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INTRODUCTION

Disadvantaged, vulnerable and/or marginalized adolescents (DVMAs) are individuals aged 10–19, who are excluded from social, economic and/or educational opportunities enjoyed by other adolescents in their community due to numerous factors beyond their control. These include factors at the social level (such as economic inequality, violence, stigma, racism, migration), family level (including neglect and abuse) and individual level (e.g. disability, ethnicity).

DVMAs include adolescents who are immigrants or refugees; sexual minorities; orphans; incarcerated; those who have run away or been turned out of their homes following neglect and/or abuse; those who are trafficked; and those who belong to a stigmatized indigenous, ethnic, tribal or religious groups.

Though gender plays an important role within each of these categories and for the group as a whole, in this brief we do not treat all girls and young women as DVMAs.

As a result of their social exclusion, DVMAs suffer from health inequities, or avoidable inequalities in their health and well-being compared to the well-being of other adolescents. Research is needed to inform ways to address these inequities.

When carrying out research with DVMAs it is necessary to address not only the obstacles to research with adolescents overall (see Brief 3 in this series, “Inclusion with Protection: Obtaining informed...”
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Produced by the UNICEF Office of Research, this series of briefs on research methods is intended to share contemporary research practice, methods, designs, and recommendations from renowned researchers and evaluators. The primary audience are professionals, including UNICEF staff, who conduct, commission or interpret research and evaluation findings in development contexts to make decisions about programming, policy and advocacy.
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In this brief, we:

- summarize the health and well-being inequities experienced by DVMAs and the need for research with this group
- review the challenges and barriers to their inclusion in research
- share practical implications and best practices for their inclusion in research that will promote their well-being
- address the ethical challenges and approaches to research with DVMAs.

Box 1. Summary of key points

1. Disadvantaged, vulnerable and/or marginalized adolescents (DVMAs) include individuals aged 10–19 who are excluded from social, economic and/or educational opportunities relative to other adolescents in their community through factors beyond their control. As a result of their social exclusion, they suffer from avoidable inequalities in their health and well-being relative to the well-being of other adolescents. Research is needed to inform ways to address these inequalities.

2. There are additional challenges to research with DVMAs beyond the usual challenges to conducting research with adolescents as a whole.

3. Best practices for greater inclusion of DVMAs in research include:
   - employing community-based participatory approaches with adolescents whenever possible and methods that are developmentally appropriate and inclusive
   - prioritizing sex-aggregated sampling of marginalized adolescents (aged 10–19) for national surveys
   - sampling DVMAs by employing approaches that maximize representativeness of the sample and using validated methods to count and characterize the sub-populations of DVMAs
   - including contextual variables and measurements of the social determinants of health and well-being
   - implementing longitudinal studies when possible
   - disseminating findings to maximize the benefit of the research to adolescents.

4. Exclusion from research is harmful to DVMAs. Guidelines for the ethical inclusion of DVMAs are proposed that simultaneously prioritize inclusion in data collection and benefit to participants, as well as protection from potential risks.
BACKGROUND: HEALTH AND WELL-BEING INEQUITIES EXPERIENCED BY DVMAs

In 2016 the Lancet Commission on Adolescent Health and Well-being described the factors that determine lifetime well-being as follows: ‘During adolescence, an individual acquires the physical, cognitive, emotional, social, and economic resources that are the foundation for later life health and wellbeing. These same resources define trajectories into the next generation.’ These factors include the social determinants of health and well-being, or ‘the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work, and age’.

According to the World Health Organization (WHO), health inequities are avoidable inequalities in health outcomes or in determinants of health between groups of people within countries and between countries. DVMAs bear a disproportionate burden of the negative social determinants of health and well-being, such as adverse childhood events, poverty, malnutrition and exposure to violence or discrimination. As a consequence, they suffer not only from inequities in morbidity and mortality, but also from greater obstacles to their well-being and a successful transition to adulthood.

An example of this is the difference in prevalence of early marriage (a social determinant of health and well-being) by ethnic group in Vietnam, illustrated in Box 2.

---

Box 2. Early marriage inequities in Vietnam

The Kinh–Chinese are the ethnic majority in Vietnam. There are over 50 recognized ethnic minorities in Vietnam, most notably the hill tribes, who are disproportionately impacted by stigma and poverty. These data illustrate the differences in early marriage, a social determinant of health and well-being, by ethnic status. In the survey assessment of Vietnamese adolescents administered by the WHO and UNICEF, 17 per cent of respondents overall aged 14–25 were ever married. However, there were great differences between Kinh–Chinese and ethnic minority respondents: 9 per cent of Kinh–Chinese males but 25 per cent of ethnic minority males were or had ever married; similarly, 19 per cent of Kinh–Viet females but 37 per cent of ethnic minority females were or had ever been married.


