

**Save the Children UK Mobile Assessment Tool for *Children on the Move*
South Africa Pilot Report – June 2010**

**Braeden Rogers & Lindsay Stark
Columbia Group for Children in Adversity**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Children on the Move Mobile Assessment Tool South Africa Pilot Report- May 2010

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Rationale for a Mobile Assessment Tool for Children on the Move | 1 |
| 1.2 SC UK's Children on the Move Literature Review | 2 |
| 1.3 Mobile Assessment Tool & Initial Pilot | 3 |
| 2. Methodology | 3 |
| 2.1 Literature Review & Rationale for Methodology | 3 |
| 2.2 Description of Pilot Methodology | 6 |
| 2.2.1 Initial Key Informant Interviews & Validation of Pilot Plan | 6 |
| 2.2.2 Typology of Children on the Move & Congregation Points | 6 |
| 2.2.3 Pilot Case Definition of Children on the Move | 8 |
| 2.2.4 Interview Site Selection | 8 |
| 2.2.5 Interviewer Selection & Training | 9 |
| 2.2.6 Sampling Strategy | 10 |
| 2.2.7 Survey Instrument | 11 |
| 2.2.8 Eligibility Screening, Consent & Confidentiality | 12 |
| 2.2.9 Referral & Response Mechanism | 13 |
| 2.2.10 Focus Group Discussions | 14 |
| 2.3 South Africa Pilot Site & Migration Dynamic | 14 |
| 2.4 Limitations | 16 |
| 2.4.1 Time Frame | 16 |
| 2.4.2 Small Interview Team | 16 |
| 2.4.3 Logistics & Administration | 16 |
| 2.4.4 Interviewer Recruitment | 17 |
| 3. Pilot Assessment Findings Based on Sample Analysis | 17 |
| 3.1 Overview of Sample | 17 |
| 3.1.1 Interview Respondents | 17 |
| 3.1.2 Child Age | 18 |
| 3.1.3 Time Spent in South Africa | 19 |
| 3.1.4 Home Province of Children | 19 |
| 3.1.5 Orphan Status | 20 |
| 3.2 Children's Journeys & Self-Identified Travel Needs | 20 |
| 3.2.1 Reasons for Leaving Home | 20 |
| 3.2.2 Mode of Travel & Travel Companions | 21 |
| 3.2.3 Entry into South Africa | 22 |
| 3.2.4 Children's Travel Needs | 23 |
| 3.3 Children's Musina Experience & Needs | 24 |
| 3.3.1 Where Children Typically Sleep & Accompanied Status | 25 |
| 3.3.2 Children's Access to Services in Musina | 25 |
| 3.3.3 Children's Needs in Musina | 26 |
| 3.4 Children's Declared Destinations | 28 |
| 3.5 Recommendations for the South Africa Programme | 29 |
| 4. Key Lessons: Methodology & Tool | 30 |
| 4.1 Interview Site Selection | 31 |
| 4.2 Interviewer Selection | 31 |
| 4.3 Sampling Strategy | 32 |
| 4.3.1 Targeted Sampling for First Wave | 32 |
| 4.3.2 Referral Mechanism, Referral Response Rate & Incentives | 32 |
| 4.4 Survey Instrument | 34 |
| 4.5 Mapping of Service & Response Mechanism | 36 |
| 5. Recommendations for Future Piloting | 36 |
| 5.1 Focus Groups | 36 |
| 5.2 Sampling Strategy | 36 |
| 5.3 Time Allowance | 37 |
| 5.4 Interview Team | 37 |
| ANNEXES | |
| I: Typology of <i>Children on the Move</i> in Musina | |
| II: Interview Guide | |
| III: Data Collection Forms | |
| IV: Focus Group Discussion Questions | |
| V: Confidentiality Agreement | |
| VI: Literature Review Bibliography | |
| VII: Mobile Assessment Tool Protocol | |

1. Introduction

1.1 Rationale for a Mobile Assessment Tool for *Children on the Move*:

*Children on the move*¹, in most contexts, are hidden or hard-to-reach populations. Because migration across international borders (and in some contexts across internal borders) without proper documentation is illegal, children who migrate internally or internationally are often stigmatized or driven to engage in illicit activities. These children are usually mobile and without a fixed address and their numbers are typically low in comparison with the overall population. As a result, it is difficult to determine how large this population is, what its characteristics are and what unmet needs the population has. Consequently, it is difficult to develop evidence-based programs for *children on the move*. In addition, the challenges associated with children being mobile mean that it is hard to develop programmes that protect children while they are in transit, since most protective services are statically located in one location. Without baseline information for these populations, it is impossible to evaluate whether programs targeting *children on the move* achieve their intended impact.

Save the Children UK has recognized that *children on the move* are often exposed to elevated risk of harm and that because they are difficult to characterize and reach while in transit, are underserved. The Oak Foundation has therefore provided a planning grant to Save the Children UK to conduct a scoping study to explore strategies for improving programmatic response for *children on the move*. This scoping study includes a literature review of methodologies previously used to collect information on children on the move, and the development and piloting of an assessment tool from which to develop programmes for children in transit. Columbia University was commissioned by Save the Children UK to undertake the latter part of the scoping study relating to the piloting of a Mobile Assessment Tool (MAT) for *children on the move* that would gather information about children's evolving needs and coping mechanisms throughout the course of their journeys. Columbia University was tasked with leading an initial pilot study to test the effectiveness of the MAT and to offer recommendations for future tests. While the initial development and pilot of the MAT took place in Limpopo province, South Africa—the border region with Zimbabwe—the MAT is intended to be adaptable to disparate contexts in which children migrate.

1.2 Scoping Study Literature Review:

¹ Those children moving for a variety of reasons, voluntarily or involuntarily, within or between countries, with or without their parents or other primary caregivers, and whose movement might place them at risk (or at an increased risk) of economic or sexual exploitation, abuse, neglect and violence. (Save the Children)

This pilot builds on a comprehensive literature review of research methods concerning children in transit commissioned by Save the Children UK and carried out by Mike Dottridge² as the first stage in the scoping study. Dottridge explored existing research and learning regarding various forms of child migration and trafficking globally. The literature review identified the following important findings and recommendations:

1. Few pieces of research on *children on the move* have looked at the role of intermediaries and their associated risk and protective factors.
2. It is essential for programmes for *children on the move* to collect information about the factors and services that help protect children in each phase of their movement.
3. Few pieces of research have compared the motivations for and outcomes of movement, between children who have and who have not migrated. This is important to enable programmes to understand the relative risks of migrating or not migrating.
4. It is ethically imperative that research on *children on the move* has an action component to ensure that if a child requests assistance or discloses abuse during information collection, there is an adequate response provided
5. It is important that any research on *children on the move* includes children's participation. Children should be involved in identifying what an effective programmatic response should consist of rather than agencies planning based on their own assumptions.
6. There are few pieces of research that have looked at children as they move. A future methodology for this work could involve accompanying children in their journey or identifying them at key points along a migration route

In addition, Columbia University noted that among studies highlighted in Dottridge's review, none attempted to generate quantitative data on a representative, random sample of *children on the move*. As a result, findings may not be representative of the true target population and programs based on these findings may fail to address key needs.

1.3 Mobile Assessment Tool and Initial Pilot:

² Dottridge, Mike. "Children on the Move: A Review of Issues Regarding the Protection of Children in Transit." A report written for Save the Children UK. July 5, 2009.

The MAT is intended to be a data collection tool that gathers representative information on children's reasons for movement; their movement plan; their needs while in transit; the protective resources they expect to or actually rely on; and the services that would help them along the travelling route. The MAT is also intended to contain a real-time service component by consulting with children and other agencies on ways to reach out to other children (e.g. creating a protective network for information and peer support) and the services that would help these children along their travelling route.

The MAT is unique in that it is a) mobile, which means it will be used to collect information from children in a number of different locations along a migration route and b) that it will not be divorced from response mechanisms. The tool is being developed and tested in parallel with a strategy that enables those who use it to respond to key needs that children may highlight during the assessment process. This assessment and action approach mitigates some ethical concerns highlighted in the literature on researching vulnerable children. Ultimately, the MAT will be used to inform programs that aim to respond to the needs of *children on the move* and enhance their protection along migratory routes and in areas where they cluster for periods of time.

Specifically, Columbia University was commissioned to design a child friendly tool that gathers the following information:

1. child migrant demographics
2. why children migrate
3. children's travel plan
4. children's migration route and mode of travel
5. children's needs while in transit, according to priority
6. services that children access in transit locations
7. services that children recommend.

Once refined the tool is intended to be further piloted and ultimately employed by Save the Children field staff in concert with a Save the Children Monitoring & Evaluation Advisor. As such the design considered the constraints of typical field programs in terms of time and staff capacity and availability.

2. Methodology

2.1 Literature Review and Rationale for Methodology

As highlighted in Dottridge's literature review of children in transit, there are several significant obstacles to accurately analyzing children's needs in migration

contexts. Some challenges include, ensuring that the research is based on a representative sample of the population of interest; ensuring that children participate in and inform analysis; and reflecting the needs of children when they are actually in transit, as opposed to in origin or destination locations.

At the outset of the project, Columbia University identified sampling as the most significant methodological challenge to be addressed through the first stage of piloting. *Children on the move*, in most contexts, can be considered hidden or hard-to-reach populations. They are characterized as such because identifying as a member of this group is potentially stigmatizing, and even dangerous. Consequently, population estimates rarely exist³.

