and talked too much. Similarly, Ana was compared to a boy by a peer, as she disobeyed her mother to play in the water.

The findings of this research contribute to existing feminist theoretical discussions around citizenship, providing more evidence to challenge conceptions of citizenship as a status and that use male-centred standards (e.g., Hobson & Lister, 2002; Lister, 2007a; 2007b; Barrientos & Muñoz, 2014; Molyneux, 2001). The findings identify some of the gendered barriers to citizenship in early childhood and further elements to help understand the complex private and public dynamics in flood prone areas. The research also expands the theoretical discussion on how gendered socialisation reinforces and is shaped by its intersection with other factors, such as age and socioeconomic vulnerability to environmental shocks.

Evidence in this research also contributes to the existing literature on environmental citizenship (Hayward, 2020; Latta, 2014). I analysed, for instance, how children took action to take care for their animals, contributing to both the animal’s wellbeing and the sustainability of their families. The evidence suggests that in the case of fostering the wellbeing of non-human entities in the Amazonian Peru, the development of strong ties between children and non-human entities is mediated by their identity as Amazonian citizens. Such bonds contribute to the children being more compassionate and empathetic towards the needs of non-human entities.
The links between care and lived citizenship expand the discussions in the literature to recognise and explore the different ways in which children perform their citizenship. Childhood studies, influenced by the feminist approach, have begun to include care as an expression of citizenship (Larkins, 2014; Wihstutz, 2017), and this research provides further evidence to expand such discussions. As discussed in Chapter 5, children in the study area carried out different acts of caring, which meet Tronto’s (1993) criteria of as citizen actions: attentiveness, responsibility, competence, and responsiveness.

Analysing caring as an expression of citizenship allows us to contribute to conceptual discussions around care. As highlighted by Cockburn (2005b) and Wihstutz (2017), care discourses tend to focus more on the perception of the carer than the perception of those who are cared. Furthermore, such discussions are in danger of replicating structural power relationships. Children are usually seen as natural subjects in need of care and protection, which can place them as ‘powerless’ and their caregivers (usually adults) in a power position. However, the findings of this research challenge such assumptions, as the evidence shows how children depend on adults in some ways, but that they are also active carers of themselves and others—including adults. An expression of children’s care was sharing their knowledge about how to safely overcome the challenges to mobility in the neighbourhood during the flooding season. Considering the importance of children’s mobility to children’s lived citizenship, I argue that caring as an expression of citizenship not only implies fostering the wellbeing of others, but also enhancing the ability of others to perform their own lived citizenship, breaking the cycle of dependence. Paraphrasing Cussiánovich (2010), children boost others’ skills enabling them to be equal protagonist in their societies.

This research provides evidence that younger children have the skills and capacities to undertake citizen actions and acts of citizenship. In the chapters above, I provided many examples as evidence of how children contribute in different ways to their families, including by taking care of others (human and animals) and fostering wellbeing. A key finding is that children from 3 to 5-years-old not only contribute to
the welfare of their families, but also at to their communities. For instance, children in the study played a role in mitigating the risks during the flooding season: the children cared for themselves, their families and other members of the community. In line with the environmental citizenship literature, I propose that participating in environmental sustainability is an expression of caring for both individual and collective concerns (Curtin, 2002; Latta, 2014).

8.2.2. Contributions to literature on risk management and climate change

This research contributed to the fields of climate change and disaster risk management, which is important considering that floodplains cover about 2% of the land surface (Tockner, 2013), and floods are likely to be exacerbated by climate change. Furthermore, as discussed in the literature review, much of the research in the field of disaster risk management and climate change focuses on rapid-onset emergencies, rather than slow-onset emergencies, such as the floods in Amazonian Peru (Jabry, 2005). Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 2 research highlights the impact on mental and physical health, with less attention to the social development of children. This research expands on the literature by discussing how living in a flood-prone area shapes children’s experiences of citizenship in their daily life. For instance, I discussed how children exercised their rights differently across the annual cycle of the river (engaging in different activities and using different places during the rising, flooding and transition stages of the river).