---

3 Patton et al., ‘Our Future’.
CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS TO CONDUCTING RESEARCH WITH DVMAS

Though there is a growing interest in conducting research and collecting data on adolescents and specifically DVMAs, conducting such research successfully can be challenging. We will review three challenges to conducting robust research with DVMAs:

- the inadequate existing baseline data on DVMAs in most LMICs
- the challenges to recruiting adolescents and obtaining a representative sample of DVMAs
- the use of developmentally inappropriate approaches to research and interventions.

The ethical challenges specific to undertaking research with DVMAs and the practical implications of how they should be approached are discussed below.

Inadequate existing baseline data on DVMAs in most LMICs

The first challenge to conducting robust research is that there is a profound lack of robust, age- and sex-disaggregated data on DVMAs globally. This includes data on the size and characteristics of sub-populations of DVMAs, primarily because they are often not included or identified in national census data, household surveys, education surveys and/or ministry of health surveys. For example, adolescents who are incarcerated are unlikely to be included in such surveys. Similarly, adolescents who are out of school are unlikely to get picked up in school-based surveys like HBSC and GSHS, which are an important source of information about this age group for decision-makers. The lack of inclusion of DVMAs in current data systems is an example of under-coverage bias. In addition, even if surveyed, DVMAs may not disclose their status or involvement in risk behaviours leading to an under-reporting bias. Without such data, policymakers and providers are less likely to identify and prioritize the needs of DVMAs in the context of the more well-documented needs of other populations.

A corollary to the lack of data is the lack of data on contextual variables, resiliency outcomes, positive developmental outcomes (such as educational or vocational outcomes vs risk outcomes) and/or data to document the effects of potentially modifiable social determinants on the health and well-being of DVMAs. Research on DVMAs to date has generally focused on individual-level variables, thus leading to systematic blindness to the role of modifiable factors that are amenable to change through policy, funding or other means (and which are generally beyond the control of affected adolescents). For example, research on young members of a stigmatized ethnic group is more likely to document their risk behaviours and negative outcomes rather than the stigma or laws that lead to marginalization, lack of opportunity, increased risk and inability to meet young adult milestones. Such a focus on individual-level variables too often ‘blames the victim’ for their situation and leads to further stigma of marginalized populations. (See Box 3 for a discussion of types of variables in research.) For more on the measurement on the social determinants of health, see Brief 6 in this series, ‘How to Measure Enabling and Supportive Systems for Adolescent Health’.

---

7 HBSC stands for Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children. This cross-national survey of school students in 45 countries collects data on 11-, 13- and 15-year old adolescents’ health, well-being, social environment and health behaviours. See: <http://www.hbsc.org/about/index.html>

GSHS stands for Global School-Based Student Health Survey. It surveys adolescents aged 13-17 from over 100 countries in 10 key areas, to assess behavioral and risk factors. See: <http://www.who.int/chp/gshs/en/>
Box 3. Why variables matter: ‘individual-level’ vs ‘contextual’ variables, and ‘risk factors’ vs ‘protective factors’

Research has often focused on individual-level variables – the characteristics of individuals (e.g. their age, race or ethnicity, religion or housing status) to explain their health (e.g. rates of sexually transmitted diseases) or well-being (e.g. their hopes for the future). Though useful for pointing out disparities or differences in outcomes, they can only point to the characteristics of individuals as the causes of their poor outcomes (e.g. the higher rates of sexually transmitted infections are due to an adolescent’s membership in an ethnic minority or because they are living on the street). This carries the risk of increasing stigma and offers little information on how to intervene to improve the outcome of affected adolescents.

Contextual-level variables focus on factors beyond the individual that may affect their health or well-being. These might include availability of healthy food, experiences of discrimination in a community, incarceration, neighbourhood poverty, access to free education or presence of a mentor. By including these variables in research, one opens the opportunity to understand how differential exposure to these positive and negative contextual factors may not only explain differences on outcomes for DVMAs, but also provide clues to interventions.

Similarly, by choosing to study protective factors (such as positive role models) as well as risk factors (such as violent environments), researchers can develop interventions that not only minimize risk, but also promote protection against negative outcomes.

Challenges to recruiting adolescents and obtaining a representative sample of DVMAs

The second challenge to conducting robust research is that there are important challenges to obtaining a representative and generalizable sample of DVMAs. It is difficult to obtain a representative sample of adolescents because there is no global consensus on which groups or individuals should be treated as DVMAs. The use of varying, non-standardized definitions of who is a member of a specific marginalized population affects our ability to compare findings between studies or to assess to whom the findings of a study apply. An even greater challenge to obtaining a representative sample of adolescents is that young people often avoid the services and/or authorities entrusted with their care and well-being because of their concerns of stigma, lack of identification with stigmatized sub-groups, past negative experiences, lack of confidentiality and cost. This avoidance, along with the high degree of mobility common to DVMA populations, renders them particularly hard to engage in activities related to services and data collection.