Hard to reach populations are traditionally studied with ethnographic methods, such as observation; open or semi-structured interviews or life story telling⁴. These methods are qualitative in nature, often require significant time investment and analysis typically remains at the individual-level rather than being generalizable to a group. The strength of these methods is that they “have the potential to lay bare the social organization of hidden group activities, uncover their meanings to group members, and reveal how interactions and actors are organized within a social context⁵.” Though in the context of an NGO assessment, the time investment required may not be feasible. As such, less time intensive methods are needed. Sampling is used to reduce the population of interest to a manageable and representative unit that can be studied. When sample selection approximates randomness and is large enough, findings based on the sample can be extrapolated to the target population.

Due to the absence of population data for hidden populations, it is difficult to randomly sample these populations, which helps ensure statistical rigor and findings with known precision. Due to this obstacle, key informant interviews, snowball sampling (or other forms of chain-referral sampling), targeted sampling techniques are often used⁶. These techniques, while not representative, attempt to gather information that can enable researchers to make inferences about the population of interest.

Key informant interviews, such as interviews with professionals known to work with the population (social workers, service providers) or with known leaders in the group, can also yield useful data. However, this information is not necessarily representative of the group and may reflect a specific perspective.

³ Heckathorn, Douglas. “Respondent-Driven Sampling: A New Approach to the Study of Hidden Populations.” *Social Problems*. Vol 44, No.2, May 1997. p. 174

⁴ Spreen Marinus and Ronald Zwaagstra. “Personal Network Sampling, Outdegree Analysis and Multilevel Analysis: Introducing the Network Concept in Studies of Hidden Populations.” *International Sociology*. Vol 9. No. 4. December 1994. P. 476

⁵ Biernacki, Patrick and John K. Watters. “Targeted Sampling: Options for the Study of Hidden Populations.” *Social Problems*. Vol 36. No 4. Oct. 1989. p. 419.

⁶ Heckathorn. 1997. p. 174.

Snowball sampling is a method by which initial respondents give the researcher the names or contacts for others who exhibit the qualities of interest. The researcher then follows up with this group and continues to ask for referrals. This method assumes that members of hard to reach populations are networked and able to refer other members of the group. While this method can be cost-effective and can help identify members of an otherwise invisible or unknown group it is hampered by selection bias.

Targeted sampling⁷ aims to improve the representativeness of samples of hard to reach groups by establishing lists of the target population according to locations they are known to occupy. As Watters and Biernacki have described, locations are identified through direct observation. Once locations are identified, ethnographic mapping is used to understand the social organization of the target group in each area and develop recruitment plans based on specific inclusion criteria. Then researchers attempt to recruit individuals exhibiting select attributes into the study at selected locations for a period of time. The drawback to this method is that there may be bias associated with the selected location or time of day when recruitment takes place and thereby certain groups may be overlooked.

Another iteration of targeted sampling, used by Muhib et al, is called venue-based time-space sampling⁸. In this method, locations where the target population congregate are similarly identified through observation. Times of day when the population frequents the location are also noted. Once this information is collected the locations and time periods are further evaluated for 1.) the number of potential subjects who frequent the venue at the designated time of day during a specific period of time (30 minutes to an hour) and 2.) of those potential subjects, the number who qualify for interview. This helps establish the expected yield of interviews according to venue time units and eliminate locations where the yield is too low. Once viable venue time units are established, a sample frame is constructed and two-stage sampling is used. Venue time units are randomly selected for inclusion and the target population is systematically approached for interview during included venue time units.

The drawback of these methods is that samples are not random. As a result, bias may be introduced and it is unclear to what degree the sample is representative of the population of interest. In particular, these methods are prone to being more representative of more socially active people because they have larger personal networks and frequent more easily identifiable locations⁹. As a result, often the easiest to reach individuals recruited to participate in

⁷ Biernacki, Patrick and John K. Watters. "Targeted Sampling: Options for the Study of Hidden Populations." *Social Problems*. Vol 36. No 4. Oct. 1989.

⁸ Muhib, Farzana B. et al. "A Venue-Based Method for Sampling Hard-to-Reach Populations." *Public Health Reports*. 2001 Supplement I. Vol. 116.

⁹ Sreen and Zwaagstra. 1994. p. 479

research. The circumstance and needs of these individuals may be significantly different from the needs of harder to reach members of the group and important information may be omitted.

Given growing public health concerns with respect to hidden populations in the context of HIV/AIDS epidemics, probabilistic sampling methods that attempt to produce estimates with known precision have emerged and are being developed. One such method, developed by Douglas Heckathorn, is Respondent-Driven Sampling. This method uses ethnographic mapping to determine where the population of interest congregates, draws an initial sample from disparate locations on the ethnographic map, and uses primary and secondary incentives to encourage respondents to refer members of the population of interest to interview. Secondary incentives can be calibrated to provide a greater reward for under-represented sub-groups within the population to ensure that the sample is well balanced. Heckathorn's research has shown that within a handful of sampling waves, samples constructed through Respondent-Driven Sampling, when modelled in sufficient statistical detail, are able to produce statistically valid indicators with known quantitative precision.

Central to this method is the use of incentives. Low response rates are a critical impediment to typical chain-referral methods addressing hidden populations, as it may be risky or socially undesirable to reveal information about one's status. In Respondent-Driven Sampling, primary incentives are used to encourage a respondent to interview and secondary incentives are used to encourage a respondent to recruit peers for interview. Through the use of secondary incentives, individuals are socially influenced to participate in addition to being rewarded for doing so with primary incentives, which improves response rate. Heckathorn has shown that the use of secondary incentives can overcome biases associated with chain referral sampling methods because the sample becomes independent from the first sampling wave.¹⁰ The sample, through not initially drawn from a randomly selected group in the first wave of sampling, is not merely reflective of characteristics of the first wave of selection but rather approaches randomness. This can improve the representativeness of the sample and also the time required to collect data.

In Heckathorn's model, initial respondents recruited from targeted locations in the ethnographic map are referred to as "seeds". If "seeds" complete the interview they are asked to recruit a limited number of peers to participate in the study. A coupon and case number system is used to track whether referrals come for interview. If they do, the seed is given a reward. Each new respondent is given the same opportunity to recruit additional respondents and receive compensation if they present for interview. A critical requisite of this method is the ability to verify respondents' status as members of the target group. Given the use of secondary incentives, this is particularly important because respondent may attempt to refer non-target group individuals in order to receive the reward.

¹⁰ Heckathorn. 1997 p.176

The Respondent-Driven Sampling methodology was reviewed by Columbia University and Save the Children when considering sampling methods for the initial pilot study. Concerns emerged regarding the use of both primary and secondary incentives. While it was determined that appropriate primary incentives were acceptable, given limited lead-time for proper ethical review, fears that secondary incentives could potentially result in child coercion convinced the research team to conduct the first pilot exercise without the use of secondary incentives. Because Respondent-Driven Sampling has been used primarily in the context of adult and not child respondents, the team decided to test whether primary incentives would be attractive enough for children to mitigate the potential for a low response rate. The pilot also set out to test another main assumption of RDS: that *children on the move* are well networked enough to refer other members for interview.

2.2 Description of Pilot Methodology:

2.2.1 Initial Key Informant Interviews& Validation of Pilot Plan:

In order to adapt the Mobile Assessment Tool for *children on the move* to the South Africa context, key informant interviews were used to inform tool development and the sampling strategy. From March 15 to March 19 the researcher met with relevant personnel from organizations delivering services to child migrants in the region. These included Save the Children Pretoria and Musina; the Department of Social Development-Musina, Childline-Polokwane, the Red Cross Society-Limpopo, Musina Home Based Care, UNICEF, URC Shelters, Clacherty Associates, staff at the border and Rwanda food containers, Refugee Children's Project and IOM. Interviews were used to:

1. Develop a typology of *children on the move* in Musina and map where different sub-groups of *children on the move* congregate;
2. Adapt a case definition of *children on the move* for the purpose of the pilot study;
3. Determine child-accessible and friendly interview locations;
4. Identify appropriate primary incentives;
5. Assemble a list of services available to migrant children in the area and how children can access them, for the purpose of referral; and
6. Understand other child migration dynamics at play in the area, including the seasonal nature of migration.

After sufficient information had been gleaned from key informant interviews, the pilot plan was refined and presented to Save the Children staff for review. The typology of *children on the move*, pilot case definition, incentive selection, and

selected interview locations were verified and approved by Save the Children Musina staff. In addition, staff was asked to comment on the classification of certain variables, such as age and time spent in South Africa, to ensure that they would be useful for programming purposes.

2.2.2 Typology of *Children on the Move* and Congregation Points

Save the Children defines *children on the move* as: *‘those children moving for a variety of reasons, voluntarily or involuntarily, within or between countries, with or without their parents or other primary caregivers, and whose movement might place them at risk (or at an increased risk) of economic or sexual exploitation, abuse, neglect and violence’*.¹¹

In order to inform the sampling plan, a typology of *children on the move* in Musina was developed. Based on the Save the Children definition of *children on the move* the researcher conducted key informant interviews and a “windshield” survey (drive through) of the town and surrounding areas to determine the characteristics of children on the move in Musina¹².

The objective when constructing a typology of *children on the move* is to determine all relevant sub-groups of this population in the target geographic area, in order to ensure that all groups are represented in the sample. Sub-groups can be defined as groups of children with different characteristics that impact their social network. Characteristics that impact a social network may

¹¹ Explanatory note

‘*Children on the Move*’ is not meant as a ‘new’ category of children. It is an umbrella definition which brings together the multitude of categories in which children who move have been, often unhelpfully, divided. This definition therefore includes:

1. children who have been trafficked,
2. children who migrate (e.g. to pursue better life opportunities, look for work or education or to escape exploitative or abusive situations at home);
3. children displaced by conflict and natural disasters;
4. children who live and work in the streets;

All of whom might find themselves at risk, especially of being exposed to various forms of abuse and involved in the worst forms of exploitation. This concept, by highlighting the common risks and challenges faced by these children but also their differences in terms of gender, age and their agency, aims to re-focus interventions and ensure coherent policies by placing the protection of the child at the centre as well as the need to support the positive effect that mobility can have on improving children’s life chances.

