



Reflection document on doing research with children and young people

Project: Reviving, Boosting, Optimising and Transforming European Film Competitiveness - REBOOT

Grant Agreement: 101094796 - HORIZON-CL2-2022-HERITAGE-01

Author(s): Katharine Sarikakis, Angeliki Chatziefrimidou (UNIVIE)

Reviewer(s): Antonios Vlassis (ULIEGE), Simon Haslauer (UNIVIE)

Object **D8.3 Reflection document on doing research with children and young people**

WP	WP8 (University of Vienna)
Deliverable Lead	University of Vienna
Type	R=report
Dissemination Level	PU= public
Version	1.0



Funded by the
European Union

Metadata

Project	Reviving, Boosting, Optimising and Transforming European Film Competitiveness - REBOOT
Acronym	REBOOT
Programme	Horizon Europe
Call	HORIZON-CL2-2022-HERITAGE-01
Grant Agreement No.	101094796
Project coordinator	Katharine Sarikakis (UNIVIE)
Licensing terms	CC-BY 4.0
DOI	https://10.5281/zenodo.18233152
Author(s)	Katharine Sarikakis, Angeliki Chatziefrimidou
Reviewer(s)	Antonios Vlassis, Simon Haslauer
Title	Reflection document on doing research with children and young people
Deliverable No.	D8.3
WP No.	8
Deliverable Lead	University of Vienna
Type	Report
Dissemination Level	Public
Version	1.0
Description	This deliverable presents a discussion of the ethical measures, which define the conduct of research with minors both at both theoretical and practical level. Research ethics are integrated across all phases of the research process: design, data collection and analysis. This reflection document emphasises the responsibilities which researchers bear at research involving children and points out their shared experiences from the research field.



Keywords	REBOOT, children as research participants, research ethics, youth
Language	English



REBOOT (www.thereboot-project.eu) has received funding from European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101094769.



CONTENTS

The REBOOT project summary.....	4
1 Introduction.....	5
2 Doing research with children	5
3 Reflections from the research field.....	8
4 Aftertalks: Researchers' final reflections	10
5 Conclusion.....	13
References	15



REBOOT (www.thereboot-project.eu) has received funding from European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101094769.



THE REBOOT PROJECT SUMMARY

This project aims to connect existing strengths, identify and overcome weaknesses, and plan for future competitiveness in the fields of policy, practice and experience. More concretely, the project's objectives are, firstly, to explore the long-standing strengths and pervasive gaps in European competitiveness and policies for competitiveness. This includes ways of measuring, analysing and evaluating the impact of policies and strategic pathways. Secondly, the project aspires to actively prepare for future audiences by exploring audience preferences and their generation, as well as modes of film content production. The latter are elements which today's youth will engage with in the coming decades as makers and consumers, as well as industry and policy leaders. Therefore, the consortium interrogates not only "what is" but also "what has been" and "what will be" from fresh perspectives.

REBOOT's ambition is to provide a full set of knowledge of the European film industry, which maximises its existing strengths, combined with strategic and tactical dimensions of action to optimise the potential held in European youth publics, understood both as emerging audiences and as citizens. Specifically, the ambition of the project combines several dimensions, which reinforce each other but are listed separately for analytical purposes (and in no particular order): a) increasing support for young people's engagement with European film; b) strengthening the place of the European Union (EU) in the global audiovisual economy, particularly in light of the rise of video on demand (VoD); c) supporting cultural diversity in the EU film industry; d) addressing the need for a different understanding of competitiveness and relevant indicators in this context; and e) recognising and supporting the importance for the EU of film and, more broadly, of the cultural and creative sector as a geopolitical asset.



REBOOT (www.thereboot-project.eu) has received funding from European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101094769.