The way that data on adolescents are collected is also often a barrier to obtaining a representative sample of DVMAs. School-based surveys do not collect information on adolescents who are out of school and household surveys and censuses are unlikely to include information on those who live on the street, in institutions or other situations outside households. The groups that are exclude from these surveys are often made up of individuals who are disadvantaged, vulnerable and/or marginalized, resulting in a dearth of valid and representative information about this population.

This points to an important limitation to the generalizability of most current data on DVMAs. Because of the hidden nature of DVMAs, the vast majority of studies consists of small cross-sectional studies of convenience samples of adolescents recruited from health or social service programmes. However, these studies thus systematically exclude individuals who are not able or willing to access those programmes. Thus these studies, though informative on adolescents who do access services, cannot be generalized to the entire DVMA population.

Use of inappropriate approaches to research and interventions

The third challenge to conducting robust research is the need for a developmentally appropriate, trauma-informed and culturally appropriate approach to research with DVMAs (as described also in Brief 6 in this series, ‘How to Measure Enabling and Supportive Systems for Adolescent Health’). Research approaches or interventions need to be tailored to the specific needs of DVMAs. Too often, approaches, measures or interventions designed for disadvantaged, marginalized and/or vulnerable adults or, equally inappropriately, for young children under the age of 10, are applied to DVMAs with little or no adaptation. This is particularly true of approaches to consent for marginalized adolescents. See Brief 3 in this series, ‘Inclusion with Protection: Obtaining informed consent when conducting research with adolescents’, and the section here on ‘Ethical issues’.
PRACTICAL GUIDELINES FOR INCLUDING DVMAs IN RESEARCH

In this section we provide a researcher’s guide to promoting the health and well-being of DVMAs. With the challenges and barriers to conducting research with DVMAs discussed above in mind, we review best practices to improve inclusion of DVMAs in research. Though our focus is on best practices, these are intended as guiding principles and should not discourage more limited forays into data collection with and about DVMAs, as long as they follow ethical guidelines.

**Use community-based participatory research approaches**

Whenever possible, use community-based participatory research approaches. Adolescents, and perhaps particularly DVMAs, are too often relegated to the role of passive participants in research – to the detriment of researchers and adolescents alike. Researchers should start by engaging DVMAs as partners in the research design process to elicit their concerns and priorities. Together, researchers and DVMA partners can then develop research questions that will be relevant to adolescents’ experiences and select appropriate approaches, methods and tools to answer their questions, intervene and/or evaluate. See Brief 5 in this series, ‘Adolescent Participation in Research: Innovation, rationale and next steps’, for more considerations and details.

**Integrate local advocates and researchers in the design and implementation of research**

The inclusion of local advocates and investigators who have a deep understanding of the local contexts and issues will increase the likelihood of the research question being relevant, of the research implementation being ethically and culturally appropriate, and of the interpretation of data and conclusions being sound.

**Include questions that address modifiable structural factors**

Research is more likely to improve the successful transition to adulthood of DVMAs if it addresses modifiable contextual variables as well as protective factors. See Box 3 above for further discussion of this best practice.

**Include sex-disaggregated samples of DVMAs**

Include data about adolescents, including DVMAs, in national and regional data collection efforts, as the Lancet Commission recommended in 2016. Disaggregate data and findings by sex and age (ages 10-14; ages 15-19). Include DVMAs and their health, social and economic inequities in planning national efforts to meet the Sustainable Development Goals.

**Maximize representativeness**

Sample DVMAs using approaches that maximize representativeness. Recruitment of a representative sample from a largely hidden and marginalized population is compromised by the inability to recruit a truly random sample from a list of the members of the target population (e.g. it is impossible to generate a comprehensive list of adolescents who have been trafficked). Because the members of DVMA populations cannot be sampled from a representative list, researchers have traditionally studied convenience samples of adolescents recruited from service settings, such as shelters or clinics dealing with sexually transmitted infections. However, as discussed above, samples of service-based adolescents generally comprise a lower-risk sub-sample of the larger DVMA population. Appropriate sampling and a clear understanding of the limitations of any approach can improve the generalizability and validity of data and their usefulness for informing policy and planning.

