

Guidelines for Co-Produced Research with Refugees and Other People with Lived Experience of Displacement

Discussion Draft

February 2023



About the guidelines

These guidelines seek to provide clear principles and strategies for individuals and organisations interested in undertaking, supporting or learning more about research that is co-produced with refugees and other people with lived experience of displacement. The guidelines are intended for researchers both with and without lived experience of displacement. They are also designed for stakeholders with an interest in co-produced research, such as universities, governments, donors, ethics review committees, NGOs, intergovernmental organisations, and community groups that may be involved in or impacted by the research.

These guidelines draw upon a thorough review of current evidence on co-produced research. They also are informed by the views and experience of a variety of stakeholders, including several refugee representatives, academic institutions, NGOs, intergovernmental organisations, and researchers with expertise in co-produced research. These stakeholders provided input into these guidelines through an international consultation process that included opportunities for written and oral feedback. Further detail about this consultation process, including the names of individuals and organisations who generously contributed to the development of these guidelines, can be found in the [Consultation Report](#).

Key Terms

What is co-produced research?

Co-produced research generally refers to research where researchers and those impacted by the research findings work in partnership as co-creators of knowledge. This partnership usually involves a commitment among researchers (including both those with and without lived experience of the topic) to share responsibility and decision-making power from the start to the end of the project. It is also normally action-oriented and focused on generating knowledge to inform social change.¹

For many researchers, co-produced research is understood as a research methodology which frames how the research is carried out. However, for some it goes beyond this, in that it ‘radically challenges who is an expert, what counts as knowledge and, therefore, by whom research questions and designs should be crafted’.² What is central to the ethos of co-produced research is that it actively prioritises the involvement of people with lived experiences of the topic, and it values their skills and capabilities.³ It also seeks to understand and redress power imbalances that exist in research and aims to implement a more democratic and inclusive approach to knowledge production.⁴

Co-produced research can be distinguished from more extractive research approaches where those who are impacted by research have little involvement in the design, analysis, or dissemination of the research.

Who are refugees and people with lived experience of displacement?

Refugees are defined under the 1951 Refugee Convention as persons who are outside their country of origin and are unable or unwilling to return due to a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of their race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion.⁵ Some other legal definitions have also extended the scope of refugee status to include additional circumstances, such as persons fleeing more generalised violence, conflict or other circumstances seriously disturbing public order.⁶ People with lived experience of displacement may include – in addition to current and former refugees – people who have encountered internal displacement, statelessness, trafficking, and/or displacement related to the impacts of disasters or climate change.⁷

Although this document uses terms such as refugees and displaced people, it is important to note that terms and labels such as these have embedded power structures which serve to include and exclude individuals and assign legal, political, and social status. These labels also can be dehumanising and homogenising. When undertaking co-produced research in practice, it is recommended that researchers and other stakeholders take an inclusive approach to co-production that recognises the agency and power of individuals to have authorship over their own labels, drawing on their unique identities and intersectional characteristics (such as race, sexual orientation, gender, ability, religion, age etc).

Benefits of Co-Produced Research

Co-produced research with refugees and other displaced people can produce several benefits for both the production of knowledge and understanding, and for stakeholders involved in or interested in the research.

Knowledge creation

Co-producing research with refugees and other displaced people can contribute to knowledge creation in a variety of ways. Researchers with lived experience of displacement may have unique access to information and networks central to the research project due to their unique and intersectional experiences, their linguistic capabilities, and their knowledge of local communities.⁸

Researchers with lived experience of displacement may also have a more nuanced understanding of relevant ethical issues and may be better situated to design research questions, undertake culturally appropriate forms of data collection and implement research findings.⁹ These skills and capabilities can lead to new and alternative ways of understanding and can contribute to a more democratic and inclusive form of research production.