¹² In contexts where there is a well-developed and fairly complete case management tool/system such as the family tracing and reunification (FTR) database, this can also help inform the typology and, in particular, help estimate the population size of *children on the move* or specific sub-groups within it. This information is important when determining the needed sample size. In Musina, the FTR database was too incomplete to offer this insight.

include age, sex, origin, language, accompanied status, length of time in the area and daily activities. Constructing a typology should occur in each geographic location where the MAT is used along a migratory route, as the composition of the *children on the move* may differ.

A typology for Musina was developed by using a simple chart with three columns: child sub-group, characteristics and where to find these children. In the characteristics column the following information was recorded if it could be determined: age, sex, population size, origin, accompanied status, average stay in Musina, typical activities and social network (i.e. what other sub-groups of children this group comes in contact with). Please see **Annex I: Typology of *Children on the Move* in Musina, South Africa.**

The Musina typology consisted of 11 sub-groups of *children on the move*:

1. Zimbabwean migrant boys accessing the formal services in Musina.
2. Zimbabwean migrant boys apprehended upon arrival but leaving Musina within a short period of time (1 week).
3. Non-Zimbabwean international migrant children.
4. Zimbabwean girls accessing formal services in Musina.
5. Zimbabwean girls who travel through or frequent truck parks.
6. Zimbabwean girls residing in high density suburbs.
7. Zimbabwean boys who live and work at the border.
8. Children who live on the street in town.
9. Smuggled/trafficked children not apprehended by the police.
10. Children on farms.
11. Accompanied children in schools.

2.2.3 Pilot Case Definition of *Children on the Move*:

From the outset of the project, it was important to be clear about a case definition of *children on the move* in order to establish inclusion criteria for sample selection in each location in which the MAT is employed. Save the Children's definition of *children on the move* was used as a basis and was refined to reflect the South Africa context and the needs of the pilot, based on the constructed typology of *children on the move*.

Given this definition the typology of *children on the move* could include international and internal migrants. However, in the Musina context, internal child migrant presence was not found. Due to limited time and personnel limitations, the case definition was further narrowed to exclude children under 10 and the following sub-groups of children on the move for the targeted first wave of sampling in the pilot:

1. Non-Zimbabwean international migrant children.

2. Smuggled/trafficked children not apprehended by the police.
3. Migrant children on farms.
4. Accompanied children in the school system.

Though these groups were not targeted for inclusion in the first wave of sampling, they were not excluded in subsequent waves if they presented for interview via referral.

2.2.4 Interview Site Selection:

Establishing a viable interview location or multiple locations within the targeted geographic area is critical to this methodology, which is dependent on children presenting for interview rather than being directly approached (in post-first wave sampling). Sites must be locations that are known to children, easy for them to access and child friendly. Children's perceptions of or access to site locations may differ according to child sub-group and necessitate the use of multiple interview locations.

Ideally, focus groups with children from the target population should be held to probe information gleaned from key informant interviews regarding interview sites. It is important to determine how children perceive different locations and what may encourage or dissuade them from going there. Due to time limitations, this was not possible in the South Africa pilot but is highly recommended for future pilots.

Given the multiple sub-groups of *children on the move* in the Musina vicinity, two interview locations were identified to receive referrals for interview. The first was the taxi rank in town. This location is well-known, very central, open and a place where many children living on the street congregate and sleep. The second site was a container that had previously been used for meal dispensing to children by Save the Children. Though food was no longer offered, the location was well known to children who operate along both sides of the border and was convenient to reach.

Chairs were set up in open yet private spaces in both locations. A tent or tarp may have been useful but was not available. It may have been useful to hang a Save the Children banner to indicate the referral location however Save the Children decided against this as children's attitudes toward the programme in Musina are mixed and it was noted that it might also act as a deterrent. These decisions depend on the context.

2.2.5 Interviewer Selection and Training:

Interviewer selection is critical to the interview process. It is important to recruit interviewers who will put children at ease and who are skilled at responding appropriately to any issues children raise. In general, it is best if the characteristics of the interviewer mirror the characteristics of the target group, with respect to language, origin and sex. Age may also be a factor with some populations. In addition, interviewers should have experience working with children and should have an open and non-judgemental approach. Ideally, more interviewers should be recruited to participate in the interviewer training than will be hired for the project. This allows for the researcher to identify weak interviewers and weed them out prior to data collection.

In Limpopo, South Africa, where Zimbabwean children constitute the vast majority of the target group, the dominant Zimbabwean local language is distinct from South African local languages and xenophobic sentiments against Zimbabwean migrants are prevalent, it was critical to hire Zimbabwean interviewers. One male and one female interviewer, who had both previously worked with Save the Children, were pre-selected to work on this project by Save the Children Musina staff. The female interviewer spoke all major local languages of Zimbabwe, while the male interviewer spoke the dominant local language, Shona.

Once identified, the interviewers underwent a two-day training to prepare for the pilot. The interviewer training addressed the following subjects:

1. Purpose of the MAP.
2. Consent & confidentiality, including the Save the Children Child Protection Policy.
3. Techniques for interviewing children.
4. Pilot methodology – review ethnographic map and sampling strategy
5. Review survey tool, translation of tool into local languages, and ensuring uniform expression of key questions across languages.
6. Review of the data collection form.
7. Role play with survey tool & data collection form, including how to divide children's journey into relevant segments.
8. Format & practice of daily de-briefs after interviews.
9. Pilot testing of survey tool
10. Tool modifications based on pilot testing of the tool.
11. How to make referrals and how to handle severe cases requiring attention.

2.2.6 Sampling Strategy:

A modification of Respondent-Driven Sampling, without secondary incentives, was attempted during the pilot. Based on the typology and refined case definition for *children on the move* used by the pilot, the research team targeted

an initial wave of “seeds” for interview. Different primary incentives and numbers of coupons were assigned to each sub-group of children in the target population. Generally, harder to reach children, such as non-institutionalized girls, were given more coupons to compensate for what was expected to be a lower response rate. Non-institutionalized girls were also given cash incentives to compensate for time spent away from work – as this population is generally at work during the day. However, due to program considerations and stronger pre-existing relationships with non-institutionalized boys, sodas were given instead of cash as primary incentives to these children. Ideally, focus groups with the target group could be used to identify attractive incentives prior to roll-out. Due to time constraints, this only happened after the pilot had begun.

Simple colour-coded coupons were used during the pilot to make and track referrals. Based on certain questions asked during the interview, such as where a child slept, and discussion of the child’s circumstances, the interviewer could determine within which sub-group in the *children on the move* typology the respondent corresponded. Each sub-group was assigned a colour and a specified number of coupons. Based on the interviewers’ assessment of a child’s status, appropriate numbers of coloured coupons were given. Coupons had a Save the Children label and included the date of interview; the case number of the respondent followed by a letter (if three coupons were given to case number 1, coupons would read, 1a, 1b, 1c); and information regarding the interview location and days and times when the interview team would be stationed there. This information allowed the research team to track referrals and determine if one sub-group had a higher referral rate than another, or if cross-sub-group referrals were made.

Table 1: Sampling Decisions

| Child Sub-Group | Target Location | Primary Incentive | Coupons Given |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Zim boys accessing services | URC Boys Shelter | Soda | 2 |
| Zim Girls accessing services | URC Girls Shelter | Soda | 2 |
| Zim girls who travel through or frequent truck parks | Border Truck Park & surrounding areas | Soda & 30 Rand | 4 |
| Zim girls residing in high density suburbs | In town at vending locations & shops | Soda & 20 -30 Rand | 3-4 (changed from 4 to 3 mid-pilot) |
| Zim boys who live and work at the border | Border container | Soda | 3 |
| Children who live on the street in town | Taxi rank | Soda | 3 |

Typically, the number of sampling waves required will depend on the response rate, the desired sample size, the composition of the sample being collected and the degree of saturation. In the pilot, time was limited and thus the aim was to determine if this sampling methodology works for *children on the move*, rather than to construct of a robust sample for analysis. However, information on the composition of the sample, and its relative representativeness, was tracked.

2.2.7 Survey Instrument:

A semi-structured, participatory survey instrument was developed to collect information from children in their local language. The instrument included a roughly sketched map of Zimbabwe and South Africa. Children were asked to draw their journey to South Africa in stages. Children were then asked to answer questions based on the journey that they drew. Participatory ranking exercises¹³ were also used to elicit information about children's needs at different stages of their journey and their relative priority.

In the participatory ranking exercise, children were presented with three stock categories of services of interest to Save the Children. In this case, the following services were presented: a) an adult to talk to (psychosocial), b) help to find family in South Africa (family reunification), and c) help to go home to Zimbabwe (repatriation). These services were selected because they constitute three of the main services that Save the Children provides to migrant children in Musina. The researchers used 3 cards with drawings and writing representing these ideas in the process. Then children were asked to free-list four of their greatest needs other than those already provided, and to write them on post-it notes. If the interviewer determined that the child was not comfortable writing the concepts, he or she did it for the child with the aid of quick sketches reflecting the meaning. Next, the interviewer showed the child a line on a piece of paper. The interviewer highlighted that the left-side represented the most important needs and the right-side, the least important needs. This was also written on the spectrum paper. The interviewer asked the child to rank the seven concepts on the line according to importance. Once the child had done so, the interviewer probed as to why the child had selected the order and would ask the child to compare why the concept in position 3, for instance, was more important than the concept in the forth position. This aided children in thinking through and sometimes reassigning positions. Once positions were fixed, the interviewer recorded the order on a data collection sheet.