Table 1 lists several approaches to sampling DVMAs, with their strengths and weakness. Choosing the sampling approach for an individual study depends on available options and resources, the characteristics of the target population, and careful formative research and planning to ensure that the chosen method is feasible, acceptable and effective. (See UNICEF’s brief on data collection and analysis methods in impact evaluation for a general discussion of sampling approaches.) Such non-probability sampling approaches have also been employed widely by governmental authorities charged with HIV surveillance, which may themselves have sampled DVMAs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling method</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Convenience             | Based on the recruitment of DVMAs who are easy to reach, often those who are accessing services. Examples are studies that recruit street-based adolescents from shelters or drop-in centres, or sex workers from clinics for sexually transmitted diseases.                                                                                                                                   | • Readily available  
• Cost-effective  
• May be able to build on relationships with providers                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | • Non-probability sample  
• Results biased towards adolescents who access services (often lower risk); not representative of those who do not  
• Limitations of this commonly employed approach are often overlooked  
• The probability of selecting a member of the population of interest is unknown  
• Labour intensive  
• May require difficult hours of operation  
• Safety of staff and of population may be an issue, depending on venues |
| Purposive               | A non-probability sampling method based on the recruitment of participants with specific characteristics within a population.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | • Can be used to ensure the inclusion of all sub-sets of a population if the characteristics of the population are well known                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | • The probability of selecting a member of the population of interest is unknown  
• May introduce a systematic bias                                                                 |
| Targeted venue-based    | Based on sampling DVMAs from venues or places where they live, work or socialize. Formative research using qualitative and/or quantitative data to construct a list of sites where adolescents may be found and recruited.                                                                                                                                                    | • Target population is visible  
• High-quality formative research can maximize validity  
• Can ensure inclusion of sub-groups through selection of venues where members of sub-groups spend time  
• Can be effective for sampling highly mobile populations  
• Can adjust sampling in response to information in the field  
• Can be paired with outreach interventions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | • Non-probability sample  
• Sampling may be biased and difficult to replicate  
• Sampling of venues may not represent the proportion of adolescents from that venue in the target population of interest; the sample may not be representative  
• Leaves out those who do not attend venues  
• Over-represents frequent venue-goers  
• The probability of selecting a member of the population of interest is unknown  
• Labour intensive  
• May require difficult hours of operation  
• Safety of staff and of population may be an issue, depending on venues |

### Sampling method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Time location   | A variant of targeted venue-based sampling that approximates a random sample by employing a comprehensive list of venues, and includes days of the week and time periods to create venue, day and time (VDT) periods. Investigators then conduct random selection of VDTs, followed by systematic counting, approaching, consenting and recruiting of eligible adolescents who attend at the venue. | • All advantages listed for venue sampling above  
• The probability of selecting a member of the population of interest can be calculated – approximates a probability sample  
• Statistical methods are available to produce unbiased estimates | • Leaves out those who do not attend venues  
• Over-represents frequent venue-goers  
• Hard to statistically adjust  
• Labour intensive  
• May require difficult hours of operation  
• Safety of staff and of population may be an issue, depending on venues |
| Snowball        | Based on sampling people through their social connections or networks. Initial adolescents recruited by research staff are requested to recruit eligible participants who may be from their social contacts to refer them to the study for participation. Snowball sampling is particularly useful for recruiting DVMAs who are hard to reach but tend to know each other, such as adolescents involved in street-based sex work. | • Targets hidden population  
• May be the best available option for some populations  
• May be faster and less expensive than locating and recruiting people with research staff  
• Peers know each other better than researchers  
• Peer recruiters can also recruit people for interventions | • Non-probability sample  
• Biased towards the socially well connected; leaves out the socially isolated  
• The probability of selecting a member of the population of interest is unknown  
• There is no statistical method to produce unbiased estimates |
| Respondent-driven* | Respondent-driven sampling (RDS) is a modified form of network sampling. To recruit a respondent-driven sample, eight to ten ‘seeds’ are recruited from the target population, based on initial formative research. After study data collection, seeds are given coded tickets to distribute to eligible individuals from their social network. Their network contacts then come to the study site, contribute their data, and are in turn given tickets to distribute. Individuals are reimbursed for their own participation and further reimbursed if those they recruit are enrolled (secondary reimbursement). Participants report the size of their network and their relationship to the individual who referred them to the study. With mathematical modelling software available freely online (the RDS analysis tool, or RDSAT), data are used to estimate the characteristics of the population of interest. | • All advantages of snowball sampling  
• Probability of selecting a member of the population of interest can be calculated; it approximates a probability sample  
• Statistical methods available to produce unbiased estimates  
• High-quality formative research can maximize validity | • Inaccurate estimates in communities with sub-networks  
• Bias towards the socially well connected; leaves out the socially isolated  
• Statistics for analysis difficult and debated  
• Findings sometimes inconsistent with qualitative research  
• Theoretical assumptions hard to meet and to verify  
• Sometimes peers fail to recruit others and so RDS fails  
• Secondary incentives may be coercive or commoditized |

Use appropriate approaches to count and characterize populations of DVMAs

If DVMAs are counted, they will be more likely to be visible to policy-makers who are then more likely to consider their needs. Population size estimation and characterization can promote inclusion of DVMAs in national research and policy efforts. Though there is currently no gold standard method for counting DVMAs, a number of methods have been proposed and tested. We briefly review some of these in Table 2.