Real-world impact and evaluation

Co-produced research with refugees and other displaced people has an increased potential for real-world impact due to its commitment to deep engagement with affected communities, its common focus on

social change and its perceived legitimacy among stakeholders.¹⁰ This approach can, for example, offer relevant guidance to local communities about needs and issues central to their lives. It can also lead to evidence-based advocacy and recommendations to governments and other stakeholders about the need for policy or institutional reform.

As research grounded in co-production seeks to be guided by and more accountable to communities impacted by the research, it also can lead to better dissemination of research findings and more thorough evaluation of the research impact.¹¹ This is often because researchers with lived experience of displacement often work with communities on the front line as agents of change.¹²

Skills development and collaboration

Co-produced research can benefit all researchers involved in the project. It can lead to the development and enhancement of skills and knowledge through practical experience and peer-to-peer training within the group. It can also empower researchers with lived experience and catalyse collaboration with diverse stakeholders invested in the research, including refugee-led initiatives, research institutes, NGOs, and others. This can in turn lead to prolonged engagement and new multi-stakeholder funding opportunities.¹³ It can also prompt institutional self-reflection for organisations to improve their relationship with refugees and other displaced people.

Key Principles

Co-produced research with refugees and other displaced people is guided by a set of principles that inform authentic collaboration and equitable power-sharing between the research team. The following principles draw from many other excellent resources (see Additional Resources below) but are summarised here.

Joint ownership

A central principle of co-produced research is that it is jointly owned and premised on a sense of shared responsibility.¹⁴ While this does not necessarily require that every researcher be involved in every decision and every element of the research project – most teams will still have some demarcated roles and responsibilities – it does mean that power relations are openly discussed, there are methods in place to enable collective control of key decisions and the balance of control is shifted towards those most directly concerned and affected.¹⁵

Inclusion and respect

Co-produced research actively seeks to bring together diverse perspectives and capabilities. It disrupts conventional understandings of academic expertise,¹⁶ and affords equal recognition and value to other forms of knowledge, such as experiential, relational, and localised knowledge. A key element of co-produced research is that everyone involved is respected as a knowledge producer, and that all voices to be listened to and taken seriously.¹⁷

Benefits for all involved

Often referred to as the principle of reciprocity, co-produced research aims to ensure that everyone involved in the research benefits in some way from the research. For members of the research team, this may involve financial remuneration, alongside other benefits such as access to new social and academic networks and the development of new skills through co-learning. Beyond this, co-produced research also aims to provide tangible benefits to the individuals and communities who participate in the research, ‘in forms determined by participants themselves’.¹⁸

Accessibility

For research to be inclusive, individuals and organisations must reflect upon and seek to overcome barriers that limit or discourage the involvement of individuals or communities in co-produced research. This includes creating culturally and physically safe research settings for all members of the research team. It also requires providing sufficient time for meaningful engagement, sharing information in culturally appropriate ways, and considering which language/s should be used for communication and publication. Beyond this, individuals and organisations should also review and address administrative barriers to ensure that institutional structures and policies facilitate inclusive co-production.

Ongoing ethics of care

Co-produced research is often impacted by real-world events and changing community interests. This can lead to unpredictable situations, including shifting levels of risk for researchers involved.¹⁹ A central principle of co-production is the need for continuous support for researchers and other stakeholders throughout the research project. This includes working proactively to prevent harm,²⁰ being adaptable in the research approaches taken, respecting confidentiality and anonymity when and where appropriate, and supporting researchers or stakeholders if they need to withdraw from the research at any time.²¹

Safety

Refugees and other displaced people can face serious repercussions to their own safety due to their involvement in research. This can range from stigmatisation and threats of violence to forced departure and physical harm.²² All researchers need to reflect upon the possible consequences of the research and devise appropriate strategies to safeguard against harmful effects.²³ This does not necessarily mean that the project will be risk-free. Rather, it requires that predictable risks are properly and regularly assessed, and appropriate action is taken with the free and informed consent of all researchers. This has consequences from inception through to and after dissemination.

