



SPOŁECZEŃSTWO
EDUKACJA
JĘZYK

Tom 13/2021, ss. 207-221
ISSN 2353-1266
e-ISSN 2449-7983
DOI: 10.19251/sej/2021.13(13)
www.sej.mazowiecka.edu.pl

Kamila Zdanowicz-Kucharczyk
Mazowiecka Uczelnia Publiczna w Płocku
Orcid: 0000-0002-1637-6307

THE RESEARCHER – THE TOURIST IN THE CHILD'S WORLD ON THE STREET

BADACZ TURYSTĄ W ŚWIECIE DZIECKA NA ULICY

Abstrakt

W artykule prezentuję refleksje na temat badań z dziećmi ulicy. Pokazuję, w jaki sposób jako badacz próbowałam dotrzeć do świata dziecka ulicy i zrozumieć go. W czasie projektu badawczego miałam wrażenie, że jestem turystą (Bauman, 1993) w nieznanym przestrzeni pełnej sekretów i tajemnic. Artykuł jest głosem w dyskusji na temat badań z dziećmi jako uczestnikami badań, którzy wprowadzają badacza jak turystę w nieznaną dla niego świat. Przeprowadziłam badania za pomocą następujących metod: obserwacja uczestnicząca (Angrosino 2010), wywiady fokusowe (Barbour 2011) i reportaże zdjęciowe (Sztompka 2005; Banks 2009). Dzieci były moimi przewodnikami w świecie ulicy.

Abstract

In this article, I present my reflections about research with street children. I show how I, as a researcher, tried to go into child's world to understand it. During the research project I had a feeling that I was as the tourist in the unknown space full of secrets and mysteries. I took an inspiration to that comparison from Z. Bauman (1993). That the article is meant to contribute to a discourse about research with children as participants who like tourist guides bring us into their world. I conducted my research with street children as participants using participant observation (Angrosino 2010), focus interviews (Barbour 2011) and photo reports (Sztompka 2005; Banks 2009).

W artykule prezentuję doświadczenia prowadzenia badań z dziećmi oraz proces swojego dojrzwania jako badacz świata dziecka. Moja podróż wzbogaciła mnie jako badacza i chciałabym się tym podzielić. Przedstawiam dzieci ulicy jako zaangażowanych uczestników badań, którzy mogą być bardzo pomocni w zrozumieniu ulicznego życia.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE

Dzieci ulicy/ dzieci na ulicy, turysta, obserwacja uczestnicząca, wywiady fokusowe, reportaże zdjęciowe

Children were my guides in the street world.

In this article I present my experiences of doing research with children and also how I, as a researcher, matured to qualitative research. My journey has enriched my practice of doing research and I would like to share it. I introduce street children as involved participants of research who are very helpful in understanding street life.

KEYWORDS

Street children/ children in the street, tourist, participant observation, focus interviews, photo reports

1. Introduction

The main philosophical orientation guiding the methodology in the research about childhood is the assumption on which the Convention on the Rights of the Child is based, especially respect for children as human beings and for their own opinions. According to these regulations, in the research about childhood researchers try to see the world through children's eyes. Moreover, the children are researchers together with the adults in this kind of projects. They plan, realise, analyse and interpret the results. They are the best source of information, the most competent people to tell about children's world. They understand this space the best, so it is worth to ask children about their feelings, concerns, fears, joys and the ways in which they deal with them.

Research about childhood has changed in different aspects, not only in methodological issues, but also in understanding the child as a participant of the society. The beginning of thinking about a child as an active member of research project can be dated to 70- ties of the twentieth century, when the view of a child started to change. The childhood no more had been seen as a time to prepare to adulthood, time to learn how to become participants of the society by going through various stages of development. It was the time when researchers started to analyse childhood in relation to the context in which the child lives. It was realised that there are some varieties of childhood and that it is not one simple phenomenon (James and Prout 1997). The possibility of constructing objective knowledge about childhood and dogma of constructing knowledge about children by adults was criticised (Hogan 2010). The constructivist perspective that captures childhood and adolescence as a period primarily determined by socio-cultural factors became popular in the social sciences. The concept of childhood constructed by the cultural and social context began to emerge. It was assumed that childhood cannot be

detached from social and cultural variables such as social stratum, gender or ethnicity (James and Prout 1997).