I discussed how children’s independent mobility provides them with opportunities to learn about the geographical characteristics of their area, including the environmental dynamics related to the flooding season. A key contribution of this research, in this regard, is the role of risky play in how children learn about the geographical conditions, allowing them to build their knowledge about the river flow, flood height, and flood duration, as well as other climate-related aspects. I provided information on how children perceived their experiences and needs as a result of living in such a setting. For example, children recognised that during the flooding
season there were less spaces in which to socialise and play, and that this situation impacted on their wellbeing.

The literature shows that children are active in promoting environmental sustainability, although such literature is mostly related to older children, while research in the area of early childhood remains limited. This research contributes to the evidence on how children in their early years take part in activities to contribute to the sustainability of their societies. It also presents evidence of children’s concerns about environmental changes and how they take action to protect themselves (and others), as well as to mitigate the impacts of the flooding season.

8.2.3. Contributions to literature on social norms in early childhood

The findings of this research provide evidence to expand the discussion on social norms in early childhood, particularly on how social norms influence children’s lived citizenship. In Chapter 7, I discussed how children’s acts of citizenship encompass transgressions to existing social norms on how children should behave as well as gender norms. In addition, as I explained earlier in this chapter, while such social norms are shaped by patriarchal and adult-centric dynamics, children also replicate these existing social norms in their interactions with their peers.

While this study did not focus on child protection issues, considering that recent research shows that gender norms are risks factors for violence against children (Lilleston, Goldmann, Verma, & McCleary-Sills, 2017; Stark & Seff, 2021), this research also contributes to the discussion on how girls transgress such norms to exercise their rights, that could serve as a protective factor. When girls transgress gender norms, they transgress two types of norms: social norms related to how children should be and behave, as well as gender norms. For instance, I explained that Paula was seen as a girl who always speaks her thoughts aloud, which her father reprimands her for. Her neighbour said that she behaved like a ‘boy’; that is, Paula transgressed the social belief that children should obey their elders, rather than think critically for themselves, as well as the social norm that asserts that girls should be passive.
8.2.4. Contributions to literature on research methods with children

A significant contribution of this research is that it highlights the role of researcher’s emotions and subconscious reactions during data collection, as well as in the process of data analysis. While the literature recognises that doing qualitative research can lead the researcher to develop close relationships with the participants, recognising and talking about researcher’s emotions is less usual, because of the risk of being seen as inept or unprofessional as a researcher (De la Aldea & Lewkowicz, 1999; García-Santesmases Fernández, 2019). As I discussed in the previous chapters, during the fieldwork I experienced different emotions about the neighbourhood, the city and the people with whom I interacted. I realised that recognising such emotions helped me to reduce their influence on my performance and my wellbeing.

Methodologically, it also contributed me to have a better understanding of the children and their context, and making productive methodological decisions for maintaining the quality of the research, but also to protect the children and myself from risks. For instance, the recognition of my anger and reflection on its cause at the beginning of the fieldwork made me recognise certain assumptions and attitudes that I held that could interfere with the data collection, such as my disgust for the dirt and unhygienic conditions and the discomfort I felt while observing children in the PRONOEI. Also, I realised that feeling angry may have been a defence mechanism to stop me from becoming ‘too close’ to the children and, therefore, prevented me from being emotionally overwhelmed. Reflecting on these emotions prompted me to rethink and improve the data collection procedures.

Being sensitive to my own emotions also helped me to be sensitive to the children’s feelings and, hence, to better understand their needs. For instance, as I explained in the methodology section, because of power relationships and sociocultural dynamics, children did not always express verbally and explicitly that they did not want to socialise with me. However, sometimes I did not feel welcome or I felt uncomfortable when I was socialising with them. Having a reflective attitude about how I was feeling and what could be triggering my discomfort helped me to recognise
participant’s non-verbal signs and non-explicit expressions, which help me to understand their real intentions and wishes.