During this process two clip boards were used. The child and interviewer typically each held a board during the process so that they could draw, record information

¹³ Ager, et al. "Participative Ranking Methodology: A Brief Guide." Columbia University. Feb. 2010.

or rank concepts on a line. See **Appendix II: Interview Guide** and **Appendix III: Data Collection Forms**.

2.2.8 Eligibility Screening, Consent & Confidentiality:

When using Respondent -Sampling, a solid method for screening for eligibility is needed to ensure that only the target population is sampled and that respondents are not interviewed more than once. Eligibility screening largely depends on the case definition being used. In this case, migrant status was verified through language. In the Musina context the vast majority of children on the move are Zimbabwean. As such, if a child did not speak a Zimbabwean local language they were declined an interview. Zimbabwean interviewers were able to easily discern this. During the pilot, two children, attracted by incentives, attempted to re-interview. This was quickly detected by the interview team. However, in future pilots a more systematic approach may be needed if multiple interviewers and interview locations are used.

In addition, the pilot aimed to interview children age 10 – 17. Children under the age of 10 were not included in the pilot case definition because they were perceived to be a small group and because interviewing these children would have required the development of a distinct survey instrument, for which there was insufficient time. Children were initially asked their age and a few questions later asked to give their date of birth for verification purposes. If the child's birth date was not in the identified window, the interview was concluded. It should be noted that age was a particularly sensitive issue for this population and this is likely similar in other contexts. The researcher noted that many children's stated ages did not correspond with given birth dates. There are many reasons why a child might disguise his or her true age – legal age of work, access to services dependant on under-18 age status, and immigration issues are just a few. Consequently, it is important to build checks into the questionnaire to verify this variable.

After eligibility screening but prior to the interview, all children were given information on the purpose of the interview, told that all information shared would remain confidential, told that they did not need to participate or could stop at anytime and were asked if they agreed to participate. The consent procedure is included in the interview guide in **Appendix II: Interview Guide**. If informed consent was given, the interviewer initialled the data collection form to indicate this. If the child declined to interview, the interviewer asked if he or she could record the answers to 3 questions: a) the child's age, b) the child's home country and c) the amount of time the child had spent in South Africa since last entry. This information was also recorded in data collection sheets that indicate that consent was not received and can be used to determine if those who refuse interview share similar characteristics.

Maintaining confidentiality was taken seriously by the research team. No unique identifiers were collected, including names. Prior to the pilot each member of the research team reviewed and signed a confidentiality agreement. Please see **Appendix IV: Confidentiality Agreement**. It was determined that confidentiality would only be breached if: a) the respondent revealed an intention to inflict serious self-harm, b) the respondent revealed an intention to inflict harm on another, c) the respondent revealed that he or she was being seriously abused and that this abuse was ongoing.

2.2.9 Referral & Response Mechanism:

Prior to interview, relevant services (asylum, health, education, psychosocial, livelihood) for migrant children in Musina were mapped. Interviewers had this list of services and how children could access them on hand during all interviews. After administering the survey, all children were briefed on available services and asked if they would like assistance accessing them. Save the Children identified a standby point person who was able to be called in to respond to requests for services or help respond to severe cases, if the need arose. This was an important element of the pilot, since the preceding literature review had identified the need to couple assessment and research with immediate programmatic action for children.

2.2.10 Focus Group Discussions:

Three focus group discussions were conducted to ask children about issues that the research team thought might have a bearing on referrals. The decision to hold focus groups was made after the referral response rate in the town taxi rank location was lower than anticipated.

Focus group participants included boys and girls living in the URC Boys shelter and on the street in town. Typically focus groups should be comprised of 6-8 individuals. Due to time constraints and difficulty identifying children, two groups were slightly smaller. The first focus group was made up of 5 children living on the street in town. During the time of the discussion most of these children were under the influence of drugs and distracted and certain questions did not yield rich data. The second group was comprised of 4 boys working in town who live at the URC boys shelter and typically attend school (during the time of the discussion they were on school holiday). The last group was made up of 8 boys found at the Rwanda feeding container in town. Most of these boys lived at the URC boys shelter, but one lived on the street.

Each group was asked the same set of questions. Questions were posed by the interviewers in Shona and Ndebele and interviewers also transcribed responses. Exact transcription was not possible. Questions aimed to help the research team understand children's attitudes towards interview location, their willingness to refer friends for interview, thoughts on incentives and perspective on Save the Children in Musina. See **Annex IV: Focus Group Discussions**.

2.3 South Africa Pilot Site and Migration Dynamic:

Musina, South Africa, a town along the border with Zimbabwe, was chosen as the pilot site. There is a long tradition of migration from neighboring countries, especially Zimbabwe and Mozambique, to South Africa. Migration has traditionally been fuelled by the pull factor of economic opportunities (mining, agriculture, skilled labor) and family members living across the border and push factor of weak economies in home states. Since 2002 the economic and political fall-out in Zimbabwe has resulted in increased migration from Zimbabwe to South Africa. Rough estimates suggest that between 3 and 4 million people have left Zimbabwe since 2000 and a large study extrapolating from the number of Zimbabweans in Johannesburg in 2007, suggested that there were between 800,000 to 1 million Zimbabweans residing in South Africa at that time¹⁴. The number is likely greater now due to lack of meaningful economic recovery in Zimbabwe and the 2009 change in South African legislation that allowed Zimbabweans to enter South Africa for a period of 90 days without a visa.

In the past several years, the nature of cross-border migration from Zimbabwe to South Africa has been shifting. More children, often unaccompanied, are coming to South Africa in search of income generating opportunities¹⁵. This may be due to deteriorating economic conditions, loss of family members or household livelihood as a result of HIV/AIDS, and poor schooling options in Zimbabwe (school closures, political violence in schools, teacher strikes).

Many children who migrate to South Africa aim to make money to send back home and are often unaware of the challenges posed by the journey and life on the other side of the border. Many boys report violence and theft while crossing the border; girls are often forced to have sex with authorities, truckers or others in order to "pay" for their passage¹⁶. Living conditions for migrant children in Musina are difficult, as shelters are overcrowded. Access to health and education is also limited as children are fearful of being reported to authorities

¹⁴ Landau, Loren. "Drowning in Numbers." in *Migration from Zimbabwe: Numbers, Needs and Policy Options*. Centre for Development & Enterprise. April, 2008. p.8.

¹⁵ Ibid. p.9

¹⁶ International Organization for Migration. "Migrants Needs and Vulnerabilities in the Limpopo Province, South Africa." Report of Phase II: Feb-March 2009. Pretoria. April, 2009. p. 26-29

and deported¹⁷. Though there has technically been a moratorium on deportation of Zimbabweans as of April 2009, accounts suggest detention¹⁸, especially among young people, continues to be a problem and fear of deportation persists and deportation continues to take place¹⁹.

In addition to the threat of detention and deportation, an increase in xenophobic violence against foreigners – punctuated by attacks across large swaths of the country in May 2008²⁰—may keep migrant children underground, fearful of accessing public services and difficult to reach.

In addition to international migration, South Africa also experiences considerable internal migration from province to province. While census-based estimated number of internal migrants is far greater than estimated number of international migrants²¹, Limpopo Province is less affected than other, more developed economic hubs. Limpopo province is the poorest of South Africa's provinces--as such it is expected that there are pull factors in other provinces that attract people from Limpopo.

2.4 Limitations:

The pilot exercise had several limitations that can be addressed in future pilot exercises.

2.4.1 Time Frame:

As acknowledged by the research team prior to the project, the time allotted for the pilot exercise was insufficient. Due to the limited amount of time, the research schedule did not allow time for error – which is common in the pilot testing of new tools. Future pilots would benefit from more time prior to data collection in order to run focus groups to get information on key aspects of tool implementation such as interview locations and appropriate incentives. Time should also be allotted to allow for comparing multiple approaches to see what works best and to allow referrals to trickle in. Three days in the town location did not provide enough time to understand whether or not the referral system was

¹⁷ Human Rights Watch. "No Healing Here: Violence, Discrimination and Barriers to Health for Migrants in South Africa." Dec. 2009. p.6-7.

¹⁸ International Office of Migration. "Migrants Needs..." 2009. p. 20.

¹⁹ Consortium for Refugees and Migrants in South Africa (CoRMSA). "Protecting Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Migrant in South Africa." Johannesburg. June 18, 2009. p. 62 -65.

²⁰ International Organization for Migration. "Towards Tolerance, Law and Dignity: Addressing Violence Against Foreign Nationals in South Africa." Feb. 2009. p. 7.

²¹ Yaqub, Shabin. "Child Migrants with and without Parents: Census-based Estimates of Scale & Characteristics in Argentina, Chile and South Africa. UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre. Feb. 2009. p. 6

working for certain sub-groups. Due the low referral response rate, it is also difficult to determine the interconnectedness of sub-groups of *children on the move* based on referrals. The research team had also hoped to pilot the tool in a second location, Polokwane, to test whether the concept of using the tool in multiple sites along a migration route was feasible, particularly since Save the Children do not have a programmatic presence in Polokwane. However, this was not possible in the end due to the time constraints. This should be included in future pilots to test the ‘mobile’ aspect of the assessment tool.