Table 2. Approaches to counting and characterizing DVMAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Possible biases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capture–recapture*</td>
<td>DVMAs are surveyed initially and ‘tagged’ in some way (perhaps by being given a small token). The DVMA population is then resurveyed later, when participants are asked if they participated or were tagged during the earlier survey. The size of the population in each survey and the size of the overlap provide the basis to estimate the total population size.</td>
<td>• Scientifically rigorous and well-developed methods for analysis</td>
<td>• Four assumptions that are hard to meet: required matching individuals captured on both surveys, closed population (no significant in or out migration), each individual has the same chance of being included, independent rounds</td>
<td>• If the two data sources are correlated, the counts will be underestimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key informant estimates</td>
<td>The target area for which the populations of DVMAs are being counted is divided into zones. Key informants are then asked about the hotspots, size and typology of DVMAs at every hotspot within zones.</td>
<td>• Easy to implement</td>
<td>• Requires well-defined and tangible zones</td>
<td>• Biased towards key informant's perspective and area of work and expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping and enumeration**</td>
<td>A comprehensive list of venues where DVMAs meet or work is generated through qualitative interviews with key informants (service providers, DVMA activists, non-government organization (NGO) staff, police, taxi and bus drivers, and DVMAs themselves). Direct observation, counting and/or surveys are carried out at the identified adolescent-serving venues.</td>
<td>• Tend to produce robust estimates</td>
<td>• Mobility, duplication and absence of the DVMAs at the hotspots or venues may produce over- or underestimated counting</td>
<td>• Under-reporting as only able to count the visible part of the DVMA population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
<td>Possible biases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier methods***</td>
<td>Similar to capture-recapture (see above), multiplier methods employ two sources of data of which at least one represents the target DVMA population. Two variations are service multiplier and unique object multiplier methods. In both, the total number of DVMA who received the service or a unique object at a certain period, and the proportion of DVMA in the subsequent survey who report using such services or receiving the unique object, are used to estimate the DVMA population size.</td>
<td>• Can be easily integrated in surveys of DVMA.</td>
<td>• Highly dependent on availability and quality of data collected for other purposes</td>
<td>• If the two data sources are correlated, the counts will be underestimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network**** and/or RDS-based</td>
<td>Use of the ordered sequence of observed social network sizes of participants in an RDS survey to produce a population size estimate.</td>
<td>• At no additional cost or time, RDS data can be used for estimation of population size</td>
<td>• Requires specific software to analyze</td>
<td>• Overestimation and underestimation are possible; both are hard to investigate or validate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network scale-up*****</td>
<td>Members of the general population (not necessarily DVMA themselves) are asked about the overall numbers of members in their overall network and the numbers of DVMA they know in their networks. If a large, representative number of people in a community is asked this question, the collective information can provide a robust estimate of the DVMA population size as a whole.</td>
<td>• Do not require a study of DVMA themselves.</td>
<td>• Hard to define what you mean by ‘know’ a friend</td>
<td>• Transmission error: people do not tell others they are DVMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom of the crowd</td>
<td>This method assumes that, in aggregate, the responses of a sufficient quantity of DVMA on their numbers will provide a good estimate of the actual number of their population.</td>
<td>• Easy to implement</td>
<td>• Participant may have difficulty in understanding the question and giving a rational estimate</td>
<td>• Can produce both low and very high estimates depending on the understanding and perspective of the respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use triangulation or mixed methods research

If it is not possible to recruit a representative sample of DVMAs for a study, collecting data employing triangulation or mixed methods research can increase the validity of the findings. Triangulation of data is the use of multiple sources of data or multiple points of view in order to answer a question when a gold standard method of research is not available, thereby increasing the validity of the findings. For example, in order to understand the experience of adolescents who are immigrants in the school environment, one could conduct interviews with immigrant students. However, the picture would likely be more complete if one complemented those interviews with other sources of data. These might include holding interviews with immigrant students who have dropped out of school and with parents of immigrant students, observing the school environment, and collecting data on attendance and rates of detention of adolescents in the school. An example of triangulation of data is presented in Box 4: a case study on how to count the number of street children in Tehran.

Mixed methods research entails collecting and analysing quantitative and qualitative data together in a single study. It offers the advantage of not only answering questions on who faces – or the numbers facing – an inequity when studying inequities employing quantitative data, but also exploring why inequities exist or the reasons for unexpected findings through qualitative research.