Allison James and Alan Prout (1997, 8.) elaborated the new paradigm in the research about childhood:

1. Childhood is understood as a social construction.
2. Childhood is variable of social analysis.
3. Children's social relationships and cultures are worthy of study in their own right, independent of the perspective and concerns of adults.
4. Children must be seen as active in the construction and determination of their own social lives, the lives of those around them and of the societies in which they live.
5. Ethnography is particularly useful methodology for the study of childhood.
6. Childhood is a phenomenon in relation to which the double hermeneutic of the social sciences is acutely present.

That was also the main idea, which I followed during my research about street children. The participants of my research project constructed their life on the street and I, as researcher-tourist, tried to reconstruct it on my own way using their help. In this article, I present my experiences during that research project. Mostly I want to reveal children as confident constructors of their street life and as tourist guides for adults in their life.

2. Street children/ children in the street- doubts in the definition

The main idea of the research project was to try to understand street children in Poland. There were a lot of publications about those issues, however I realised that they refer to the street worker's view and observations about those children (Olszewska-Baka 2000; Bielecka 2005; Sierocka and Drewniak 2006; Kurzeja 2008; Frysztacki and Nóżka and Smagacz- Poziemska 2011; Adamczyk 2015; Adamczyk 2016). I was wondering what street children would like to communicate to us- adults about their choices and behaviour. Maybe they would not be willing to make contact with us, yet that is why they had started living in the street. Those questions and doubts begun bothering me as a researcher. To learn the street children's perspective, in my research project I asked: How your everyday life look like on the street?

The definition of street children raises a lot of doubts. In the public opinion we can consider two understandings of this terminology. According to the first in Poland there are no street children. The polish children who spend in the street space a shorter or longer time compared to the children from Africa, Asia or South America are not real street children. They do not live on the street all the time. The second meaning relates to children whocome from families with a high risk of pathogenic and dysfunctional factors and have loosened family and school relationships (Adamczyk 2016). These de-

definitions can be clarified by understanding of this phenomenon by a Russian researcher. S. Stephenson (2001) who divided street children into two groups:

- *children in the street*- children who spend most of their time on the street, but return home or institution at night
- *children of the street*- children living on the street all the time.

I applied the terminology defined by the Council of Europe (Głowacka 2003) street children live in the street for a short or long time. Their official address is the address of their parents or some social institution. They have place where they belong to, but mostly they avoid it and adults who live there. Considering those definitions, I invited to the project children from the child-care institution. Of course, they had care provided, but in spite of it, they escaped to the street and spent their time there. To present that situation it is worth to mention that one of participant of my research project run away on the street during research and did not come back to the end of the project. In spite of the fact that those children had their place where they belong to, they chose street as their place of living and bringing up. And about that time, I wanted to know as much as it was necessary to know and understand them and their choices.

3. The research project

I did my research in the city in the North of Poland with street children. Before the project started, I had spent with those children six months as a volunteer. I was having fun with them, doing everyday activities. I helped them doing homework. I listened to them if they had wanted to talk. I tried to become a part of their reality. So they had known me before I proposed to them going to the town. I had a hope, that it would help me to gain their trust. Working on the research project consisted of three stages:

1. City tour and photographing selected places by children.

I asked children to go with me to the city and made photos wherever they wanted to.

2. Watching photos and choosing the most interesting ones.

I showed children all photos and we chose the most interesting according to them.

3. Doing photographic reportages by children.

We made photographic reportages about their life on the street on huge sheets of paper. During this activity we also had group interview (focus interview) (Barbour 2011). Children were making reportages and were talking about their motivation to present these photos and what do these places mean to them. I let the children to lead me in their life. The street was the unknown space for me.