2.4.2 Small Interview Team:

The interview team was very small, consisting of only one lead researcher and two interviewers. A larger interview team should be employed in future iterations and would likely help address some of the time constraints. A larger team of interviewers could be used to staff multiple interview locations at the same time. It could also be used to “seed” for interviews, ie conduct targeted recruitment, while also receiving referrals. In the South Africa pilot this was not possible, in part, due to supervision requirements for interviewers. As interviewers were required to be observed by the lead researcher while interacting with children, it was difficult for the team to split up.

2.4.3 Logistics & Administrative Support from the Host Field Office:

Due to staffing constraints in the Musina office, Save the Children was not able to dedicate a staff member with adequate time available to advise the research team and help negotiate logistics and administrative issues. Given the already tight time frame and unclear roles concerning this issue, the process moved more slowly than anticipated. In future pilots, it is important that the field office provide advice, logistic and administrative support to the research team.

2.4.4 Interviewer Recruitment:

Given little lead-time for the host field office to prepare, only two interviewers were identified to work on the pilot. In future iterations, it would be useful to over-recruit interviewers for the interviewer training and make a final determination about the team after the training. This would help eliminate any weak candidates. In addition, candidates should be pre-screened, according to Save the Children’s child protection requirements, prior to data collection.

3. Pilot Assessment Findings Based on Sample Analysis

3.1 Overview of Sample:

The interview team targeted 6 select sub-populations of children on the move in Musina based on the typology of 11 sub-groups of children on the move in this area. Decisions were made to focus sampling on town and border locations (as opposed to farms) and on sub-populations of unaccompanied children that were determined to be more difficult to reach due to time restrictions. As such, the following sub-groups of children on the move were targeted:

1. Boys living in the URC Boy Shelter
2. Girls living in the URC Women's Shelter
3. Children living on the street in Musina town
4. Girls living in suburbs and working in town.
5. Boys working at the border
6. Girls frequenting or passing through truck parks at the border.

In order to target these groups, the research team split its time between shelter, in-town (street) and border locations. Approximately one day was spent interviewing children at shelters, three days were spent interviewing children in town and three days were spent interviewing children at the border.

3.1.1 Interview Respondents

Over the course of approximately 7 working days 52 children (40 male, 12 female) were approached or referred for interview in the Musina vicinity. 31 of 52 children were approached by the interview team for interview and 21 children were referred either via coupon or word of mouth. 48 of these children agreed to be interviewed and basic demographic data was collected from 4 children who declined to interview. 26 male children were interviewed at the border location, 16 (9 female, 7 male) children were interviewed at the town taxi rank location and 10 (3 female, 7 male) were interviewed at shelters. Consent was not received from 3 boys at the border and one girl working on the street in Musina town. Despite several attempts to find girls at the truck park location near the border, the research time was unable to identify any girls in the select age group (10-17).

3.1.2 Child Age:

The interview team targeted children age 10 to 17 for interview. The mean age was 15.5 years (Standard Deviation 1.2); the youngest child interviewed was 12 and the oldest 17. The mean age for girls (15.3) was slightly lower than for boys (15.6). Children were classified into three age groups recommended by the Save the Children South Africa team: 10-12 years, 13-15 years and 16-17 years. The

majority of children interviewed were in the oldest age group at the time of interview– ie 16 to 17 years.

Table 2: Child Age at Time of Interview

| Child Age Group (Current) | Total # | % of total sample | Male N (%) | Female N (%) |
|---------------------------|---------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|
| 10 – 12 years | 1 | 2% | 1 (3% of M) | 0 |
| 13 – 15 years | 19 | 37% | 13 (33%) | 6 (50% of F) |
| 16 – 17 years | 32 | 62% | 26 (65%) | 6 (50%) |

* N – 52 – all children approached for interview

Based on the length of time the child indicated that he or she had spent in the country since last entry, it is possible to calculate the age of child migrants when they most recently arrived in South Africa. The mean age at entry was 14.5 years (standard deviation 1.4); the youngest migrant was approximately 10 years and 5 months old and the oldest 17 years old. Since a third of the sample had already crossed into South Africa previously, it is reasonable to assume that mean age at first entry for the entire sample is younger than the mean age reported here.

Table 3: Child Migrant Age at Last Entry

| Child Age Group (At age of entry into South Africa) | # | % | Male N (%) | Female N (%) |
|---|----|-----|-------------|--------------|
| 10 – 12 years | 4 | 8% | 3 (8% of M) | 1 (9% of F) |
| 13 – 15 years | 37 | 77% | 29 (78%) | 8 (73%) |
| 16 – 17 years | 7 | 15% | 5 (14%) | 2 (18%) |

* N = 48 – only children who consented to interview

3.1.3 Time Spent in South Africa:

Time since last arrival in South Africa was also recorded and classified into periods. The mean time since entry was almost 1 year (standard deviation 0.9) with a minimum time since entry of less than 1 day and the maximum of 3 years. It should be noted that children's responses to this questions were estimations – oftentimes children seemed to round to a whole number – such as 1 year, 2 years etc. If this information is important for programming purposes, a more precise question, with validation checks, should be employed in future pilots.

Table 4: Time Since Most Recent Entry into South Africa.

| Time spent in South Africa | Total # | % | Male | Female |
|----------------------------|---------|---|------|--------|
|----------------------------|---------|---|------|--------|

| | | | # (% of M) | # (% of F) |
|------------------------|----|-----|-------------|--------------|
| Less than 2 weeks | 5 | 10% | 3 (8% of M) | 2 (18% of F) |
| 2 weeks to < 3 months | 8 | 17% | 6 (16%) | 2 (18%) |
| 3 months to < 6 months | 7 | 15% | 5 (14%) | 2 (18%) |
| 6 months to 1 year | 14 | 29% | 11 (30%) | 3 (27%) |
| More than 1 year | 14 | 29% | 12 (32%) | 2 (18%) |

** N = 48 – only children who consented to interview*

3.1.4 Home Province of Children:

In the course of drawing their journey from home to South Africa during interviews, children were asked to identify where they lived in Zimbabwe. This information was then classified according to province and major city (independent of province by Zimbabwean jurisdiction). The sample comprised children from each province and major city in Zimbabwe. However, children from provinces closer to South Africa that are traditionally poorer – Masvingo, Matabeleland South and Midlands – comprise the majority of the sample.

Table 5: Home Province/Major City of Children

| Home Province or Major City in Zimbabwe | Total # | % |
|---|---------|-----|
| Bulawayo | 4 | 8% |
| Harare | 4 | 8% |
| Manicaland | 1 | 2% |
| Mashonaland Central | 1 | 2% |
| Mashonaland East | 1 | 2% |
| Mashonaland West | 2 | 4% |
| Masvingo | 17 | 35% |
| Matabeleland North | 1 | 2% |
| Matabeleland South | 9 | 19% |
| Midlands | 8 | 17% |

** N = 48 – only children who consented to interview*

3.1.5 Orphan Status:

Though not systematically asked in the interview, most children spoke about their situation at home prior to their decision to leave Zimbabwe. Details were recorded by interviewers in the “notes” section of the interview form. The majority of children interviewed, 32 children, had lost at least one parent prior to departure. Half of the children interviewed had lost both parents. For 6 of the children, this information was not recorded. Some children spoke of being cared for by other relatives, after their parents’ deaths, who also proceeded to die. The toll of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, coupled with financial fall-out and drought in Zimbabwe is contributing to high the high mortality rate.

Table 6: Orphan Status of Children

| Orphan Status | # | % | Male | Female |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|--------------|---------------|
| Single Orphan (1 parent dead) | 8 | 17% | 7 (19% of M) | 1 (9% of F) |
| Double-Orphan (both parents dead) | 24 | 50% | 17 (46%) | 7 (64%) |
| Non-Orphan (both parents alive) | 11 | 23% | 10 (27%) | 1 (9%) |
| DK | 5 | 10% | 3 (8%) | 2 (18%) |

3.2 Children's Journeys and Self-Identified Travel Needs

Information regarding children reasons for leaving home, their mode of travel, travel companions, entry into South Africa, and travel's needs were collected by the Mobile Assessment Tool. Findings regarding children's journeys, based in this small sample, are detailed in the following sections.

3.2.1 Reasons for Leaving Home:

Children's first two reasons why they left home were recorded. Not all children gave more than one response to this question, in which case the interviewer marked the second reason as a "non-response" (NR).

School dropout was the number one reason cited by children for their decision to leave. Orphan status is also a primary reason why children decide to migrate. Many children cited the death of a parent and their ensuing inability to pay for schools fees as major drivers of their migration. It should be noted that since 2007, the Zimbabwean school system has undergone tremendous challenges. Schools across the country were closed for significant periods in late 2008 due to lack of state funding for education. Since then teacher migration and strikes due to low salaries have also limited access to education. Further, unaffordable exam fees have inhibited children from passing their courses and proceeding to higher grade-levels.

Another chief reason that children indicated that they left Zimbabwe was to look for work or money. Other reasons included experiencing abuse at home, to join relatives in South Africa, lack of adequate food at home and parental divorce.

Table 7: Children's Reasons for Leaving Home

| Reasons why children left Zimbabwe | Frequency of Response |
|---|------------------------------|
|---|------------------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| Dropped out of school | 22 |
| Parent(s) died | 20 |
| For work / money | 16 |
| To join relatives/relations in SA | 6 |
| Abusive home situation | 6 |
| No food available | 5 |
| Parents divorced | 3 |
| Other | 5 |
| Non response | 12 |

3.2.2 Mode of Travel and Travel Companions:

Most children in the sample came to South Africa fairly directly and their journeys did not last long. Children travelled by train, bus, truck, mini-bus, malaisha (taxi hired to smuggle children), hitching rides and walking. Most children took multiple modes of transportation on their way to South Africa. Few children who lived outside of Beitbridge, Zimbabwe (Matabeleland South), a town along the border, walked for the entire journey.