Box 4. Case study: counting street-based adolescents in Tehran

Researchers in Tehran, Iran, in collaboration with UNICEF, the University of California at San Francisco and the San Francisco Department of Public Health, are employing multiple methods to estimate the size of the population of street-based adolescents.*

1. Employing multiplier methods, the investigators employed service provider data and data from a modified time location sampling survey together to estimate the size of the population of street-based adolescents in Tehran. Service providers who collect unduplicated data on street-based adolescents under their care (e.g. social welfare, housing, food stamps and NGOs) were asked for their count of adolescents served over a specific time period (e.g. 2015). A subsequent time location sampling survey of street-based adolescents assessed the proportion of study participants who reported having accessed such services in the same time period. Given these two sources, their estimate of the total number of street-based adolescents in Tehran is:

\[
\text{number of adolescents accessing services} = \frac{\text{total number of street-based adolescents}}{\text{proportion of time location sampling adolescents accessing services}}
\]

2. Estimates from a literature review, mapping and enumeration, and the wisdom of the crowds will also be gathered.

3. The final estimate will result from a review of these estimates and validation by a Delphi expert panel discussion.

Use appropriate data collection methods
Employ methods of data collection that are developmentally appropriate, inclusive and recognize the inherent power differential between individuals gathering data and DVMAs themselves. Qualitative data collection methods, mixed method approaches and participatory action methods can be inclusive ways to obtain data. See Brief 5 in this series, ‘Adolescent Participation in Research: Innovation, rationale and next steps’, for a discussion of these issues and examples of the use of youth-led participatory action research as a way to engage adolescents, including DVMAs. (For guidance on qualitative data collection methods, see UNICEF’s brief ‘Interviewing’.)

Explore whether technology can increase the access to and comfort of adolescents with research activities. DVMAs globally have increasing access to social media or technology, especially with mobile phones, despite a persistent digital divide with some sub-groups. Please refer to Brief 5 in this series, ‘Adolescent Participation in Research: Innovation, rationale and next steps’, or read more about UNICEF’s Short Message Service (SMS)-based U-Report, for examples.

Include contextual variables in data collection
Given the importance of social determinants in the health and well-being of adolescents, and the greater burden of negative social determinants among DVMAs, research and data systems should include not only individual but also contextual variables in data collection (see Box 3). Similarly, the use of positive developmental outcomes, such as school completion, vocational training or locally relevant measures of civic engagement, can assist policy-makers who are allocating resources, to focus on not only the avoidance of risk, but also on supporting adolescents in successful transition through adolescence to adulthood. Such indicators are often highly relevant to programmatic decisions.

Employ standard definitions
For readers to evaluate the rigour of a study, the definitions of the target population, and of the variables studied need to be clearly defined. The use of standard definitions (e.g. the use of UNICEF definitions of the adolescent age range) allow those reading a study to compare the findings to other research studies with the same population or on the same topic. Standard definitions are often those most often used in the literature. If there is no clear standard, the choice of a specific definition for inclusion in a DVMA sub-group should be justified.

Conduct longitudinal studies when possible
Conduct longitudinal studies when possible, as encouraged by the 2016 Lancet Commission call for research that can identify interventions that can contribute to positive outcomes (‘a second chance’) for DVMAs. Specifically, longitudinal data collection is required to document not only the outcomes of DVMAs, but also how interventions might alter those outcomes. However, longitudinal studies of DVMA cohorts are rare, particularly in LMICs. There are obvious reasons for this, including, but not limited to, the lack of expertise in conducting longitudinal research with adolescents, the expense of and insufficient funding for such work, and the challenges of keeping young people in studies over time. One possible way to retain adolescents is to partner with the service organizations that maintain longitudinal relationships with them. Though working with service organizations limits generalizability, as discussed, this limitation can simply be acknowledged. Governments and NGOs may not be in the position to conduct longitudinal research themselves, but are in the position to signal their interest in such work.

The importance of longitudinal studies of children and young people and an example of best practices is discussed in a 2015 Innocenti Research Brief, ‘Tracking the Children of the Millennium’.

14 Dayton et al., ‘How Can We Better Serve Adolescent Key Populations’.
16 Patton et al., ‘Our Future’.
ETHICAL ISSUES

Ethical concerns can discourage investigators and governments from engaging DVMAs in research. However, by excluding DVMAs from research, we may harm them by also excluding them from the potential benefits. Thus, investigators must simultaneously prioritize the inclusion of DVMAs in data collection as well as protection from the potential risks of research. To accomplish this goal, it is incumbent on researchers working with DVMAs to ensure that in designing their research they prioritize adherence to both international ethical standards and community ethical norms. The most effective ways to meet this requirement are for researchers to be familiar with these norms and guidelines, to consult researchers experienced in working with DVMAs when possible and, most importantly, to collaborate with community members who are entrusted with caring for DVMAs. Thus they must ensure that research is reviewed by a local institutional review board for their feedback and guidance, and that local researchers are engaged in research funded by outside entities.