I was looking for the methodology that could help me to enter to the street children world. The observation could be a good beginning but I wanted to extend the choice of methods. The best way to know a new world is taking photos and talking with natives, so I realized that I should broaden my methodology using those activities. The

participant observation (Angrosino 2010), focus interviews (Barbour 2011) and photo reports (Sztompka 2005; Banks 2009) gave me those kinds of possibilities. I chose them as a possibility of collecting the research data. It turned out very helpful to encourage children to participate in the research. I hoped that it would help me to notice things which were invisible for other adults from street children environment.

Below I present the main assumptions about my research project with children. I divide them into three impressions of a trip and tourist's feelings. There are also my reflections, about realisation of the research with children:

I was looking for impressions, like the tourist in the new country. The chosen methodology gave me a lot them.

I desired for adventure. Results which I have developed during the research were for me not only a lesson, but also a real school of street childhood.

The last my assumption- the tourist pays- the tourist requires. To convince children to participate in research you have to give them an attractive offer. If I've succeeded, I'll try to explain in discussion.

4. Looking for impressions- methodology

The researcher in the word of a child is like a tourist who wants to explain the space which he is exploring. For the researcher it is an unknown and mysterious area. What is more, he remembers that some days he belonged to this space, but now it is like walking in a thick fog. The world is changing, people have other habits, children are raised according different concepts so it is incomparable and impossible to put together the world of the researcher and the child who participated in the research. He looks for stories about impressions from the children's life and the research results are his effects which he cares of.

In the research the main problem is how to know the answers to the problems. One of the key challenges in any research problem is to identify appropriate methods that would aid researchers in findings answers to their research questions. The research space is full of methods which, for better or worse, help delve into the world of the child. To me as a researcher the main issue was how to reach to street children. It is a specific group of children who try to avoid the adults. They escape to the street from their parents, teachers, educators so I had to find a way to convince them that it is worth to share with me their experiences. I knew that it should be something attractive and which gave them the opportunity to be active in their space. I wanted to get to know their life on the street, so it would be not possible only by talking about it. I wanted, as tourist in unknown country, to feel that space, to see it with my own eyes, to walk those roads, to visit those places. My ambitions were huge and I knew that it was almost impossible to reach all the children I wanted to. Fortunately, the participant observation (Angrosino 2010) focus interviews (Barbour 2011) and photo reports (Sztompka 2005; Banks 2009) offered me help to realise my objectives.

There are two types of collecting data by doing observation: non- participant observation and participant observation. The first one is that the researcher can study a situation in its natural setting without altering the conditions, but only if the researcher can blend in naturally. One obvious disadvantage is that non-participant observation relies only on observing behaviour. Since the researcher cannot interact in the social behavioural processes, most of the collected data will be qualitative, interpretive and to some extent limited. It usually relies on the researcher being unknown to the studied group (Parke & Griffiths 2008). The second- participant observation combines the researcher's participation in the lives of the people under study while also maintaining a professional distance (Angrosino 2010). The researcher interacts with people in everyday life while collecting information. It is an unique method for investigating the enormously rich, complex, conflictual, problematic, and diverse experiences, thoughts, feelings, and activities of human beings and the meanings of their existence (Jorgensen 2015). I chose participant observation.

That method allowed me to participate in the life of street children, only for a short moment during my research project. I felt like a tourist on a dangerous trip with guides whom I do not know what I can expect from. I can compare the participant observation in research with children to the trip to the new world. And the researcher is a tourist who visits the child's world. In the text below, I try to convince the reader that research with children could be a wonderful journey- full of mystery and adventure if we let children to take us to their life. Today, when I am thinking about that research project and research with children I can imagine a tourist in the unknown country, who wants to get to know the new environment. That is why, I would like to compare the researcher to the tourist who visits the new world for him. He is an artist and the tourism is his creation. Of course, construction of a child's world by adult researcher is like when the tourist constructs a new space unknown for him. He creates this space with tourist guides- the children.

Participant observation has its historical roots in anthropology and ethnology and in the social reform movements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the United States and Great Britain. It has often been used as a collection procedure together with interviews, group discussion and document analysis. Researchers see participant observation as a flexible, methodologically plural and context- related strategy that could incorporate widely different procedures (Lüders 2004). In qualitative research, observations mostly take place in settings that are natural environment of participants activity. Such naturalistic observation is an integral part of field research (Angrosino & Rosenberg 2011).