Children typically travelled to South Africa alone or in the company of other children. Often children described beginning to travel alone, and picking up travel companions along the way—most often in Beitbridge, Zimbabwe prior to crossing the border.

Some children also travelled with adults – either adult siblings or aunts and uncles. Many of these children were separated from these adults once in South Africa. Some due to difference in asylum/passport status, while others were abandoned. In two distinct instances, girls were approached by adult strangers in Zimbabwe and invited to travel with them to South Africa and work for them there. Some children also travelled with Malaishas – taxi drivers hired to smuggled children into South Africa. Malaishas are often hired by adult family members and asked to transport a child to other family members across the border. This has long been a practice among Ndebele, people residing largely in the Matabeleland Province in the south west of Zimbabwe, due to strong kinship ties in South Africa and regular circular migration between the two countries. Others linked up with adults along the way.

Table 8: Children's primary travel companions

| Primary Travel Companion | Total # of children | % |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-----|
| Alone | 15 | 31% |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|----|-----|
| Child friends & family members | 23 | 48% |
| Adult relation | 5 | 10% |
| Adult stranger | 5 | 10% |

3.2.3 Entry into South Africa:

For the majority of children interviewed, this was their first time in South Africa. A third of children indicated that it was not their first time in South Africa. Many of these children were interviewed at the border location – where children cross back and forth across the border regularly for income generating purposes. Eleven of the twelve girls interviewed indicated that this was their first trip to South Africa, suggesting that boys may be more likely to travel back and forth across the border in comparison with girls. However, it should be noted that the interview team was unable to make contact with any girls who reportedly frequent or pass through truck parks at the border.

Children were asked to draw their journey from home to Musina. Based on this drawing and discussions during the interview, it was possible to determine if a child came through the border post or walked through the bush or river to gain entry into South Africa. Just over a quarter of children indicated that they entered through a non-official channel, circumventing the border post entirely while the rest indicated that they came by way of the border post. This does not suggest that they gained legal entry. All children entered without proper legal entry permits: children gained a free pass from border officials, paid bribes, did odd jobs for border officials to gain entry or were permitted to exit Zimbabwe without hassle and then dodged South Africa officials by walking through the bush in close proximity to the official entry point. Though questions regarding the means of entry were not systemized in the data collection tool, 14 children mentioned that they were either allowed to cross the border without hassle or were able to bribe their way through. All the children who mentioned being given a free pass were interviewed at the border location, where children regularly cross the border for income generation purposes and are likely known by border officials.

Table 9: Children's Entry into South Africa

| First Entry? | # | % | Male | Female |
|--------------|----|-----|---------------|---------------|
| Yes | 32 | 67% | 22 (60% of M) | 10 (91% of F) |
| No | 16 | 33% | 15 (40%) | 1 (9%) |

3.2.4 Children's Travel Needs:

Children were presented with three stock protection services that they might need while travelling: an adult to talk to (psychosocial support/guidance), help to go home (reunification with family in Zimbabwe) and help to find family in South Africa (reunification in South Africa). Save the Children South Africa Programme determined that these were the services about which they were most interested in collecting children's perspectives. Children were then asked to free-list the 4 additional needs that they had while travelling from their home until they arrived in Musina. This time period was highlighted by the interviewer on the map that the child drew of his or her journey to reiterate the time period in question.

Children were then presented with a spectrum drawn on a piece of paper. The left side represented the most important needs and the right side represented the least important needs. Each child was asked to rank the seven needs identified (three stock and four free-listed) on the line. The position of each need was recorded.

Money was by far the most frequently cited travel need and received the highest mean rank. For the purposes of this analysis, money and work were grouped together because children indicate that they need work to gain money. During travel, children use money to pay for transportation; to buy food and other needed goods; and to pay for entry (via bribes of customs officials) into South Africa. Several children also noted that they were robbed during their journey – most by mgumagumas (thugs) who operate around the border area—and were left without any money upon arrival in South Africa.

After money, clothes received the second highest mean overall rank. This may in part be due to children being robbed of their clothes during their journeys. This is common tactic of the mgumagumas. Food was received the third highest overall mean rank.

Having an adult to talk to received a mean overall rank of 5 (tied with official documents) out of 10. This suggests that children do appreciate this service and feel the need for guidance as they travel and enter a new country, but that it does not outrank more immediate needs associated with gaining entrance into South Africa and basic survival.

Official travel and identity documents received a mean rank of fifth. Children cited several types of documents that would make their journey easier – passports, asylum permits and birth certificates. Several children interviewed indicated that they did not have birth certificates, which prohibited them from accessing other needed official documents and also blocked entry into the South African school system.

Help to go home and help finding relatives in South Africa also ranked, though these were not as important to most as basic needs.

Children were also asked where would be most useful to receive help to address the needs mentioned in the top two priority positions. This question did not yield strong data. Either the question was not well understood or, more likely, due to children's typically short journeys to South Africa it was not relevant. At the border, in Musina, in South Africa were the most common responses.

Table 10: Top Four Travel Needs According to Children's Ranking

| | Overall Frequency | Mean Rank |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|
| Money/work | 47 | 1 |
| Clothes | 25 | 2 |
| Food | 27 | 3 |
| Shelter | 16 | 4 |
| An adult to talk to | 19 | 5 |
| Travel/ Official Documents | 20 | 5 |
| Help to go home to Zimbabwe | 12 | 7 |
| Reunification with family in SA | 9 | 8 |
| Education | 7 | 9 |
| Other | 9 | 10 |

3.3 Children's Musina Experience and Self-Identified Needs

Information on children's experience and needs while in Musina was also collected by the Mobile Assessment Tool. Findings are detailed in the following sections.

3.3.1 Where Children Typically Sleep and Accompanied Status:

Children were also asked to identify where they sleep in order to understand whether they were accompanied and if they benefited from any protection in the place where they “live.” Open-ended responses were classified into the six categories detailed in table 11 below. Generally, children indicated that they slept either in a shelter, in a rented room or home, or in assorted informal locations in marketplaces, truck parks or taxi ranks – which are labelled as “street” below. Only two children, living in rental arrangements indicated that they were accompanied by an adult who is a family member.

Among boys who were interviewed who live in shelters (8), the mean period of time that they had been in South Africa was a little over 4 months; the longest a boy living in the shelter had spent in South Africa was 1 year. In comparison, boys who indicated that they slept in non-shelter locations (on the street, at the border, in rentals) have been in the Musina vicinity for an average of 1 year and 5.5 months.

Among the 15 boys who sleep on the street on either side of the border, the average length of stay in South Africa was about 1 and 4.5 months.

Table 11: Sleeping Locations of Children

| Where children typically sleep | Total # | % | Male # (% of M) | Female # (% of F) |
|--------------------------------|---------|-----|-----------------|-------------------|
| Beitbridge, Zim - rental | 4 | 8% | 4 (11% of M) | 0 |
| Beitbridge, Zim- street | 2 | 4% | 2 (5%) | 0 |
| Border area, SA - street | 13 | 33% | 13 (35%) | 0 |
| Musina, SA -rental | 9 | 23% | 4 (11%) | 5 (46%) |
| Musina, SA - shelter | 14 | 35% | 10 (27%) | 4 (36%) |
| Musina, SA - street | 6 | 15% | 4 (11%) | 2 (18%) |

3.3.2 Children’s Access to Services in Musina:

Children were asked if they access any formal services and if so what they are. This question may not have work well because it was too open-ended. As such, it is possible that children did not remember to include all services that they received. The analysis on formal services (education, shelter, healthcare, asylum, livelihood training, food provision) children are receiving is therefore limited. In future pilots, this question could be improved by presenting a list of services known to be offered in the area and asking the child whether he or she received each, within a time period relevant to the service.

Despite this weakness, the data indicates that half of children interviewed are receiving at least one formal service. Children living in shelters are the only children who reported receiving more than two services. Children in shelters mentioned receiving the following: shelter, education, clothes, food, asylum and guidance from an adult.

Children living on the street in Beitbridge or in rentals in Beitbridge did not report receiving any formal services. Similarly, children living on the street in the border area of South Africa received very few services. Those who did receive a service mentioned accessing asylum and food. Children living in rentals in Musina also reported receiving very few services. Those mentioned were asylum and toiletries. Of the seven girls interviewed who do not live in a shelter, none had received a service other than asylum status.

In contrast, children did report receiving informal services from the community. Children cited being given a place to sleep in a shop or other sheltered location, being employed for odd jobs by the community and being offered food by well wishers as services that they had received.

3.3.3 Children's Needs in Musina:

The free-listing and ranking methodology was also used to gain insight into children's needs in Musina and the surrounding areas. Children were again presented with three stock categories: an adult to talk to, help to find family in South Africa and help to return home to Zimbabwe. Children were asked to think about the time they had spent in Musina and to list four additional needs that they had there. Then children were asked to rank these seven items on a continuum from most important to least important.

Money/work was overwhelmingly the most important need that children expressed. Money was the need most frequently mentioned and had the highest mean rank overall. Food, shelter and clothes –all basic needs—received the highest mean ranks after money/work.

Help to gain official documents, help to go home to Zimbabwe and help with family reunification in South Africa received the lowest mean ranks for the first four positions on the continuum of importance.

In addition, for the top two priority needs each child was asked who they thought should help provide for the need. This was a difficult question for most children to answer and as such interviewers regularly follow-up by probing with “do you think it would be best to get this thing from an NGO, from the government, from the local community, or from someone else?”