1 INTRODUCTION

Conducting research with people, despite their age, comes with specific ethical responsibilities for researchers. The following is a discussion of the conceptual and practical measures taken to address some of these ethical issues during the design and implementation of research with minors and reflect the complexity and diversity but also common standards across different institutional settings in the countries involved. Some elements are here as to be expected, whereby researchers seek institutional clearing for research and set up an appropriate context for research subjects to provide their consent. Providing informed consent requires that participants have received adequate information about the study, which has been conveyed in a corresponding language. Additionally, researchers carry the responsibility to respect participants' boundaries of voluntary participation, which includes their right to withdraw anytime they wish, without facing any negative consequences. The ethical complexities become even more challenging when research involves minors. Children younger than 15 years are considered as a "vulnerable group," while they are still developing both physically and cognitively. This report aims to reflect, collect and present a comprehensive summary of key factors and processes on conducting research with children and young people, which derives out of collective work with 108 focus groups with a total of 607 children and young people and 4.453 survey responses from young people ages 12 to 24, from nine countries: Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Greece, Italy, Poland, Spain and Türkiye. We begin with an overview of current understandings and sensitivities across various disciplines while doing research with children. We then address some important issues involved in conducting research with children as they transpired in the project and finally include researchers' direct reflections on the data gathering process. We conclude with an overview and thoughts for further consideration in projects.

2 DOING RESEARCH WITH CHILDREN

For research with minors in many European countries requires a formal ethical approval from a central Ethics Committee, which exceeds the institutional review board. Additionally, in case of conducting research at educational environments, a further ethical approval is mandatory from regional formal school research approval from Federal Ministry of Education or Regional Education Authorities. After obtaining these ethical clearances, permission for school access is necessary, provided by the school principal and local school bodies, such as school forum or school community committee. The next level of permission is the written informed consent of participants' parents or



legal guardians and the final level of consent is individuals' oral consent to voluntarily participate in the study (Sarikakis et al., 2025).

The multilevel consent process required for minors, children up to 15 years, is grounded on the vulnerability of children as research participants. The highest ethical value that governs research with children is not to harm the study's participants in any way (Alderson & Morrow, 2020), defined by the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC, 1989, Article 3(1)): "in all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies, *the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration.*" In this regard, a fundamental value is that the research is being conducted *with* children and not *on* children. Children are not research objects, but rather subjects, who actively participate in the research process (Kousholt, 2016).

As children are not fully developed as "transformation to adulthood occurs by a process of biological, cognitive, and moral development in which distinct stages can be identified" (Larcher, 2025, p. 435), children do not yet have complete ability to assess information and give informed consent independently. They depend on adults' support and care (Lansdown, 1994) to ensure their wellbeing and protection against risks, as defined by the CRC (1989): "States Parties undertake to ensure the child such protection and care as is necessary for his or her well-being, taking into account the rights and duties of his or her parents, legal guardians, or other individuals legally responsible for him or her [...]" (Article 3(2)), which underlines the vital role of parental informed consent.

Along with parental informed consent, we have also deemed it a necessity for children to provide their own informed consent to participate in the study. This entails two implications: first, children's informed consent lies in ensuring that children are adequately informed. The study's information and processes need to be conveyed in a language which corresponds to children's age (Alderson & Morrow, 2020; Sarikakis & Chatziefrimidou, 2025). The second implication is that children's participation must be imposed on them only because their parents have consented; children have the right to decide themselves whether they want to participate in the study, even if their parents have consented (Sarikakis & Chatziefrimidou, 2025). However, the reverse does *not* apply: if children wish to participate but their parents have not provided their consent, they are not permitted to join the study. Even when children provide oral consent, an additional measure is required, as researchers need to be aware and prepared to observe participants' reactions, as children may not feel comfortable to directly communicate how they feel and what they want. It requires some sensitivity from adults to recognise signs of discomfort, distressed or unwell, which may be expressed through symptoms such as stomachache, headache, tears or shaking. To secure



voluntary participation, researchers should inform participants that they have the right to withdraw anytime, without facing any negative consequences (Sarikakis et al., 2025).

Another important matter on doing ethical research *with* children refers to data management. Researchers should secure participants' anonymity, which extends to information about children's environment, such as the name of parents, friends, school, teachers or classmates. Research participants should not be identifiable in any way. The anonymity is a principle which enables a trusting environment between researchers and participants (Hopf, 2015). However, it remains challenging for researchers to highlight personal aspects of participants, without revealing information which eventually could lead to participants' identification. Therefore, researchers should remain aware and careful on presenting children's quotes, as they bear the responsibility to amplify and facilitate children's voice and agency, actively working against persisting marginalisation (Kousholt & Juhl, 2023). The protection of children's private data adheres to the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) law.