Anthropological researchers differentiate three- step process of observation:

- Descriptive observation- observation of every conceivable aspect of the situation. Observators should be childlike, who do not know nothing about the field.
- Focused observation- observation with becoming more familiar with the setting. They almost always involved interviewing and concentrate on well- defined types of activities.

- Selective observation- concentration on the elements of social action that are most salient, presumably from the native point of view (Angrosino & Rosenberg 2011).

During my research project I tried to concentrate on those three stages. The most difficult was the beginning because I had to gain children's trust. It is difficult for an adult to reach their world, and it is even more difficult to understand. We communicate in other languages, we move in a circle of other cultures: children and adults. I tried to hear what the child is talking about street and living on it (descriptive observation). However, I felt maybe not like a child, but more like a tourist in the unknown city. I tried not only to see and to describe the children's living on the street, but also to understand it. So, I arranged the interviews. It was the second step- focused observation. It was very interesting to go closer as a researcher not only to children's activities on the street, but also to their understanding of presence on the street. Children as tourist guides could familiarise me with the daily life of the street. They allowed me to concentrate on elements that are most salient, because they had invited me to their world (selective observation).

Participant observation is not simply data- collection method. It observe the context in which researchers assume membership roles in communities they want to study. They do negotiations with those who are already members (Angrosino & Rosenberg 2011). I did a lot of negotiations with children, mostly about who decide. Fortunately, we could communicate and together finish research project. Entering in the child's world is not an easy task for a researcher. It becomes more possible, when we arrange fun for them and then try to make communication with children. Photo report gives this kind of possibility. It opens us as tourists in the children's world not only by having fun, but also by souvenir making. This kind of participating for children gives them possibility to be active, to show what is difficult to say and to go- visit their spaces on the street.

P. Sztompka (2005, 75.) says, that: "photography is a window, but also a mirror. It's a mirror in which the photographer looks, the situation in which he photographs his culture, era, predilections, intentions and motivations". It is an element of social reality in a triple sense: it is created by people, presents social life and is an element of social reception. The picture was taken by someone, presents something and is addressed to someone. In my research project, the photography was taken by children- tourist guides, presents living on the street and was addressed to me- the adult tourist in their life. In photography, I found a methodological opportunity to reach the depths of many aspects of the child's everyday life.

Another way to approach children was a focus interviews (Barbour 2011). The researcher tends to processual-analytical reconstruction of collective action practices. Children, in a circle of friends, one generation or gathered within one institution, combine fundamental layers of meaning. They find themselves in a group, talk to each other, and these conversations can be treated as documents of their collective experience. During my research trip to the child's street world, I wanted to reconstruct how they create social facts and events. The research's construction of the project gave me possi-

bility to organize them freedom in their discussion and having fun during making photo reportages. I sought to understand how children recall a shared world of experiences, how express typical experiences that were important for them and, therefore, important for research reconstruction, reference points of collective orientation patterns. That method gave me possibility to listen and try to reconstruct children's life. I heard how they themselves determined the subjects relevant to them and expressed them in their everyday language, in the usual form of discourse. By analyzing their discourse, I was able to reach their world of experiencing everyday life, especially street life. Participation in the focus interview with children was like listening to the stories about unknown tourist spaces, which from word to word is more interesting. We could not only relieve it again, but also it allowed me to explore their experiences and come to other spaces which were impossible to me to study while watching photos.

While collecting the data, during volunteering at children care institution and carrying out a research project, I noticed the following aspects of collecting the data:

- generalisation of participants: I considered what they had said during interviews, free talks in the institution or during our trip on the street. Sometimes, there is a divergence between declared and actual experiences of the subject. Distinction between them helps to understand that;
- neutral observations: this is what I observed during the project;
- individual experiences: what are experiences of and individual child? Sometimes they are very special and unique;
- interactions between members of group: children- children, children and their carers from care institution, children-parents (Scollon & Wong 2004, 158.).