Transparency and trust

Research grounded in co-production requires open dialogue and transparency for trusting relationships to form between all members of the research team. It is important that researchers invest time in one another, speak honestly about roles and challenges, and demonstrate cultural sensitivity to each other's experiences and needs.²⁴ This includes actively listening to one another and providing appropriate support where needed. Beyond this, trust also needs to be developed with the other institutions and stakeholders involved in the research.

Reflexivity

Reflexivity is an important principle of co-produced research. It requires researchers to both individually and collectively reflect upon the assumptions and motivations they bring to the research project. It also requires researchers to consciously consider how their intersecting identities and positions shape and influence their research choices and findings.²⁵

Reflective practice is particularly important in research relating to refugees and other displaced people given the ways research in this field has often occurred within political and social conditions that perpetuate uneven power relationships and privilege Eurocentric, colonial, upper-middle class, male, and heteronormative perspectives.²⁶ Reflective practice can help to recognise and dismantle these power asymmetries and privileges, and it can bring greater accountability to researchers.²⁷

Co-produced Research in Practice

In each stage of the process, there are many ethical questions and issues that arise when undertaking co-produced research with refugees and other displaced people. The questions and issues discussed below offer some guidance in relation to some of the more common issues. However, they are not intended to represent all the issues that may arise.

Is co-produced research the right approach?

Co-produced research with refugees and other displaced people can lead to numerous benefits for both the generation of knowledge and the various stakeholders involved in and impacted by the research. However, co-produced research may not be the best research approach to take in situations where:

- There is insufficient time, budget, and other resources to engage with communities meaningfully and ethically
- The research team does not have the necessary skills to undertake co-produced research
- Structural barriers relating to authorship limit the potential for equitable recognition of research contribution. (For example, student researchers may be restricted in the extent to which they can co-author with other researchers.)
- There is no identifiable need for the research or the risks of harm caused by the research outweigh the potential benefits.²⁸

In situations where co-produced research is considered not a suitable approach, researchers should consider what steps they may be able to take to overcome these barriers to co-production, and what alternative participatory approaches to research they can nevertheless undertake. Engaging refugees and other people with lived experience of displacement is not an all-or-nothing endeavour. Researchers and other stakeholders should also consider refugee-led research as another viable option.²⁹

Setting the research agenda

A central foundation for authentic co-produced research is *co-design*. This is where all persons involved jointly make decisions about the aims and focus of the research, and how these aims are to be achieved.³⁰ Some aspects of co-design include collectively determining which research questions to examine, how data will be gathered, and how roles and responsibilities will be assigned. It is at this stage of the project that applications for funding are also often sought.

Although the idea of co-design is relatively simple, its implementation in practice is rarely straightforward. At the time of agenda setting, relationships of trust have often not been established and power asymmetries among prospective researchers and other stakeholders are often more pronounced. Specific ethical challenges also often arise at the beginning of the project, such as the need to

weigh up the scope of initial stakeholder consultations with the likelihood that the project will be able to commence.

Navigating these ethical issues requires prospective researchers to engage in transparent dialogue with relevant individuals and organisations about the feasibility of the project and its prospective parameters, while retaining sufficient flexibility to allow for meaningful and ongoing involvement in co-design. Setting appropriate expectations for the project is also key at this stage. Undertaking sufficient background research to understand the context – and connecting with organisations led by refugees and other affected communities – are additional practical steps that can help facilitate ethical co-design from the onset.³¹

Recruitment

Making decisions as to who should be on the research team will ultimately depend on the aims of the research project and the skills required to accomplish those aims. It is important that researchers are recruited through fair and legitimate processes and that there are clear justifications for each appointment. While open and transparent recruitment methods are usually best practice, there may be situations where this is not feasible, such as in high-risk settings or where a direct appointment is ethically justified.