Recognising and validating my fears led me to have a more transparent and genuine relationship with the children, in which I felt comfortable expressing my feelings. For instance, as I explained in Chapter 6, I share with the children my fear of walking in the water and on the bridges during the flooding season. In response, the children took measures to help me and took care of me. Thus, I was able to experience children’s contribution to caring for others myself and learn more about their actions of care.

8.3. Contributions to policies and practice

This research has implications for policies and practice in the area of early childhood. In this section, I outline the implications of the findings for supporting caregivers, education settings (schools), and policies related to environmental sustainability and urban planning.

The results of this research on the importance of risky play, exploration, and moments of rest for children’s citizenship serve as a starting point, by generating reflection and raising awareness among adults, including caregivers, practitioners and those involved in political decision making. The findings highlight the need to encourage children to recognise risks and learn how to face them in the cities where they live, in order to be able to move about independently and safely. Therefore, the evidence suggests that there is a need to ensure conditions for children that allow them to take risks, but still be protected to a certain extent. This is particularly relevant in places with natural hazards, to minimise the risk of injury. The results indicate that it is necessary to promote free play and spaces where children can socialise among peers, without the direct intervention of adults.

As mentioned, this study found that caregivers usually limit children’s mobility for several reasons, including lack of confidence in children’s ability to handle the risks. The findings of this research provide examples that could help in discussions with caregivers to show them that children are not only risks takers, but have also
developed strategies to protect themselves. In this regard, the evidence shows that it is important to recognise the dangers and then establish measures to mitigate their impacts, rather than avoiding such situations entirely, which may ultimately put children at higher risk.

Caregivers and practitioners play a key role in children's gendered socialisation; they can reinforce stereotypical behaviours, or contribute to breaking down gender social norms and promoting healthier relationships and conduct. The findings of this study suggests a need for discussions around how gender social norms shape children’s behaviours, highlighting the fact that more restrictions are generally imposed on girls, than boys, which limits their lived citizenship experiences. In particular, there is a need to reflect on how caregivers restrict girls’ mobility compared to boys’ mobility.

During this study, I observed how gendered social norms shaped children’s behaviour, but I also witnessed how some children transgressed gendered (and other) social expectations. When this happened, caregivers usually reprimanded them, sometimes using violence. Based on the findings, it is suggested that it would be useful to have strategies to shift adults’ attitudes about caregiving. For example, while caring is an activity that is usually associated with females, I witnessed that both boys and girls were skilled in providing care. Caregivers should provide positive feedback to children reinforcing such behaviours and recognising that both girls and boys can, and do, perform various activities that contribute to their families’ wellbeing.

Certain key messages can be drawn from the findings, which could be used in mass media and social mobilisation campaigns to tackle gender and social norms that limit children’s lived citizenship, including the following:

- Caring is not only a female activity; girls and boys are equally capable of providing care to others and fostering wellbeing in their families and communities.
• Using public spaces is a need and a citizen right for girls and boys that contributes to children exercising their rights and learning how to face risks in their cities.

• Play is a citizen right for girls and boys that contributes to their wellbeing and supports them to exercise their rights.

The discussion and examples of how children perform their citizenship could serve as guidance for practitioners who work with caregivers and teachers on how to identify children’s citizen actions and acts of citizenship, as well as the limitations on the enforcement of their rights, particularly social norms. As seen earlier, adult caregivers usually recognise some of children’s contributions, but tend to overlook others; therefore, practitioners can use the evidence provided in this research to help caregivers and teachers to identify children’s contributions. Examples of how the children in this study cared for me could also be used to promote reflection among caregivers on how they receive care from their own children. This would make the contributions of boys and girls more visible. Acknowledging children’s contributions could help adults to provide positive feedback to children, encouraging children to maintain these behaviours over time.

The understanding of children’s acts of citizenship also offers practitioners and policymakers different ways to understand children’s ‘misbehaviour’. As discussed in Chapter 7, understanding children’s acts of citizenship allows us to explore children’s needs and the struggles they go through to exercise their rights. In this case, practitioners could use the findings of this research to help caregivers and other adults to identify things that limit children’s rights. In particular, it would be beneficial to use examples of the social norms discussed in this study to develop awareness among adults about their beliefs.