Doing research with children using photo reportages, focus interviews, observations, saving field notes let me to come closer to the child's life from different kinds of perspectives. I could not only describe it from my perspective, but also acquaint it with the street and children on the street. I realised that that research project expanded my horizons on different kinds of research and convinced me to engage participants (most children) as much as possible.

5. Desire for adventure- results

The researcher wants to feel call of adventure. He chooses the mystery space for him which is also unknown or not enough known in science. He goes into new world filled with new people, relations, events. He wants to know, observe, learn and describe it. The souvenir from this trip is a research report, which he leaves for the others who would like to delve into the secrets of knowledge.

My research project opened my consciousness on the world of street children. It was an adventure from two sides: the world of a street and the world of a child. The research participants taught me what living on the street means and from my perspective, a researcher's perspective, it was as exciting, or even more, as a trip to a foreign country.

The tourist is looking for a new experiences and only differences could provide that- something which he did not see and know. Various nooks of streets, people dressed another style, different customs could be a new adventure full of mystery. I had seen those difference during analysing results of research. To me, it was another world which existed along side me, but also outside of me- like in another country which I know only from stories.

This adventure changed my street child's picture from lost and in need of help to powerful and realising whatever he wants. I reconstructed children's reality on the street on my pedagogical way¹. In my reconstruction street boys are wearing hooded sweatshirts to hide their real looks, to hide their faces. They pose on strong, independent "macho". Nothing can threaten them. Girls try to look like photo-models from the media and women from their real life. They expose their femininity and sexuality. They assimilate to adults, do not let themselves to look and be more like children. I understood from my street tourist guides that on the street the one who is strong will survive. Therefore, using described above appearance, I saw, that they act like individuals who, can handle any situation. I learned from them, that it is worth to be like that on the street. These poses give confidence, courage and constitute a position in a group. Whereas, my observations let me to notice that outside this game, they had been children who like to have fun, need understanding and do not want to give up its childhood too early. It was a great adventure for me as a researcher to see, that those children have two faces: in the street strong, independent and for themself a look of innocent child. Children helped me to realize why that powerful appearance is needed in the street. I had to ask them to help me to understand their life on the street. In opposite to the pedagogical picture of a street child who is lost and cannot function without the help of adults, I perceived them as brave, resourceful, clever young people. They showed to me responsibility for their decisions and actions and consequence towards those who break the rules of their lives. I had seen children who climbed the heels and what they signalled me was that they needed to believe in themselves- the street children. One more thought, which is worth to mention that, I know their street language. Sometimes, like a tourist in foreign country, I had to ask them to translate some words to me.

During that trip to the street children's world I noticed three spaces: family home, child care institution and the street. Although adults would love to see them in the first two places, according to my reconstruction, this is not their natural space. I noticed that, they feel torn between them. They do not get attached to any of them. They only visit them. While they have found their space on the street. It is the only place where adults cannot limit their freedom and independence. I supposed that, for that reason, children choose street not home or institution. This is where the child makes decisions. And adults can come there only to the extent that the child allows. I as a researcher had only been a tourist on their street and they had shown me what they wanted to. My adventure finished in the space where those children wanted to finish it. I was

¹ More: Author. (2012). *Everyday street life from a child's perspective*. Elbląg: Elbląska Uczelnia Humanistyczno- Ekonomiczna

curious to know more, to learn about street living more, but my trip was limited by my tourist guides.

6. The tourist pays the tourist requires- discussion

Visiting the world is connected with spending the money. Research projects also absorb financial outlays. Mostly, researchers spend money for materials to do research. Sometimes, they pay participants for attending in the research. Just like tourists who pay and require to provide their all needs and greetings, they pay for participation in research.