For open recruitment, it is common for advertisements to either require or give preference to researchers who are refugees or otherwise displaced. However, when taking this approach, consider the range of skills and expertise that these prospective researchers bring to the project. Simply recruiting researchers because they have

experience of displacement can be reductive or tokenistic without this broader recognition of skills and attributes.

An ongoing challenge in co-produced research is recruiting researchers who continue to experience marginalisation due to their age, gender and diversity and the contexts where they live. To help facilitate inclusion, consider how position descriptions may be drafted in ways that do not perpetuate structural disadvantage (such as by loosening formal requirements for university qualifications or visa requirements when these are not essential to the role). It is also beneficial to engage with a variety of local networks which may be better situated to share opportunities and can advise on how to create safe and welcoming spaces for these prospective applicants.

Recognition

It is ethically appropriate for all co-researchers to be properly and equitably recognised for their contributions to the research project. This is particularly important for refugees and other displaced people who have often been marginalised from research funding opportunities and are not as frequently remunerated for their research contributions as part of a regular employment position.

Inequities in recognition can negatively impact collaboration and trust among the researchers. These inequities can also cause further harm to individuals and communities impacted by the research through the perpetuation of structural disadvantage. This recognition has two key components: remuneration and authorship.

(a) Remuneration

When undertaking co-produced research, there may be several challenges to paying researchers who are refugees or otherwise displaced. For example, researchers may live in contexts where they do not have work or residency permits. Alternatively (or additionally), they may have difficulty receiving payment due to lack of access to bank accounts or financial services.

Given the risks that may be involved in receiving payment for work, it is important that researchers and institutions involved in the research are aware of these potential barriers. An open conversation should also take place prior to any payment being made to confirm:

- whether payment is considered appropriate by the intended recipient;
- whether any steps can be taken to mitigate risks that may arise from payment;
- if payment is agreed upon, which payment methods are most suitable for the researcher involved (taking into consideration processing fees); and
- whether another form of recognition or compensation for the work undertaken is preferred.

Additionally, it is important that all members of the research team, along with the organisations and institutions that support them, actively try to remove or mitigate some of the structural barriers and risks that may exist with regards to recognition and remuneration. This may include utilising alternate payment services, reforming institutional practices, and advocating for systemic change. Ensuring

payment is made in a timely manner is also an important element of fair and appropriate remuneration.

(b) Authorship

Another element of recognition that is often revisited at the time of dissemination is who should be named and identified as an author of the research output. While authoring customs differ across research disciplines and contexts, research authorship should be attributed fairly and should truthfully reflect the contributions made to the research project. These contributions could relate to the conception and design of the research, data acquisition and analysis, and/or the drafting of research findings, for example.

Where authorship and recognition can be complicated in co-produced research with refugees and other people with lived experience of displacement is in the need for anonymity. Although de-identification should not be assumed, researchers from displacement backgrounds often face ongoing risks to their own protection and there may be reasons why such researchers are unable to identify themselves in the research. In addition, the risk to the group to which the refugees or other displaced persons belong must also be factored into all decisions in this matter. On occasions anonymity may not be enough.

Decisions as to whether a researcher chooses to be identified in the research should be made by that researcher alone, with support and guidance offered by the research team. Where identification is not possible, the research team should consider other options, including providing an explanation in the research output/s as to how the research was produced and the barriers to authorship and recognition

that were experienced. Pseudonyms may also be useful to the extent that they may enable de-identified researchers to later claim credit for their contribution should their circumstances change.

Undertaking ethics review

Seeking institutional ethics approval is an increasingly common practice in research projects around the world. This review is often undertaken by university ethics committees when research projects involve academic or student researchers. However, institutional ethics review may also be undertaken by affected community organisations, donors, NGOs, governments, and other stakeholders.

Institutional ethics review processes play an important role in directing researchers to reflect upon the social and cultural implications of their work and to develop risk-management strategies prior to commencing research involving human participants. Yet, this does not mean that institutional ethics review processes guarantee ethical research.