The findings on how children perceive the floods, as well as their contributions to prevention, response and recovery measures, could help to develop strategies that actively involve children in mitigating the risks of natural hazards. This aspect is particularly important considering the impact of climate change and likelihood that
such hazards will increase in the future. Furthermore, the discussion on children's actions to care for others, as well as non-human entities, can also be used to understand and promote children's care for their environment. This information can be used, particularly in school settings, to promote children's environmental citizenship.

As discussed in this study, the environmental challenges of living in a flood-prone area not only relate to floods, but include high temperatures and heavy rains. The experts suggest that these environmental challenges may be exacerbated by climate change and call on governments to involve children in activities for environmental sustainability. In this study, I have provided examples that could serve as a guide for possible actions that children could perform in this context. These actions could be used as a starting point for recognising other contributions of children in emergency settings and in mitigating the impacts of disasters. As the literature in the field of risk management suggests, ignoring their actions to cope with critical situations can affect children's self-confidence as active agents, leading to them see themselves as powerless in the transformation of their context (Jabry, 2005; Martin, 2011; Mort et al., 2018), impacting on their lived citizenship in the future.

The findings of this research provide evidence on the importance of including children’s perceptions and needs in urban design, to make cities more appropriate and to ensure that they respond to what children need in order to exercise their rights. As Gülgönen (2016) asserts, understanding how children use their cities contributes to making cities more accessible to them and promoting their inclusion as citizens. This research suggests that urban mobility needs to consider children’s characteristics, such as their age and gender. In addition, urban infrastructure should enable children to move around safely and offer them spaces for socialising and resting. As I discussed, ‘children's places’, that is, the places that children use according to their own rules, have the following characteristics: they protected children from the weather (e.g., from the heat or rain), are safe to play in (e.g., no glass, garbage, and protected from robberies and violence) and allow children to socialise with their peers without direct adult intervention—that is to say, places
where they are protected from the weather, from geographical and social risks, and where they have independence.

The findings of this study reinforce the need to developing gender-sensitive risk management and urban policies. The research shows that gendered social norms shape how children learn and develop skills to face the risks associated with the flood season; therefore, preparedness activities for the flood season should reinforce children's (boys and girls) abilities to protect themselves. For example, due to gendered socialisation, I noticed that girls were less skilled than boys in swimming and showed more fear, putting them at a higher risk of drowning during the flood season. Preparedness activities should strengthen girls’ knowledge and skills to reduce the risks and protect them.

This study also shows many differences in the ways that boys and girls use their public spaces and the challenges they face in doing so. For example, girls had more mobility limitations imposed on them than boys, across all of the seasonal stages; girls usually socialised in private spaces, while boys were more likely to be allowed to play in and use public spaces. Urban planners need to reflect on such gendered experiences to increase female participation in public spaces and respond to girls’ needs and interests. Policies should also include strategies to raise awareness of the importance of girls participating in public spaces, and not only in the private domain, at all ages.

As seen in this research, being able to explore their neighbourhood allows children to become familiar with their context and learn how to face risks and protect themselves.

This research contributes valuable data to challenge the stereotypes about people living in flood-prone areas in the Amazonian Peru, which may influence the relationships between people in the country, as well as the design of policies. As mentioned before, there is a common belief that people in the Amazonian Peru are lazy, because they often lay on the floor. The findings of this research show the value of such moments, for children’s wellbeing (as children recognised) and for the construction of their daily experience of citizenship.
8.4. Considerations for future research

This thesis lays the groundwork for future research on membership (identity and belonging) and care as key elements of lived citizenship. As seen in other studies, this research found that children’s contributions were usually overlooked or minimised—not only by adults, but also by children themselves (Alderson, Hawthorne, & Killen, 2005; Ames, 2013; Martin, 2011). Hence, I suggest that further research is needed to understand how this under-recognition influences their willingness to contribute to their societies. For instance, as I explained, caregivers who participated in the study said that older children were less worried about the wellbeing of others than younger children. Also, despite the fact that I witnessed girls and boys both performing acts of caring, I also observed that in adulthood care was a role assumed mainly by females.