One of the rules of engaging children in research is the principle of beneficence. It refers to actions that promote the well-being of children. It refers to a researcher's obligation to strive for their research to improve the status, rights and/or well-being of children. Beneficence is understood as more than acts of kindness and charity and envisages that both the research process and outcomes include positive benefits. Gaining information from children should result in children receiving something in return for this information (Graham et al. 2013, p.17). Such benefits may take a diverse range of forms, from undertaking research in caring, attentive and responsible ways so that children feel they are heard, and that their experience is validated and respected, through to providing children and communities with tangible benefits, such as payment or provision of resources, appropriate policies or programmes. The principle of beneficence requires researchers to identify clear benefits likely to arise from research involving children and to reconsider proceeding if these cannot be articulated. (Graham et al. 2013,17)

In contrast to trip paying for participating in research could be controversial. Of course, it provides more people who wants to attend in the research, but I am not so sure, that researcher is looking for this kind of participants. This kind of remuneration can be a form of researcher control over the participants. It could be also an encouragement to get involved in the project for commercial purposes only (Bielecka- Prus 2013; Boyden & Ennew 1997).

At the beginning of my research project, I was wondering how to convince children to participate in my research. I heard from their educators that I could buy them ice- cream, cookies or something similar. It could be easy and attractive way to find participants, but I did not want to arrange to my research those children who would like to get sweets as a payment. When the tourist pays for different kind of services, he also requires that the natives will do what he wants from them. They provide various attractions, sometimes for special wish. They act and behave just the way the tourist wants. This kind of a danger occurs also in the research. When we arrange children in research they could behave as they think they are expected to. Children learn how to please their parents, teachers, educators. They know what they expect from them, so they do it to get a reward. So, if we as researchers promise children recompense, certainly, they act as they think we want from them to behave. In case of street children, it is more compli-

cated. These children, often rejected, hurt, do not trust any adult people. Moreover, if it is possible to get reward, they do everything to get it, but without attachment and trust. These children know how to react to get what they want. Therefore, if I would promise them some material benefits, probably to research project children would come forward for whom the prize would be a priority, not participating in our play.

Remembering, however, about the rule of beneficence, I decided to give children something more than material benefits. I organized the research in a way that would remind them of a good adventure in the city. According to my beliefs, first of all, to them it was a diversifying routine to life in the institution. Children could go out from the child care institution and go wherever they want. Secondly, they could visit their places on the street, walk on pipes, roofs or playgrounds if they wanted to. Thirdly, they made photos and for them it was a souvenir. Fourthly, they acted as tourist guides and I remembered that they were proud that I wanted to see their spaces and know their rituals. Last but not least, I showed them interest and they did not show that, but I felt that it was very important to them that an adult wanted to get to know them on their own terms and conditions.

Of course, they got something material, too. Every child, who took part in the research got CD with photos from our trip. They could show that to their friends and educators if they wanted to.

I am sure, that this kind of beneficence helped me to find children who wanted to present their life and not only wanted to get a prize. Yet, I think it was valuable for me as a researcher too because I got something more than the results of research- the best time on the street with my tourist guides- children. And I learned a lot of about children as participants of research project from them.

In here, I would like to compare researcher to a tourist in one more aspect. Maybe not to a tourist but to vagrant. The vagrant bows to the wanderers, the tourist expects indigenous bows. Comparing to this issue, I learned that I bowed to the children. In that way, I was more the vagrant than the tourist. I wanted to understand street children world so much that I was ready to give them instead what they wanted to. I remember how nervous I felt before going on the street. Just as I asked the children to go out for a trip, I was told that : "Dogs² will know where we are!" I was almost sure that no one would come along the following day. Fortunately, children had one night to think through and some of them wanted to meet me.

At the same, I was very nervous to go out with children alone without any other adult. They liked it very much but I was terrified about their security. Today I know that it created a very good atmosphere: there were only children and I who wandered the streets together. They showed me more, told me more stories and behaved more confidently, than somebody from educators would have been with us. That's why I took the risk to know more about street children in the places where their street life was infolding

² Street children called the Police "dogs".

every day. That project taught me to be more confident that a lot of problems arise during the research and it is worth to be flexible and looking for a new solutions.

7. Conclusions- the end of a trip which had changed the tourist

This research tour changed me as a researcher and as a pedagogue. I started to be more cautious in planning the research projects. I understood that without invitation to the research participant's world I could not enter in this space. And I could see only this what they wanted to show me and help to understand. I wonder if participants of my research project trusted to me. They had showed me their favourite places and their activities on the street. They told me a lot about their choices, lifestyles, ways to survive on the street. In my view, they trusted me, otherwise it would not be possible to realise my research plan.