In doing research with children there is a further sensitive issue to address regarding the power dynamics between researchers and participants and the additional level between adults and children or at the educational environment the complex dynamics between educators and pupils. Researchers need to be aware of the power imbalances and aim to create respectful interaction and collaboration with the study's participants, adopting a non-authoritarian approach (Kousholt & Juhl, 2023). Children as citizens have their preferences, opinions and experiences and researchers' role is to perceive and capture their understandings and act as translators to communicate and implement them to the broader society and policy regulation. Adopting the interpretivism approach, which supports that every situation should be interpreted within its specific cultural and historical context (Al-Ababneh, 2020), children's perspectives are distinguished from adults, such as educators or parents and researchers bear the responsibility to recognise their situated knowledge and take this under consideration at the process of data interpretation (Bukamal, 2022).

Further exploring the role of researchers, despite the approach of a traditionally, distanced position, research with children aimed not at a neutral and objective representation, but rather to build a trusting environment, which enables open communication and produces knowledge by bridging existing power imbalances through confidentiality (Gurung, 2020) and acknowledgement of researchers' positionality (Al-Ababneh, 2020). Researchers employ an active role in the process of knowledge acquisition and transparency regarding their positionality that enhances credibility and trust (Bukamal, 2022). Each person is a unique constellation of factors combining demographic markers such as gender, origin, experiences, which shape their identity and affect their perspective. This should be taken into consideration in the research process (Bukamal, 2022), as every stage in



the research is being affected by researchers' background, which is called researcher's reflexivity (Von Unger, 2021). Self-reflexivity points out the connection between researchers and the research field, along with researcher's positions as an insider or outsider, which correspond also to potential limitations (Von Unger, 2021). This reflexive approach cultivates approachability, inviting children participants to express themselves freely (Mayorga-Gallo & Hordge-Freeman, 2017).

3 REFLECTIONS FROM THE RESEARCH FIELD

Among the nine countries participating in the study: Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Greece, Italy, Poland, Spain and Türkiye, only researchers in Finland did not face challenges and complex and long processes to obtain ethical clearance to conduct research with children at schools. In all other eight countries, the researchers had to follow many layers of administrative requirements to receive ethical approval. In the case of Türkiye, the Ministry of Education in the country did not approve the survey questions and the researchers were denied the access to schools to conduct the survey and the focus groups to secondary educational institutions. Specifically time demanding was to secure individual schools' collaboration, presenting here the example of Austria, where the necessary numbers of school institutions were five secondary schools. The researchers reached out to 112 schools in Vienna by email, they repeated the process and they continued with making phone calls to schools' directors or to their organisational assistants. That extended the data collection duration to one year from February 2023 to February 2024 in order to reach the number of 250 secondary students.

After the completion of the research process the researchers led an oral feedback with classroom teachers regarding the process and the majority expressed a positive attitude from their research experience. Some educators expressed difficulties in collecting signed parental informed consents. During the research process, the researchers asked teachers not to be present at the research process to reduce the power dynamics of teachers and students. However, there were teachers who wanted to be present during the data collection, even though they were not involved in the research process. Eventually, these teachers were unwilling to leave their class with individuals that the children did not know.

The researchers who visited the schools had either background on education or experiences in working with children or conducting research with children. Additionally, the research teams were selected to be as young as possible to reduce the power imbalances between adults and students. The survey approximately lasted 15 minutes and the focus group 30 minutes. The data collection tools were composed with the cooperation and collaboration of the entire group of researchers from



all participating research institutions and finalised after conducting pilot study in all participating countries.

Before the research began, researchers using age-appropriate language introduced themselves and the project and explained the research project and the process of data collection, including the tools. School students expressed interest and enthusiasm to participate in the study overall. There were many students who wanted to participate but they did not have parental consent, so they were excluded. The researchers accompanied participants and answered every question they had about the study and the questionnaire.

The primary concern of researchers was to support participants to feel safe and comfortable, without feeling any pressure. Researchers were aware of noticing any signs of discomfort especially among younger participants. There was a case of a 12-years-old boy who exhibited signs of possible stress with flushed cheeks when he received the survey: *The researchers approached the boy and kindly said to the boy that the survey is not a test, it aims to understand his preferences. So there are no correct and false answers. Also, the researchers told him that he can skip any question he does not feel comfortable to answer and if he wants he can give it a try, if he does not want, he is not obliged to make the survey, he can stop anytime and that it is completely fine. The boy decided to try to make the survey and completed it without any challenge.*

Especially, during focus groups the majority of participants at the beginning of the study displayed reservedness, which is expected when children are among individuals they are not familiar with. To enable the feeling of a safer environment students were seated in a circle and there were offered small treats and snacks to help them feel comfortable and communicate. The groups had a small number of students five to eight and consisted of students from the same class or groups of friends to convey interaction.