The literature suggests that, in addition to structural factors, the experience of citizenship depends on children’s perception of themselves as social actors and citizens (James, 2011). I also propose further research into how contextual aspects that limit children’s agency may affect their self-perception as capable of contributing to their societies and, consequently, the enactment of their citizenship in their daily life. For example, I explained how children take on responsibilities to care for their animals; however, this can be challenging, not only because the economic difficulties involved in meeting the animal’s needs, but also because of the environmental conditions. Paula’s pet, for instance, died because she bathed it too often in an attempt to cool it down. Cussiánovich (2009) argues that economic hardships may motivate children to take action to contribute to their societies. If this is the case, it would be beneficial to explore which aspects promote or limit children’s self-perception and actions as citizens.

As the literature suggests, citizenship relates to the process of identity shaping and belonging (Warming, 2018). In this thesis, I provide evidence that children’s independent mobility provides them with opportunities to create bonds with key elements of the Amazonian identity, such as a close relationship with nature. For example, the children in this study recognised the river and the animals as enjoyable
aspects of living in the ‘jungle’ of Peru, which was possibly related to their sense of attachment and belonging to their place. However, further investigation into how children develop their sense of belonging and their experience of being citizen of an Amazonian city in Peru would help us to better understand this dimension of their lived citizenship.

8.5. Concluding thoughts

The proposal for this research set out the aim of deepening our understanding of how children experience their citizenship. This study provides evidence on how children learn about the geographical and sociocultural characteristics and needs of their context, and how, based on such knowledge, they perform their lived citizenship, by caring for others and their environment, as well as transgressing social norms to enforce their rights. The findings of this research have the potential to contribute to the recognition of children as social actors; as protagonists in the wellbeing of the members of their families and communities; as well as in environmental sustainability.

Conducting this research involved a process of continuous learning, at a theoretical, methodological, and personal level. As I discussed, over the course of the research, I increased my knowledge and contributed to filling the gaps in the literature, particularly on citizenship in early childhood, as well as on care, social norms and theory in disaster risk management. Regarding the methodological challenges to research in areas prone to climate-related emergencies, the fieldwork and data analysis involved continuous decision making. I hope I have ensured, through my reflections, the rigorousness of the research, as well as protecting the privacy and integrity of both the participants and myself. This research has enhanced my commitment to recognising children as subjects of rights and promoting spaces for their participation as citizens. It has also increased my academic curiosity to continue understanding how to establish conditions that positively recognise differences for the development of more committed citizens.
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Appendixes

INFORMED CONSENT – PARENTS/CARER

Dear Parent/ Carer,

Research project on children’s lived citizenship

I am a research student at the University of Edinburgh and I would like to have a deeper understanding about the lived citizenship of children. As part of my research I will visit the school and the community for eight months, between September 2018 and May 2019 and observe the children's interactions. I will also ask children to take part in group sections and I will interview some adults. Additionally, I will analyse policies and laws related with children and their development.

If you are happy for your child to be included (anonymously) in my research, please tick the boxes if you agree and sign the information below.

☐ I hereby agree that my child takes part in the research with Karina Padilla. The data will be used for the completion of Karina’s PhD thesis and possible other publications.

☐ I understood the information provided during the meeting that took place in (place and date) and descriptions in the pamphlet.

☐ I understand that the information that my child will provide, as well as his/her identity, will be anonymised. Also the identity of the school and the neighbourhood will be anonymised.

☐ I understand that if I change my decision, I can inform this to Karina and my child will be out of the research.

I WANT my child to take part in this research project.

Child’s name ______________________________________________________________

Signed/fingerprint______________________________________________________

If you would prefer that your child not be included in the research, please sign the information above.
This form allows you to opt out of the research. As my research takes place during everyday activities at the school and the neighbourhood, I can’t guarantee that if you do opt out, that I will never interact with your child. However, I will not use any interactions that I do have as data for my research.