In our experience, the consent process for research with marginalized adolescents is far from standardized and is often not described even in reports and papers. Though this general topic is described in detail in Brief 3 in this series, ‘Inclusion with Protection: Obtaining informed consent when conducting research with adolescents’, we share examples of approaches to research consent with street children in western Kenya, which could be adapted to other studies of marginalized young people.

The Vijana Wetu project in Kisumu, Kenya, studied HIV prevalence and risk factors in street children and young people aged 13–21. Study staff, in collaboration with local providers for street-based children and adolescents, obtained written consent from participants using a form that was read in participants’ preferred language. Participants who were unable to sign their name made a mark in the presence of a witness. Kenya’s national HIV testing guidelines allow for minors at least 15 years old to consent for voluntary HIV counselling and testing and for minors under the age of 15 to provide their own consent if engaged in behaviours that put them at risk of HIV infection. Participants under 15 years old completed a short quiz to assess their understanding of the consent form, for which they had to receive a score of 70 per cent to be eligible to participate in the study. No potential participant was excluded because they had a low score. Participants received a meal voucher from a local food vendor for their participation, a level of compensation that was not found to be coercive in a prior pilot study.*

Investigators engaged in research with street children in Eldoret, Kenya, have outlined additional principles for the engagement of minors, including integration of the research into community consent and community services, the appointment by adolescents of an adult who can support them in their consent process, and the engagement of peer outreach workers for recruitment of adolescent participants and for input into the research process.**

Depending on local guidelines and in discussion with the local institutional review board, researchers may conclude that anonymous or oral consent is most appropriate, particularly when signed consent is the only documentation tying adolescents to a study.

---


The principle of beneficence dictates that investigators pay particularly close attention to the increased vulnerability of disadvantaged, vulnerable and/or marginalized sub-populations of adolescents and protect them from harm. Research guidelines further require that participating marginalized adolescents themselves, especially minors, not simply the population overall, must benefit from participation. Given the requirement to protect vulnerable research participants and the fact that DVMAs may not have adults in their lives who are looking out for their best interests, the investigator is responsible for protecting adolescents not only from possible physical harm, but also from possible emotional and social harm from research. As DVMAs are frequently vulnerable legally, this requires investigators to protect the identities of participants and the confidentiality of study data in order to prevent disclosure of their marginalized status and/or further stigma. Measures may need to be taken to protect a database from illegal disclosure.

Beneficence further requires multiple measures to minimize the risks inherent to research, by accurately taking participants’ views, rights and needs into account. These may include formal staff training in research ethics, protection of data, confidentiality and adolescent rights; and minimizing the stigma and potential dangers of participation. A non-stigmatizing name should be chosen for the study or project, ideally with the input of members of the target population. Sensitization of the local authorities, particularly the police, may be necessary to ensure their support of the activities and that adolescents’ participation does not pose an increased risk of identification, arrest or detention.

Beneficence also requires that researchers ensure the provision of care to adolescent participants, preferably through referrals to collaborating community partners or, when available, to providers who can provide adolescent-friendly, confidential, long-term care after the study or research ends. It also requires researchers to plan for the referral and care of young people who are in imminent danger or are a threat to themselves or others. Again, collaboration with community partners and the local institutional review board is critical. If the appropriate resources for a research project to be completed ethically are not available, it may be more appropriate to focus on work that could increase the availability of necessary resources first, or to scale down the objective of the project.

Furthermore, beneficence requires that a well-formulated dissemination and uptake strategy directed at policy-makers be formulated to maximize the study’s potential to improve the lives of adolescents. DVMAs should be informed of the link between the research they participate in and the potential improvements in services and programmes that the research is intended to bring about. Researchers should maximize the benefit of dissemination of findings without harm or increased stigma to the target population. DVMAs should be targeted in the dissemination of results and included as actors in dissemination activities when possible.