To enable higher levels of interaction for children and young people, there were not only oral answers; some questions requiring written responses were through play and creativity, for example, asking children to create a poster or a map as a group. All participants received a “thank you” small gift such as candy, cookies, pens, pencils or cinema tickets.

A challenging issue was the privacy protection of children’s data collection. The first level was in the survey, as some institutions selected to collect the data online to make the process quicker and simpler. The online tools used were approved by the collaborating universities and adhere to GDPR regulation of data protection. Others followed a more conservative approach where children’s responses were collected manually in printed form and then manually again the researchers had to enter all data in the system. This happened in order to protect children’s personal data, aiming for the maximum security measures. Likewise, in focus groups some research institutions used online



tools for recording and transcription, while others offline applications. Offline tools offered less quality support in the analysis, so to ensure the quality and comprehensibility of the data, manual review of *all data* by the researchers was necessary.

4 AFTERTALKS: RESEARCHERS' FINAL REFLECTIONS

After the completion of the focus groups with children, 12 researchers from all countries provided their feedback regarding their experience with the research process. Researchers pointed out that they enjoyed the process a lot and their surprise of the interesting content children shared: "I think people always underestimate what children have to say" (Researcher 1). Researchers recognised children's intelligence: "I'm so happy when they say something so smart I didn't even think of" (Researcher 2) and participants' willingness to participate: "They were all really motivated to say something and to contribute in some way" (Researcher 11).

Overall researchers' impressions were positive regarding children's active participation: "The discussions were really flowing so good. They had so many things to say" (Researcher 12). Although researchers noticed that children were more reserved at first, during the interview they were more and more open, enabling interaction and an ongoing conversation: "I think most of them were maybe a little bit reserved in the beginning, but we got into nice conversations" (Researcher 2). To break the ice and encourage children to participate, researchers mentioned employing some *non verbal* strategies such as smiling, being kind: "I try to look nice and welcoming" (Researcher 2) and some verbal strategies such as filling the silences: "I tried to fill the silences a little bit so it's not uncomfortable for them to sit and no one's talking" (Researcher 2) and repeating or emphasising important information or questions: "So maybe repeat the question or specify what we are looking for in their answers" (Researcher 1). Additionally, the researchers discussed the topic of using age-appropriate language with children, selecting words over others.

Furthermore, researchers emphasised that they aimed to approach children as equals: "just talk to them, as if not as a researcher, but as a human with them so they feel like they can open up" (Researcher 1). Researcher 3 mentioned that another factor that created a friendly environment for children to open up was the set up of the room: "It was nice that we were not in a row, but we were in a circle, and they had something like a snack, or they were sitting next to their friends, so that made them feel more comfortable and I think we were not like teachers, we were not strict" (Researcher 3). Other researchers also mentioned that they managed to address power asymmetries as much as possible, presented in the following dialogue:



- *“Researcher 4: At the beginning I was a bit nervous about the dynamics. But I actually found it very pleasant.*
- *Researcher 6: Yeah, there was no hierarchy. There was no dominance on our side. It was just a conversation.*
- *Researcher 5: Yes, exactly. I had the same feeling that we had a friendly conversation. It was very comfortable and pleasant for them.”*

A further example of balancing power relationships could be described by the following incident, which describes the different role and relationship between teachers and students compared to researchers and students:

In the first class, during the survey there was a child that was feeling uncomfortable. He started turning red and he said, do we have to do it or is it optional? Yeah. And the teacher said, no, you have to do it. So then I said: ‘no, you do it only if you want to’. ‘And you can start with it and you can leave it anytime you want’. For me, that was very uncomfortable because we are coming to a school not as teachers. This is not a test. This is something that children do because they like it and they have fun and they choose to do it”. (Researcher 12)

At the same time, researchers discussed the group dynamics, as some children feel more comfortable sharing among their peers, while others are more open in personal interviews: “It would be really interesting to also have an one-on-one with each child, so we could get more out of them, because I feel like this girl that was sitting here, she probably would have a lot of things to say, but I don’t think she was that comfortable now sharing it with the group” (Researcher 1). Although researchers tried to include with their questions all participants, some participants had a more active role than others due to their personality, as indicated from the following dialogue:

- *“Researcher 3: And then in the first focus group, I would say children were more loud, because of their personalities. They are loud children, and they felt quicker, more comfortable.*
- *Researcher 2: They were talking to each other. Yeah. They were interrupting each other.*
- *Researcher 1: They were more spontaneous. Yeah. The second group of children, I would say they were more quiet, more focused.*
- *Researcher 3: But I think that you both tried to engage everyone, and the fact that the first group were more noisy, I think it is part of they felt comfortable, and it was a very big difference between in the class with the teacher and then with us. They felt different. They felt they could be more themselves.*



On the other hand, researchers also referred to groups with more introverted personalities: “we tried to engage them and make them comfortable. But maybe they were insecure or shy. Just shy people” (Researcher 8).

Another key factor, which influenced the group interaction is whether participants know each other. Focus groups in which children were friends were characterised by researchers that they had “better harmony” (Researcher 5), while groups where students did not know each other characterised as “not having a good dynamic” (Researcher 7): “I feel like they didn’t know each other very well. And they were not really comfortable with each other. I don’t think they were friends” (Researcher 7).

Researcher 10 also explained that children from the same class had a better interaction among them, compared to groups consisted by students from different classes or more effort was required to engage and include students from other classes:

“I think it was difficult because in both groups, the class distribution was not even. There were always four of one class and two of another. And it was very visible that the two from the other class did not talk as much because I felt like they didn’t feel that comfortable. But in the second group, I felt it was better because the four people in the other class engaged them more and said: ‘you should say something’”. (Researcher 10)

The third factor which impacted on children’s participation was whether they had few or many relevant experiences to the topic. Researcher 4, stated that in a group “everyone was very open and very active. And they had more experience” explaining that “I think because they are in the media field, they have a lot of interest”. The same point was highlighted by Researcher 2, mentioning that: *“But from the content, I think that the second group had more answers to give and they answered the questions more to the point compared to the first group. I also feel like they had more experience and more interest in the topic as well, like the person that said that he’s doing videos regularly.”*

A further discussion point was the feelings of the researchers during the conduction of the focus groups. Researchers shared that among other emotions, they also felt nervous: “I have to say I was nervous, because interacting with children is always very sensitive, and you don’t know how they will react” (Researcher 2). However, the researchers mentioned that the questions of the questionnaire were appropriate and interesting for the children.

Exceptionally, in one class some students expressed lack of interest to participate in the study despite parental consent. In this case, the children’s decision was respected: “in my class for the first time there were people that had their consent forms but said, ‘I’m not in the mood to do it right now’. Okay, it’s really the first time we hear something like that” (Researcher 10).

Finally, the researchers discussed the diversity of the participants’ answers and they commented that the responses were not expected:



"I have to say I was surprised. In my mind, young people watch Netflix, maybe blockbuster movies, but I feel like their answers were very diverse. They were all watching different stuff. But I think it was funny that both groups said that they like older movies better. I think that was really interesting" (Researcher 1).

5 CONCLUSION

Summarising the reflections from the research with children, it indicates that the level of complexity in doing research with children is higher compared to adults. Although children expressed enthusiasm and interest to participate in the research, the multilevel approvals that are required made it very difficult for researchers to secure cooperation and access to schools. Given the vulnerability of children and the power dynamics between adults and children as well as researchers and participants, researchers bear an additional responsibility to balance and reduce the power dynamics, recognising children's agency. To achieve this, researchers have to develop a sensitivity towards research participants and recognise them as research subjects and not objects.

The research process highlighted three factors that enable more active children's participation: when children are familiar to each other, when children have experiences with the topic of discussion and when children feel comfortable in the environment, they are better able to express themselves. Researchers during the research process with children need to be able to recognise non verbal signs of communication whether children feel nervous or uncomfortable and at the same time they need to be able to adapt on children's level of knowledge, comprehension and ways of expression, as they carry the responsibility of translating and convey their voice into adults' world at research and policy communication.

Finally, the researchers emphasised that children, despite their age, have very interesting and insightful opinions to share. This underscores the necessity to create space for their perspectives both within the European film industry and generally in research. Children are not citizens *in the making*, but they are *already* citizens. Along with other social and cultural fields, in the film industry children hold a primary role both as audiences but also as film professionals.