Research has shown that institutional ethics review processes, particularly those conducted by universities, are not always familiar with research methods grounded in co-production and are not always well suited to undertake this review.³² Ethics committees may, for example, lack relevant expertise to properly consider community interests and may make inaccurate assumptions about the vulnerability or capacity of research team members and other research participants. Institutional review processes also usually assess ethical issues at a fixed moment in time, which is at odds with the realities of co-produced research, where researchers need to be ethically responsive and adaptable to shifting circumstances as they arise.

A further issue is that institutional ethics review processes often orient compliance and ethical accountability towards powerholders such as universities rather than those communities most affected by the research. To address these issues, researchers should invest time to help improve institutional ethics committees and inform them about co-produced research and its benefits.³³

Researchers should also consider what alternative and/or additional forms of ethics review could strengthen ethical accountability. This could include review processes conducted by organisations led by refugees and other displaced people (which may need to be financially supported)³⁴ or the formation of peer groups to discuss ethical issues and receive critical feedback.³⁵

Intellectual property, copyright, and data management

When undertaking co-produced research, it is important that all team members discuss openly the intellectual property, copyright and data management issues related to the research project. This includes determining where data arising from the research will be safely stored and who will retain copyright and control over the distribution (and re-distribution) of the research findings.

It is now increasingly common for universities and funding bodies to require researchers to prepare data management plans for the safeguarding of data and the ethical communication of research results. When co-developing data management plans, researchers should consider each of the key principles of co-produced research, particularly the principles of safety, joint-ownership, and accessibility. Researchers should also consider the copyright

implications of different publication types (such as books and academic journals) and consider open-access alternatives.

Knowledge sharing and support

One of the central aspects of co-produced research is that it brings together researchers with diverse skills and capabilities. This diversity in experience and knowledge creates opportunities for skills and knowledge sharing among the research team, or what has been labelled an ‘educative partnership’.³⁶ This knowledge sharing can, for example, focus on research or advocacy skills. Alternatively, it can enable team members to gain a deeper understanding of local contexts and networks.

Beyond the training itself, skills sharing between researchers can build trust and lead to more sustainable partnerships among the team. It can also improve power asymmetries and contribute to effective joint decision-making. Alongside skills sharing, it is also important to provide emotional support within the research team, such as debriefing sessions when issues arise and access to external support where appropriate.

Reporting and disseminating the research

As co-produced research seeks in many cases to inform social change and contribute to more democratic forms of knowledge production, it is necessary that research teams consider how best to disseminate research findings and report on results. This includes considering who is best situated within the research team to influence social change. It also involves considering where to publish findings, in which mediums, and in which languages.

While academic research has traditionally been shared in books, journal articles and academic conferences, these mediums are not always accessible to affected communities, as well as researchers who are refugees or otherwise displaced. Instead (or in addition), it may be preferable to share research findings through more accessible mediums such as policy briefs, blogs, podcasts, explainer videos, reports, media releases or interactive workshops with relevant stakeholders.³⁷

Evaluating research impact

One of the biggest risks of undertaking co-produced research with refugees and other displaced people is that the research does not accomplish what it said it would achieve. This is particularly a concern for affected communities who contribute to research projects in good faith. However, it is also relevant to funding bodies, co-researchers, and other stakeholders. In all cases, this risk must be clearly set out before the research bid is made and then again before the actual research is undertaken. As discussed previously, setting expectations from the onset of the project is important in this regard.