On the whole, most children expressed that they would like services related to their priority needs to be offered by NGOs. However, children gave mixed responses regarding the provision of education, clothes, work and shelter. Some children felt that the government should provide education, clothes, and work opportunities/money. Most commonly, children felt that the local community

should provide work opportunities/money. Some children also suggested that the local community should provide shelter and clothes.

Table 12: Top Four Needs in Musina According to Children's Ranking

| | Overall Frequency | Mean Rank |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|
| Money/ work | 45 | 1 |
| Food | 26 | 2 |
| Shelter | 22 | 3 |
| Clothes | 27 | 4 |
| Education | 17 | 5 |
| An Adult to Talk to | 14 | 6 |
| Help to Go Home to Zim | 14 | 6 |
| Travel/ Official Documents | 13 | 7 |
| Reunification with family in SA | 11 | 7 |
| Other | 3 | 10 |

Table 13: Who Should Deliver Services to Meet Children's Needs

| Needs | NGO Provide | Community Provide | Government Provide | NR/Other |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| An adult to talk to | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clothes | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Travel/ Official Documents | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Education | 9 | 0 | 5 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------|---|---|
| Reunification with family in SA | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Food | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Help to go home to Zimbabwe | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Money/ work | 3 | 11 | 5 | 1 |
| Shelter | 7 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

3.4 Children's Declared Destinations:

Though it is often thought that children migrate to South Africa with the intention of heading to Johannesburg or another major city, data from this sample suggests that Musina is a destination for many children who emigrate from Zimbabwe. Nearly three-fourths of children interviewed indicated that Musina was their destination, including 9 (of 14) children living in a shelter. Only 6 children indicated that they intended to head to a large city – Johannesburg, Pretoria or Durban. 3 children indicated that they aimed to travel to Polokwane or Louis Trichardt – other towns in Limpopo Province. 4 children indicated that they wanted to go home to Zimbabwe and 2 of these had only recently arrived in the Musina area.

This finding may have significant implications for program approaches in the Musina area. Musina is often considered a transit location for child on the move but it should also be considered a destination. As such, longer-term services such as education, income generation assistance and foster care arrangements for the significant number of children on the move who have lost both of their parents and other family members may warrant renewed consideration.

Children were also asked what services they would most like to be provided at their destination. This question yielded a high number of non-responses or replies indicating “none.” The question did not resonate as well as intended; this is likely because many children indicated that Musina was their destination and had already ranked services that they would like to receive in Musina during the interview. It was also asked at the end of a 45 -55 minute interview when children's attention was waning.

All children were asked what services they would like to receive at their destination, regardless of the destination itself. Education was the most frequently cited service (22 of 65 responses given), particularly among children who indicated that their destination was other than Musina.. ‘No service’ was the second most common answer (15 of 65 responses) and shelter was the third most common response (10 of 65 responses).

Table 14: Desired Services at Destination

| Destination | # | % |
|----------------------------------|----|-----|
| Musina Area | 35 | 73% |
| Johannesburg, Pretoria or Durban | 6 | 13% |
| Home in Zimbabwe | 4 | 8% |
| Polokwane or Louis Trichardt | 3 | 6% |

3.5 Recommendations for the South Africa Programme:

Even though the pilot findings represent a small non-representative sample of select sub-groups of children on the move in Musina and therefore are not statistically rigorous, a few issues warrant attention from the South Africa Programme in the context of future program planning.

First, programs should make efforts to do more outreach to target girls. According to the literature on child migration into the Musina area, there is not a good understanding of the number of girls who migrate to or through Musina. One reason for this maybe that there is no dedicated shelter for girls in Musina, while there is one for boys, making them more visible. While the URC Women's Shelter does house girls, several girls interviewed complained about the conditions there. Another reason may be that girls can more readily integrate into South African communities through boyfriends or early marriage, which limited data suggests may be a coping mechanism. During the research team's limited time looking for and receiving referrals from girl children working in town (3 days), 7 girls were easily identified. These girls were vendors on the street for "employers" and working in "Indian" shops in town. Most of these girls were not aware of services for children that are available in Musina, other than asylum permits.

Second, the South Africa Programme should think about service provision for children on the move in Musina in terms of both transit and destination services. The majority of children interviewed indicated that Musina was their destination and only a few indicated that they intended to return home. Further, 58% of children interviewed had been resident in the Musina area for more than 6 months with the mean time since last entry of 1 year. When asked about their priority needs for Musina, emergency services such as reunification, repatriation and help attaining official documents did not rank as high as day-to-day needs. As a result, it may be necessary to re-conceptualize programming in terms of longer term services which may provide children with more normalcy or continuity in their lives, such as education, vocational programming and, when appropriate, foster care for the significant number of children who have lost both parents and

may not have other relatives to care for them. Lack of access to education, due to inability to support costs, was one of the most significant factors why children initially left Zimbabwe, a country with a very strong education ethic. If children who want to return to school are re-afforded access, either at home in Zimbabwe or in Musina, and their basic needs are catered for, it may curb their desire to migrate further, exposing themselves to considerable risk.

Third, there appears to be a significant number of children on the move who live on the street on both sides of the Zimbabwe-South Africa border. Children choose to live near the border because they deem the work there – by and large ferrying goods across the border for travellers or merchants—to be more lucrative than odd jobs that they find in Musina town. The border area is approximately 15 kilometers from Musina town and as such it is not feasible for most children to move back and forth between these two locations. Children living at the border reported that they sleep at the taxi rank, in spaza shops, in the open and in the truck park. According to the interviewers, the border area is very dangerous, especially at night, due to the large number of mgumagumas (thugs/thieves) who operate there. As such, the South Africa Programme may want to consider alternative shelter for children who live at the border that offers them some protection at night and regular meals while allowing them to continue to pursue income-generating activities.

Fourth, through conducting the process of this research, the interview team became aware of complaints about Save the Children's food support from four Ndebele speaking children who live near the border area. These children reported their experiences of Ndebele speakers being discriminated against with regards access to the food support. Whilst this is not an issue related to this pilot study it is important that Save the Children should further investigate these reports.

4. Key Lessons: Methodology & Tool

4.1 Interview Site Selection

Selecting viable interview locations where the research team can receive child referrals is critical to the success of the methodology. Depending on the typology of children generated for the targeted geographic location, multiple interview locations may be needed. Interview locations must be within close proximity to where targeted sub-groups of children are known to congregate because children will likely walk to reach them. They should be locations that are well known to children so that they can easily identify where they are. Further they should be open spaces, that are preferably outdoor or in public spaces so that children can

approach them and survey the scene without feeling trapped. Lastly, the locations should be non-threatening to children.

Determining whether a location is non-threatening to children is the most difficult criterion to satisfy. The reputation of a location may not be obvious to adults and may differ among sub-groups of the target child population. As such, the research team found that key informant interviews with adults did not provide enough information to make this determination.

Because the response rate was lower than anticipated in the town taxi rank interview location, the research team conducted three focus groups with *children on the move* operating in town to elicit information about the taxi rank, among other issues. Children living on the street and children residing in the URC Boys Shelter who did piece-jobs on the street in town participated in the focus groups. Based on these discussions it became clear that while children who live on the street find the taxi rank to be a suitable location for interview, children who live in shelters did not. These children were familiar with the location and found it accessible but indicated that they associated it with substance abuse, an unhygienic lifestyle and lack of protection. This is by and large because children living on the street stay there and sniff glue and drink alcohol. Based on these findings it seems that this location may be considered to be the territory of one group of children and is somewhat threatening to another. The team also probed about other acceptable in-town locations. One viable recommendation that emerged was under a baobab tree near the hospital in town.

4.2 Interviewer Selection:

Recruiting interviewers who have worked with children in the target location, near the interview site may improve participation rate and mitigate perceived risk of self-identifying as an illegal migrant. While both pilot interviewers had previously worked with Save the Children, one interviewer had worked as an outreach worker near the border and was known to many of the boys who operate there. Because the interviewer was familiar to children in this area and was associated with Save the Children, children may have felt more comfortable presenting for interview and referring their friends. However, due to the small sample collected (especially when segmented by interview location), disparate incentives used, and child perceptions of chosen interview locations, it is not possible to directly compare referral response rates between the town and border locations. Yet, within the approximately three days spent conducting interviews in both locations, 26 interviews were held at the border and 15 in town. This assumption could be tested in future pilots.

4.3 Sampling Strategy

4.3.1 Targeted Sampling for First Wave

On the whole, targeted sampling of locations to generate the first wave of the sample worked well. Interviewers were able to identify and recruit “seeds” from all selected sub-groups within the pilot case definition of *children on the move* except for girls in truck parks.

Though the team made multiple attempts to find a seed for the ‘girls frequenting truck parks’ sub-group, security considerations prevented the team from recruiting at night, when girls are known to emerge from trucks or frequent these parks for commercial sex purposes. In future pilots, researchers should think critically about alternative means of recruiting seeds for this sub-group of children, or other similar groups. Recruitment of seeds for this sub-group may require targeting individuals known by key informants to be in this group rather than targeting locations they are known to frequent. While the purposive targeting introduces bias, it may be mitigated by multiple waves of sampling using a respondent-driven sampling strategy.

While girls in truck parks were difficult to find, girls residing in high-density areas and working in town were not. There is uncertainty about the population of migrant girls in Musina due to the relatively small number of girls presenting at shelters and food distribution points. Generally it is believed that the population of migrant girls is considerably smaller than the population of migrant boys in Musina. Despite this, the research team was able to easily identify migrant girls working on the street and in shops in town. This may suggest that improved outreach efforts or services that specifically address the needs of girls should be considered.