In conclusion, we outline five key points to observe and keep in mind in research involving children. Children in research are active contributors, whose impact may shape the public sphere, placing a particular responsibility on researchers: to approach children on an eye level, creating a friendly environment, which allows openness and trust; to diminish barriers by adopting child friendly language tailored to their developmental level; to respect children's rights and boundaries of



voluntary participation; to secure responsible management of children's personal data; and to responsibly translate and convey children's input to the adults' world.



REBOOT (www.thereboot-project.eu) has received funding from European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101094769.



REFERENCES

- Al-Ababneh, M. (2020). Linking ontology, epistemology and research methodology. *Science & Philosophy*, 8(1), 75-91.
- Alderson, P., & Morrow, V. (2020). *The ethics of research with children and young people: A practical handbook*. Sage Text. UK.
- Bukamal, H. (2022). Deconstructing insider-outsider researcher positionality. *British Journal of Special Education*, 49(3), 327-349.
- CRC. (1989). Convention on the rights of the child. *Treaty Series*, 1577(3), 1315.
- Gurung, L. (2020). Feminist Standpoint Theory: Conceptualization and Utility. Dhoulagiri: *Journal of Sociology & Anthropology*, 14, 1063115.
- Hopf, C. (2015). *Schriften zu Methodologie und Methoden qualitativer Sozialforschung: Herausgegeben von Wulf Hopf und Udo Kuckartz*. Springer-Verlag.
- Kousholt, D. (2016). Collaborative research with children: Exploring contradictory conditions of conduct of everyday life. In E. Schraube, & C. Hojholt (Eds.), *Psychology and the conduct of everyday life* (pp. 2413258). Routledge.
- Kousholt, D., & Juhl, P. (2023). Addressing ethical dilemmas in research with young children and families. Situated ethics in collaborative research. *Human Arenas*, 6(3), 560-579.
- Larcher, V. (2025). Children are not small adults: Significance of biological and cognitive development in medical practice. In *Handbook of the philosophy of medicine* (pp. 435-457). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- Lansdown, G. (1994). *Children's rights: Are we really respecting them?*. Educational and Child Psychology.
- Mayorga-Gallo, S., & Hordge-Freeman, E. (2017). Between marginality and privilege: Gaining access and navigating the field in multiethnic settings. *Qualitative Research*, 17(4), 377-394.
- Sarikakis, K., & Chatziefrimidou, A. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Privacy: The Urgent Need for Children's Media Literacy. *Revista Comunicando*, 14(1), e025003-e025003.



Sarikakis, K., Winter, L., & Chatziefrimidou, A. (2025). Children's legal consciousness: the thorny right to privacy in social media. *Information, Communication & Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2025.2531132>

Von Unger, H. (2021). Ethical reflexivity as research practice. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*, 46(2), 186-204.



REBOOT (www.thereboot-project.eu) has received funding from European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101094769.



Disclaimer

This document is part of the outputs of the *Reviving, Boosting, Optimising and Transforming European Film Competitiveness - REBOOT* project, which received funding from the Horizon Europe programme of the European Union under the Grant Agreement No. 101094769.

© 2026, REBOOT Consortium. All rights reserved. Licensed to the Horizon Europe under conditions.

Licence



This document is authorised under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY 4.0) unless otherwise noted. Reproduction and distribution of the material for research, educational or other non-/ commercial purposes is permitted without the authorisation of the rights holders, provided the source is properly acknowledged.

Please see: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Citation

Please cite this report as follows:

Sarikakis, K., & Chatziefraimidou, A. (2026). Reflection document on doing research with children and young people. The REBOOT project (Reviving, Boosting, Optimising and Transforming European Film Competitiveness – REBOOT), funded by the European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101094769. <https://10.5281/zenodo.18233152>

Contact

Website: www.thereboot-project.eu

Email: reboot.2023@univie.ac.at



REBOOT (www.thereboot-project.eu) has received funding from European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101094769.



REBOOT Contributors



universität
wien



ΕΛΙΑΜΕΠ
ELIAMEP



UNIVERSIDAD
COMPLUTENSE
MADRID



KADİR HAS
ÜNİVERSİTESİ

Erasmus
University
Rotterdam



UNIVERSITEIT
GENT

uc3m

Universidad Carlos III de Madrid
Instituto Universitario del Cine Español



Sant'Anna
School of Advanced Studies - Pisa



UNIVERSITÉ
CÔTE D'AZUR



JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO
UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ



UNIVERSITY
OF WARSAW



REBOOT (www.thereboot-project.eu) has received funding from European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101094769.