Although research impact is often difficult to isolate and measure – given the range of factors which contribute to social change and the often-slow moving pace of reform – it is important that research teams invest time and resources to evaluating research impact over time. This evaluation should focus outwardly on how the research findings have informed or shaped practice, as well as inwardly on how the project has impacted the research team and other engaged stakeholders themselves.³⁸

Training Exercises

1. A donor has expressed interest in funding a co-produced research project involving refugee researchers with varying levels of experience from several different country contexts. While some of these contexts are high-income countries, others are lower and middle-income countries. Prior to committing funding, the donor would like to know how you plan to determine rates of pay among the research team? What ethical issues would you consider in making this decision?
2. You are part of a newly established research team that is interested in examining the barriers to employment experienced by refugee women in City X. From the onset, you are interested in co-designing this research with local stakeholders to ensure that the research is relevant to their needs and experiences. However, you have not yet obtained funding for the project. How would you approach contacting local stakeholders in this initial stage? What information would you need to share with them?
3. You are part of a small research team that only includes two male researchers. You are researching the political engagement of refugees in an area where community leaders are overwhelmingly male, and sex and gender-based violence and discrimination are known to occur. What steps should you take to address the gender dynamics of this research project?
4. You are undertaking a co-produced research project with several resettled refugees from Country Y. During the project, high levels of violence and persecution escalate in Country Y, causing significant stress and worry to your research colleagues. How would you best approach this issue as it arises?
5. You are participating in a multi-country research project where a team-member with current refugee status is responsible for collecting data from Country X. In this country, there are a few organisations that could bring unfavourable consequences to your team-member if they learned about their involvement in the research project. However, input from these organisations is vital for the research. Are there ways to gather data from these organisations without jeopardising the protection of your team member? What steps would you take to assess this risk and decide how best to proceed?
6. You have recently shared a preliminary draft of a research report for feedback from local community organisations. Several organisations are supportive of the report and its potential impact. However, one organisation expresses concern that it may adversely impact their work and potentially even cause risk to refugees and other displaced people in the community. How would you address this feedback? Would you respond differently if more respondents were concerned about the report?

Additional Resources

Asylum Access, [Building Equitable Partnerships: Shifting Power in Forced Displacement](#) (Asylum Access, 2021)

Atem Atem et al, [Ethics and community-based participatory research with people from refugee backgrounds](#) (UNSW Sydney, STARTTS NSW, Coventry University, Manchester Metropolitan University, 2021)

Caroline Lenette, *Participatory Action Research: Ethics and Decolonization* (Oxford University Press, 2022)

Katarzyna Grabska and Christina R Clark-Kazak (eds.), *Documenting Displacement: Questioning Methodological Boundaries in Forced Migration Research* (McGill-Queen's University Press, 2022)

International Association for the Study of Forced Migration, [Code of ethics: Critical reflections on research ethics in situations of forced migration](#) (IASFM, 2018)

Michelle Lokot and Caitlin Wake, [The co-production of research between academics, NGOs and communities in humanitarian response: A practice guide](#) (London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, 2021)

Refugee Studies Centre, [Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice](#) (2007) 26(3) *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 162

Danielle Roth et al, [When “we know nothing”: Recommendations for ethical research and learning with and for LGBTQI people in humanitarian settings](#) (New York: International Rescue Committee, 2021)

Iva Strnadová, Leanne Dowse and Chloe Watfern, [Doing Research Inclusively: Guidelines for Co-Producing Research with People with Disability](#) (DIIU UNSW Sydney, 2020)

Ulrike Krause, [Researching forced migration: critical reflections on research ethics during fieldwork](#) (RSC Working Paper 123, 2017)

Evidence Base

¹ Michelle Lokot and Caitlin Wake, *The co-production of research between academics, NGOs and communities in humanitarian response: A practice guide* (London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, 2021) 9.

² Michelle Fine and María Elena Torre, ‘Critical Participatory Action Research: A Feminist Project for Validity and Solidarity’ (2019) 43(4) *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 433, 435.

³ Caroline Lenette, *Participatory Action Research: Ethics and Decolonization* (Oxford University Press, 2022) 1-2.

⁴ Lindsey K Horner, *Co-constructing Research: A Critical Literature Review* (AHRC, 2016) 26, 28.