Finally, the principle of respect for persons dictates that adolescents, including DVMAs, have the right to express their views on matters that directly affect them, including the design of programmes to improve their lives. By including their voice in research activities, they can influence the decisions made on the basis of the resulting findings. A community or youth advisory board can fulfill this role. However, in developing such a board, it is important to avoid tokenism and not to forget that there are multiple communities of adolescents and of DVMAs, and that adolescents may not be qualified to represent other adolescents just on the basis of being in the same age bracket. The principle of respect for persons also requires that DVMAs, who may be foregoing activities to meet their basic needs in order to participate in research, be adequately compensated for their time and participation, in a way that is respectful of local guidelines. Therefore adolescents are often compensated with food or other basic needs (e.g. soap, lunch), not with cash. Conversely, it is critical that the compensation will not be so great or unusual as to be coercive, a determination that is context dependent and requires local input. Furthermore, it is important to take into account that what may be considered non-coercive for other adolescents may be coercive for those who are DVMAs.
## GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adolescents</strong></td>
<td>Persons aged 10–19 years, as defined by the WHO and UNICEF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coercion</strong></td>
<td>The use of unnecessary or excessive influence to encourage someone to take part in a research study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual variables</strong></td>
<td>Variables that describe the context of a person’s environment as opposed to characteristics of an individual. Contextual variables might include variables on a person’s family, education or economic environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-sectional studies</strong></td>
<td>Studies based on data collected at one point in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delphi expert panel</strong></td>
<td>A structured communication technique or method, originally developed as a systematic, interactive forecasting method which relies on a panel of experts who answer questionnaires in two or more rounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantaged, vulnerable and/or marginalized groups</strong></td>
<td>People who, owing to factors usually considered outside their control, do not have the same opportunities as other more fortunate groups in society. Examples include unemployed people, refugees and others who are socially excluded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formative research</strong></td>
<td>Preliminary research, often qualitative in nature, that is conducted to answer questions on the design of a study and which is intended to increase the validity of a study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generalizable</strong></td>
<td>Findings of a study are generalizable if they can be applied to the population as a whole. Findings may not be generalizable if the study sample was not representative or if a bias existed in data collection or analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human trafficking</strong></td>
<td>The recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, abduction, fraud, deception, abuse of power, or a position of vulnerability or the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrants</strong></td>
<td>Persons who permanently reside outside their country of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incarceration</strong></td>
<td>The state of being legally confined in prison or jail; imprisonment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-level variables</strong></td>
<td>Variables that describe the attributes of people themselves, as opposed to attributes of their environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Longitudinal studies</strong></td>
<td>Studies based on data collected more than once over a period of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed methods research</strong></td>
<td>Research that collects and analyses quantitative and qualitative data together in a single study or programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modifiable factors or variables</strong></td>
<td>Variables that describe attributes of a person or their environment that can be changed (for example through education, policy or services).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morbidity</strong></td>
<td>A measure of disease or disability in a given population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mortality</strong></td>
<td>The number of deaths in a given population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-probability sampling</strong></td>
<td>An approach to sampling where all members of a population do not have an equal or known probability of being selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orphans</strong></td>
<td>Children who have lost one or both parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Random sample</strong></td>
<td>A sub-set of individuals (a sample) chosen from a larger set (a population), in which each individual has the same probability of being chosen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugees</strong></td>
<td>Persons who have experienced a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, and therefore are outside the country of their nationality or unable or unwilling to avail themselves of the protection of that country owing to fear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representative sample</strong></td>
<td>A sample of members of a population that share the characteristics of the population as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resiliency outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Variables that describe people’s success in the face of adversity (as opposed to variables that describe negative outcomes or risk).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex work</strong></td>
<td>Activities where one receives money, goods or non-monetary items (such as food, drugs or shelter) in exchange for sexual services, either regularly or occasionally, whether or not the activities are consciously defined as income-generating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual minorities</strong></td>
<td>People who do not meet gender norms for their biological sex and/or people who do not identify as heterosexual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social determinants</strong></td>
<td>The conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work and age. These circumstances are shaped by the distribution of money, power and resources at global, national and local levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stigma; internalized stigma</strong></td>
<td>An attribute that society defines as ‘deeply discrediting’, spoiling a person’s identity and disqualifying them from full social acceptance. Persons experience internalized stigma when they identify themselves as having a stigmatized trait or identity, and see themselves fulfilling the negative stereotypes and assumptions associated with the trait or identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street-based adolescents</strong></td>
<td>Adolescents for whom the street in the widest sense of the word (e.g. unoccupied dwellings, wasteland) more than their family has become their real home – a situation in which there is no protection, supervision or direction from responsible adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target population</strong></td>
<td>The entire group of people the researchers are interested in studying and to whom they would ideally generalize their study findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trauma-informed</strong></td>
<td>An approach or framework that recognizes signs and symptoms of trauma, realizes the widespread impact of trauma, understands the potential paths for recovery, responds by integrating knowledge about trauma into systems, and seeks actively to resist re-traumatization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triangulation of findings</strong></td>
<td>The use of multiple sources of data or multiple points of view in order to answer a question when a gold standard method of research is not available – this helps to increase the validity of the findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under-coverage bias</strong></td>
<td>A systematic deviation of the results of a study through lack of sampling or participation of a part of the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under-reporting bias</strong></td>
<td>A systematic deviation of the results of a study due to participants’ systematic tendency not to report or share a behaviour or characteristic, often because of a concern about negative consequences or stigma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Validity</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which the findings of a study are objectively true or correct. Internal validity is the degree to which the findings of a study are correct for the sample that was studied. External validity is the degree to which the findings of a study are correct for the population which the sample is intended to represent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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