I DO NOT WANT my child to take part in this research project.

Child’s name ________________________________

Signed/fingerprint______________________________

If you have any questions, please, feel free to contact me at my email or let me know during my visits to the neighbourhood if you want to chat with me about my research.
INFORMED CONSENT – ADULT’S INTERVIEW

Dear participant,

Research project on children’s lived citizenship

I am a research student at the University of Edinburgh and I would like to have a deeper understanding about the lived citizenship of children. As part of my research I will visit the school and the community for eight months, between September 2018 and May 2019 and observe the children’s interactions. I will also ask children to take part in group sections and I will interview some adults. Additionally, I will analyse policies and laws related with children and their development.

If you are happy to participate in an interview where I will ask you about your opinions about children’s citizenship, please tick the boxes if you agree and sign the information below.

☐ I hereby agree to take part in an interview with Karina Padilla. The data will be used for the completion of Karina’s PhD thesis and possible other publications.

☐ I understood the information provided during the meeting that took place in (place and date) and the description delivers in the pamphlet.

☐ I agree that the interview will be audio-recorded.

☐ I understand that the information I will provide as well as my identity will be anonymised. Also the identity of the school and the neighbourhood will be anonymised.

☐ I understand that if I change my decision or I do not wish to answer any questions or stop the interview, I can inform this to Karina.

☐ I give permission to the researcher to use short quotations from the interview in an anonymised way in order to illustrate relevant chapters of the PhD thesis.

If you have any questions, please, feel free to contact me at my email or let me know during my visits to the neighbourhood if you want to chat with me about my research.

Name

Signed/fingerprint ___________________________________

Date _______________________________
INFORMED CONSENT – HEAD TEACHER OF SCHOOL

Research project on children’s lived citizenship

Please tick the boxes if you agree and sign the information below.

☐ I agree that the school, I lead, may take part in the research conducted by Karina Padilla. I approve that Karina will be doing her participant observation between September 2018 and May 2019. This will involve that Karina will spend time at the school on a regular basis and taking notes.

☐ I understood the information provided during the meeting that took place in (place and date) and descriptions in the pamphlet.

☐ I will be able to decide on the time and frequency of Karina’s presence in the classrooms of 3 to 5-year old children.

☐ I understand that, what I, the teachers or the children say and do during the observation will be treated as confidential and the participant’s name will not appear on any research findings. Also the identity of the school will be anonymised.

☐ I understand that I will be able to withdraw from my participation at this research at any time and I can withdraw any information I have provided.

☐ I understand that, if any significant concerns about a child’s well-being arise, Karina will inform me and also she will notify to the Children's Ombudsman Offices, who will follow the procedures they have in place.

Name

__________________________________________

Signed/fingerprint __________________________________

Date ________________________________

If you have any questions, please, feel free to contact me at my email or let me know during my visits to the school if you want to chat with me about my research.
INFORMED CONSENT – TEACHER

Research project on children’s lived citizenship

Please tick the boxes if you agree and sign the information below.

☐ I approve that Karina will be doing her participant observation between September 2018 and May 2019 in the class I lead. This will involve that Karina will spend time at the classroom on a regular basis and taking notes.

☐ I understood the information provided during the meeting that took place in (place and date) and descriptions in the pamphlet.

☐ I understand what I or the children say and do during the observation will be treated as confidential and the participant’s name will not appear on any research findings. Also the identity of the school will be anonymised.

☐ I understand that I will be able to withdraw from my participation at this research at any time and I can withdraw any information I have provided.

☐ I understand that, if any significant concerns about a child’s well-being arise, Karina will inform me and also she will notify to the Children's Ombudsman Offices, who will follow the procedures they have in place.

Name __________________________________________

Signed/fingerprint ________________________________

Date _______________________________

If you have any questions, please, feel free to contact me at my email or let me know during my visits to the school if you want to chat with me about my research.