At the same time, I am sure that they showed me only what they wanted to present. They spared a lot of secrets which I had no possibility to know. Just like the tourist guides, they were those who planned the whole tour. There were children who guided me, not the other way round. I was like a tourist: I visited only those spaces that were made available for me. I had no possibility to decide about our trip. In spite of that, I got to know a lot about their life because they wanted to show off. Finally, they found the adult who wanted to listen to them.

A tourist should not feel like at home during the trip, take roots. Believe me, it was impossible with street children. I suppose that, they presented me so much because they knew that I would disappear from their life after the research project was finished. And it was safe for me and for children, too. I visited and learned a lot from them and then finished the research. However, I had a lot of their photos, research results and a lot of memories and impressions which I can share with other adults.

What is the most important knowledge for me from this research project is my perspective of street children. They are strong, smart, intelligent and they know how to survive on the street. This is the ability which I wanted to learn from them. It was an adventure for me, but for children their real life. And I understood that the adults do not know better what is the best for them, like tourists do not know better what is best for natives. Our experiences do not give us right to change their lives.

The journey could change the tourist and this trip changed me as a human. I began listening to children actively, and stopped talking to them constantly. I understood that sometimes silence could open children to us- adults, if we want this. However, playing with them, doing different activities could be very helpful in collecting the data. It was my payment to them for taking part in the research. That research project opened me to a different and unusual methods, like photos, reportages, participant observation- which could be a great journey not only for a researcher but also for the research participants. Every trip opens our minds and that journey also enriched me as a researcher and pedagogue.

This research adventure also altered my view of the project. And I think that happened not only as a result of the research procedure, but also thanks to children who participated in research. This research project showed me that it is worth to take a risk and trust children that they can lead us through their world. This trip could be planned, realised and interpreted by children acting just like tourist guides. And we, as tourists, could let them lead us into their own worlds.

REFERENCES:

- Adamczyk, Barbara. 2016. Wykluczenie edukacyjne dzieci ulicy. Raport badań z Krakowa (Educational exclusion of street children. Research report from Krakow). *Seminare*, 2 (37), pp. 59 - 71. <http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.desklight-88c616e2-78d3-43c2-a747-963ec9a1d3b9>
- Adamczyk, Barbara. 2015. *Dzieci ulicy w Polsce i na świecie Definicja typologia etiologia (Street children in Poland and worldwide Definition typology etiology)*. Kraków: Akademia Ignatianum Wydawnictwo WAM
- Angrosino, Michael., Rosenberg, Judith. 2011. Observations on Observation: Continuities and Challenges. In: *Qualitative research*. Norman Denzin, Yvonna Lincoln, (eds.) London: SAGE Publications Ltd. (pp 151- 177).
- Angrosino, Michael. 2010. *Doing ethnographic and observational research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Banks, Marcus. 2009. *Materiały wizualne w badaniach jakościowych (Using Visual Data in Qualitative Research)*. Warszawa: Wyd. Naukowe PWN
- Barbour, Rosaline. 2011. *Badania fokusowe (Doing Focus Groups)*. Warszawa: Wyd. Naukowe PWN
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1993. Ponowoczesne wzory osobowe, *Studia Socjologiczne*, 2 (129). (pp. 7- 31). <http://docplayer.pl/21827945-Ponowoczesne-wzory-osobowe.html>
- Bielecka, Elżbieta. 2005. *Streetworking Teoria i praktyka (Streetworking Theory and practice)*. Warszawa: Pedagogium.
- Bielecka- Prus, Joanna. 2013. Paradygmat partycypacyjny w naukach społecznych. Wykorzystywanie danych wytworzonych przez badanych w analizie jakościowej (A participatory paradigm in the social sciences. Use of data produced by the respondents in qualitative analysis). *Rocznik Lubuski*, 39, part 1, 29 - 50. <http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.desklight-796c3c3b-a6fa-4475-80ec-f145e29c718b>
- Boyden, Jo., Ennew, Judith. (eds.). 1997. *Children in Focus: A Manual for Experiential Learning in Participatory Research with Children*, RäddaBarnen, Stockholm.
- Convention on the Rights of the Child, Retrieved from (<https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx>), (Accessed on 17.12.2019).