⁵ This definition is based on the international legal definition contained in the *1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees* (Refugee Convention), as modified by the *1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees*.

⁶ See, for example, *Organization of African Unity Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa*, opened for signature 10 September 1969, 1001 UNTS 45 (entered into force 20 June 1974) Art 1(2); also, *Cartagena Declaration on Refugees* (adopted by the Colloquium on the International Protection of Refugees in Central America, Mexico and Panama, 22 November 1984) in 'Annual Report of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights' (1984-85) OAS Doc OEA/Ser.L/V/II.66/doc.10, rev 1, 190–3.

⁷ For more on the legal frameworks and terminology issues that relate to these forms of displacement, see Guy S Goodwin Gill and Jane McAdam with Emma Dunlop, *The Refugee in International Law* (Oxford University Press, 4th ed, 2021) 636-704.

⁸ Jay M Marlowe et al, ‘Conducting post-disaster research with refugee background peer researchers and their communities’ (2015) 14(3) *Qualitative Social Work*, 383, 392-393.

⁹ B Heidi Ellis et al, ‘Ethical Research in Refugee Communities and the Use of Community Participatory Methods’ (2007) 44(3) *Transcultural Psychiatry* 451, 471; also, Kathryn Oliver, Anita Kothari and Nicholas Mays, ‘The dark side of coproduction: do the costs’ outweigh the benefits for health research?’ (2019) 17(33) *Health Research Policy and Systems* 1, 2.

¹⁰ On the latter point, see Richa Shivakoti and James Milner, ‘Beyond the partnership debate: Localizing knowledge production in refugee and forced migration studies’ (2022) 35(2) *Journal of Refugee Studies* 805, 817.

¹¹ Iva Strnadová, Leanne Dowse and Chloe Waffern, *Doing Research Inclusively: Guidelines for Co-Producing Research with People with Disability* (DIIU UNSW Sydney, 2020) 7.

¹² Michelle Lokot and Caitlin Wake, *The co-production of research between academics, NGOs and communities in humanitarian response: A practice guide* (London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, 2021) 11.

¹³ Susan Carter et al, *Co-production in African weather and climate services* (: Future Climate for Africa and Weather and Climate Information Services for Africa, 2021) 6.

¹⁴ Gary Hickey et al, *Guidance on co-producing a research project* (INVOLVE, 2018) 7.

¹⁵ Iva Strnadová, Leanne Dowse and Chloe Waffern, *Doing Research Inclusively: Guidelines for Co-Producing Research with People with Disability* (DIIU UNSW Sydney, 2020); also, Ann Dadich, Loretta Moore and Valsamma Eapen, ‘What does it mean to conduct participatory research with Indigenous peoples? A lexical review’ (2019) 19(1) *BMC Public Health* 1388, 2.

¹⁶ Ann Dadich, Loretta Moore and Valsamma Eapen, ‘What does it mean to conduct participatory research with Indigenous peoples? A lexical review’ (2019) 19(1) *BMC Public Health* 1388, 2.

¹⁷ Gary Hickey et al, *Guidance on co-producing a research project* (INVOLVE, 2018) 8; also, Tristan Harley, Najeeba Wazefadost and Suyeon Lee, ‘Not just a seat at the table: Refugee participation and the importance of listening’ (2022) 70 *Forced Migration Review* 25.

¹⁸ Eileen Pittaway, Linda Bartomolei and Richard Hugman, ‘“Stop Stealing Our Stories”: The Ethics of Research with Vulnerable Groups’ (2010) 2(2) *Journal of Human Rights Practice* 229, 234.

¹⁹ Matthew Flinders, Matthew Wood and Malaika Cunningham, ‘The Politics of Co-production: Risks, Limits and Pollution’ (2016) 12(2) *Evidence & Policy* 261, 266.