- Frysztański, Krzysztof, Nóżka, Marcjanna, Smagacz-Poziemska, Marta. 2011. *Dzieci ulicy. Studium szczególnego problemu miejskiego (Street children. A study of a particular urban problem)*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego
- Głowacka, Barbara. 2003. Dzieci ulicy (Street children). In: *Encyklopedia Pedagogiczna XXI wieku (21st century Pedagogical Encyclopedia)*. Warszawa: Żak Publisher. (p 878).
- Graham, Ann., Powell, Mary., Taylor, Nicola., Anderson, Donnah. & Fitzgerald, Robyn. 2013. *Ethical Research Involving Children*. (ERIC). Florence: UNICEF Office of Research - Innocenti. Retrieved from <https://childethics.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/ERIC-compendium-approved-digital-web.pdf>
- Griffiths, Mark., Parke, Jonathan. 2008. Participant and Non-participant Observation in Gambling Environments, *Enquire*, Volume 1, Issue 1. (pp 61- 74). <https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/sociology/documents/enquire/volume-1-issue-1-parke-griffiths.pdf>
- Hogan, Diane. 2010. Researching 'the child' in Developmental Psychology. In: *Researching Children's Experience. Methods and Approaches.*, Sheila Greene, Diane Hogan (eds.) SAGE Publications Inc., London, (pp 22–41). Retrieved from <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-317339>, (Accessed on 17.12.2019).
- James, Allison., Prout, Alan. 1997. *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: contemporary issues in the sociological study of childhood*, Falmer Press, London–Washington.
- Jorgensen, Danny. 2015. Participant Observation. In: *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences: An Interdisciplinary, Searchable, and Linkable Resource*, Stephen Kosslyn. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kurzeja, Anna. 2008. *Dzieci ulicy- profilaktyka zagrożeń (Street children - risk prevention)*. Kraków: Impuls
- Lüders, Christian, 2004. Field observation and ethnography. In: *A companion to qualitative research*. Uwe Flick, Ernst von Kardorff, Ines Steinke. (eds.) London: SAGE Publications Ltd. (pp. 222- 230).
- Olszewska- Baka, Grażyna. 2000. *Dzieci ulicy. Problemy. Profilaktyka. Resocjalizacja (Street children. Problems. Prevention. Resocialisation)*. Białystok: ERBE Publisher
- Scollon, Ron. & Wong, Suzie. (2004). *Nexus analysis: discourse and the emerging internet*. London: Routledge
- Sierocka, Beata., Drewniak, Marcin. (2006). Dzieci ulicy. Raport z socjologicznych badań terenowych, Kraków (Street children. Sociological field research report). Krakow. Retrieved from <http://www.archiwum.mlodziez.info> (Accessed on 29.07.2012)
- Stephenson, Svetlana. 2001. Street children in Moscow. *Sociological Review*. 4(49). 530-547.

Sztompka, Piotr. 2005. *Socjologia wizualna Fotografia jako metoda badawcza (Visual Sociology Photography as a Research Method)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN

Author 2012. *Codziennosc uliczna z perspektywy dziecka (Everyday street life from a child's perspective)*. Elblag: Elblaska Uczelnia Humanistyczno- Ekonomiczna

Informacje o autorce:

Kamila Zdanowicz-Kucharczyk, adiunkt - Mazowiecka Uczelnia Publiczna w Plocku. Autorka interesuje sie zagadnieniami zwiazanymi z dzieciinstwem ulicy, badaniami partycypacyjnymi z udzialem dzieci oraz zagadnieniami metodologicznymi dotyczacymi badan z udziale dzieci.

Kontakt:

e-mail: k.zdanowicz.kucharczyk@mazowiecka.edu.pl

adres korespondencyjny:

Mazowiecka Uczelnia Publiczna w Plocku, ul. Galczyńskiego 2, 09-400 Plock.