²⁰ Christina Clark-Kazak, ‘“Why Care Now” in Forced Migration Research? Imagining a Radical Feminist Ethics of Care’ (2023) *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* (forthcoming).

²¹ Caroline Lenette, *Participatory Action Research: Ethics and Decolonization* (Oxford University Press, 2022) 80.

²² Karen Jacobsen and Loren B Landau, 'The Dual Imperative in Refugee Research: Some Methodological and Ethical Considerations in Social Science Research on Forced Migration' (2003) 27(3) *Disasters* 185, 193.

²³ Refugee Studies Centre, 'Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice' (2007) 26(3) *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 162, 164.

²⁴ Kate Pincock and William Bakunzi, 'Power, Participation, and 'peer researchers': Addressing Gaps in Refugee Research Ethics Guidance' (2021) 34(2) *Journal of Refugee Studies* 2333, 2343.

²⁵ Kim V L England, 'Getting Personal: Reflexivity, Positionality, and Feminist Research' (1994) 45(1) *The Professional Geographer* 80; also, Caroline Lenette, 'Cultural Safety in Participatory Arts-Based Research: How Can We Do Better?' (2022) 3(1) *Journal of Participatory Research Methods* 1, 6.

²⁶ Caroline Lenette, 'Cultural Safety in Participatory Arts-Based Research: How Can We Do Better?' (2022) 3(1) *Journal of Participatory Research Methods* 1, 4. See also, Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, 'Recentring the South in Studies of Migration' (2020) 3(1) *Migration and Society: Advances in Research* 1, 2; also, E Tendayi Achiume, 'Race, Refugees and International Law' in Cathryn Costello, Michelle Foster and Jane McAdam (eds), *The Oxford Handbook on International Refugee Law* (Oxford University Press, 2021) 43.

²⁷ Gillie Bolton and Russell Delderfield, *Reflective Practice: Writing and Professional Development* (Sage, 5th ed, 2018) 4-5, 8.

²⁸ Ulrike Krause, *Researching forced migration: critical reflections on research ethics during fieldwork* (RSC Working Paper 123, 2017) 3.

²⁹ See, for example, the University of Oxford's Refugee-led Research Hub <<https://www.rsc.ox.ac.uk/research/refugee-led-research-hub>>.

³⁰ Iva Strnadová, Leanne Dowse and Chloe Watfern, *Doing Research Inclusively: Guidelines for Co-Producing Research with People with Disability* (DIIU UNSW Sydney, 2020) 11.

³¹ Danielle Roth et al, *When "we know nothing": Recommendations for ethical research and learning with and for LGBTQI people in humanitarian settings* (New York: International Rescue Committee, 2021) 9-12.

³² Catriona Mackenzie, Christopher McDowell and Eileen Pittaway, 'Beyond 'Do No Harm': The Challenge of Constructing Ethical Relationships in Ethical Research' (2007) 20(2) *Journal of Refugee Studies* 299, 300.

³³ Caroline Lenette, *Participatory Action Research: Ethics and Decolonization* (Oxford University Press, 2022) 89.

³⁴ This approach is more common in research involving Indigenous participants but is relatively underdeveloped in relation to refugees and other displaced people.

³⁵ See Ulrike Krause, *Researching forced migration: critical reflections on research ethics during fieldwork* (RSC Working Paper 123, 2017) 27.

³⁶ Lesley Wood, 'The Ethical Implications of Community-Based Research: A Call to Rethink Current Review Board Requirements' (2017) 16(1) *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 1.

³⁷ Nisha Thapliyal, 'Research with former refugees: Moving towards an ethics in practice' (2018) 60(2) *Australian Universities' Review* 49, 54. In relation to interactive workshops, see Caroline Lenette, *Participatory Action Research: Ethics and Decolonization* (Oxford University Press, 2022) 120.

³⁸ Gary Hickey et al, *Guidance on co-producing a research project* (INVOLVE, 2018) 13.