While initial “seeding” was straightforward, fewer referrals were presented for interviews than expected, especially in the town taxi rank location. This precipitated the need to conduct multiple waves of seeding. This should be considered and tracked in future pilots. Potential reasons why this was the case are discussed in sections 4.1 and 4.3.2.

4.3.2 Referral Mechanism, Response Rate and Incentives

This research team employed a modified version of Respondent-Driven Sampling, which eliminated the use of secondary incentives, to sample the target population. Primary incentives and the number of possible referrals (represented by coupons) differed according to the sub-group of *children on the move* (see Table 1: Sampling Decisions). This pilot found that this sampling methodology did not achieve a high referral rate. There were several limitations that potentially affected this result including limited time to allow for referrals to present for interview and the selected interview locations. There are also methodological

reasons for why this may have occurred, including choice of incentives and the lack of secondary incentives (See Section 2.4: Limitations).

Referral response rates were calculated according to child sub-groups. It should be noted that response rates are drawn from a small sample taken in a very limited period of time.

Shelters: The boys' shelter and girls' shelter were seeded first and interviewers spent less than a day at each shelter receiving referrals. Due to logistical complications during this phase of the pilot, interviewers were unable to spend all of the originally allotted time at these locations. This coupled with an interviewer error with respect to coupon distribution has flawed the referral data. As a result, referral response rates could not be calculated. Nonetheless, several referrals presented for interview in both locations, suggesting that referral system worked well in these closed environments.

Girls working in town: 9 girls were approached for interview in town. Of the 9, 1 declined to interview. Girls were offered a soda and between 20 & 30 rand as an incentive for interview and 3 or 4 coupons for referral depending on the day²². From the 8 interviews that were conducted, 1 occurred at the end of the interview period at the town location and was not given coupons for referral. From the 7 remaining interviews, 23 referrals could have been made. Only 2 of 23 potential referrals presented for interview, resulting in an 9% referral response rate. It should be noted that 2 girls who interviewed refused coupons altogether indicating that they worked all day and did not have time to distribute them.

Boys in town: 7 boys in town were interviewed; each was given a soda and 3 coupons. The last child interviewed did not receive coupons because it was the end of the interview period in this location. From the 6 remaining interviews, 18 referrals were possible. Only 2 of 18 potential referrals presented, resulting in an 11% referral response rate.

Boys at the border: 26 boys were approached for interview; 3 boys declined to interview. Each boy was given a soda and 3 coupons. Of the 23 remaining interviews, 8 interviews were conducted on the final day for interviews at this location. These 8 interviews are not included in the referral response rate calculation, given the limited time available to refer peers. From the 16 interviews conducted on the first two days at the border, 12 of 48 possible referrals presented for interview resulting in a 25% response rate.

²² Throughout the course of time spent in town, the research team altered the number of coupons and incentives girls received. 4 coupons were given during the first day and the 3 for other days. After the first day, the research team decided that 4 coupons may seem overwhelming for a respondent and reduced the number. During the last 2 days the primary incentive was raised from 20 to 30 rand to determine if this would improve the response rate.

Overall, the referral response rate (excluding shelter-based interviews) was 18.0%. While timing was limited and the sample small, this pilot did not achieve a high referral response rate. Noted limitations including, time to allow for referrals to present for interview; selected interview locations; chosen incentives and the lack of secondary incentives may have affected the result. This should be further explored in future piloting.

Because the referral response rate was lower than anticipated, three focus groups were held to probe several issues including referrals and appropriate incentives. Children were asked if they would refer their friends for interview and what would motivate them to do so. Most children indicated that if asked, they would refer their friends for interview. All three focus groups, without prompting, indicated that it would be easier to ask their friends to interview if they had something tangible to show them. Groups claimed that having a tangible incentive would help convince others to come for an interview. They suggested that a t-shirt, food or a blanket could serve as proof to convince their friends that they would also benefit from the interview. Children were mixed on the use of cash incentives – some thought it would be motivating, others thought it might be suspicious. They said that their friends might think they were being lured into precarious situation and that items typically distributed by NGOs (such as those listed above) would be more reassuring. Because none of the primary incentives used in this pilot (cash and soda) were considered identifiable “proof” when recruiting friends for interview, they were likely not as effective as they could have been. In future pilots, incentive selection should be explored with focus groups prior to roll-out and tangible items that can be shown to potential recruits should be considered.

4.4 Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was designed to be an interactive, semi-structured conversation that incorporated drawing and participatory ranking exercises for each major stage of a child’s journey. The interview team found that the tool was easy to use, kept children interested and required approximately 45 minutes to implement. Because only simple props are required, the interview tool can be used in disparate locations. Interviewers were asked to evaluate the tool throughout the course of the pilot and uniformly indicated that it worked well.

The tool itself is intended to be flexible. There is a large area on the data collection form where interviewers can take notes based on their conversations with children. This qualitative information is important to better understand each child’s circumstance. In future pilots, interviewers should be encouraged to make use of this section to record important details. Should common themes emerge, the team may choose to integrate a new question into the tool to reflect that theme.

Based on the review of the data, a few questions should be highlighted. Please refer to **Annex II: Interview Guide** for exact wording.

Questions 1 & 6: Both of these questions ask the respondent to identify his or her age. Question 1 asks the respondent his or her age outright. Question 6, posed several questions later asks for the child's birth date. This proved to be important because 19 of 48 respondents gave an age that did not correspond with their birth date, suggesting that they were masking or did not know their true age. Typically children told the interviewer that they were older than their birth date suggested. Because birth dates are more difficult to fabricate on the spot, question 6 (birth date) was used to analyze children's ages rather than question 1.

Question 14: This question aimed to establish if children relied on any coping mechanism while on their journey. However, it did not generate useful data. Children often did not answer this question and it should be reworded or eliminated in future pilots.

Question 20: This question asks the child to comment on where priority services should be provided along the migratory route. This question did not generate useful data. This may be because most children had fairly direct journeys to Musina. This may not be the case in other contexts.

Question 23: This question asked children to comment on services that they receive in their current location – for the purposes of this pilot, in Musina. This was phrased as an open-ended question. In future pilots, it should be a closed question based on services available. Appropriate time periods for each service should also be included in the question to make measurement more precise. For instance, children might be asked if they have ever received assistance to gain an asylum permit but asked whether they have accessed food distribution ever and in the last week.

Question 29: This question asks children to comment on whom they would most trust to deliver the priority services that they mentioned in the ranking exercise. The interviewers found that children did not understand this question without being prompted. In this pilot, interviewers followed this question by asking if a child would most like an NGO, the government, the host community or anyone else to provide this service.

4.4 Mapping of Services & Response Mechanism

Referring children to services available in the pilot location is an essential aspect of the tool. Given Save the Children's presence in Musina, this was easily accomplished. In pilot locations where Save the Children is not present, it would

be important to seek the insight of well-informed key informants working on issues related to children.

At the end of each interview, children were told about services that were available in town and how they could access them. If a child free-listed a service in the ranking exercise that was available in Musina, it was highlighted by the interviewer during this time. Children were also asked if they would like to receive assistance to access services. If they did, a Save the Children staff member was on call to respond. This is an important function that should be prioritized by staff. During the Musina pilot, two children were assisted to receive needed health care. In pilot locations without Save the Children's presence, a member of the research team may be able to fill this role.

5. Recommendations for Future Piloting

Based on the South Africa pilot, several aspects of the Mobile Assessment Tool worked well and other elements require refinement and future testing. Further piloting of the Mobile Assessment Tool is an important next step in developing the methodology. Based on the South Africa pilot, there are four major recommendations for the next stage. Additional, specific suggestions can be found in Section 4: Lessons.

5.1 Focus Groups

Focus group discussions with children in the target group, held prior to data collection, would be a useful addition to the methodology. Focus groups can help the research team clarify issues arising in key informant interviews. They should also be used to probe about key decisions including where children on the move congregate, interview locations, appropriate incentives, the degree to which sub-groups of *children on the move* are networked and other potential barriers to the referral system. Focus groups could also be used to further test questions which did not work so well in this initial pilot.

5.2 Sampling Strategy

Based on this pilot it is clear that the use of incentives should be given serious consideration in the design of the next pilot. Appropriate primary incentives that attract children and that children can use as proof of having benefitted from the process when referring their peers for interview should be determined. Incentives used to attract different sub-groups of *children on the move* may differ. However, based on focus group discussions held during the South Africa pilot, t-shirts, blankets and food, were recommended. In locations where Save the Children has a favourable reputation among children, these items could be branded with a Save the Children sticker or button to inspire confidence among potential interview recruits.

In addition to primary incentives, secondary incentives deserve renewed consideration and an ethical review to determine if they are appropriate. The use of secondary incentives, framed as prizes, may make the process more game-like and interesting to children. Secondary incentives will create an environment in which children have a vested interest in referring their peers and thus improve the referral response rate. If secondary incentives are used, the research team should add a question to the interview guide that asks children how they were referred and why they chose to come for interview. This may help the team determine whether children's methods of persuasion are appropriate or not.

5.3 Time Allowance

More time should be built-in for future pilot studies. It is important that there is sufficient time scheduled in each interview location within the target geographic area to fully appreciate whether the referral system is working to determine the interconnectedness of sub-groups of *children on the move* and to allow the team to adjust the methodology accordingly. Due to the low referral response rate and the limited number of sampling waves that could be conducted (due to the tight timeframe) it is difficult to meaningfully determine the degree to which sub-groups of *children on the move* are interconnected. Future piloting should allow at least five days in each interview location to test key aspects of the methodology. More days should be allotted if the aim is to sample enough waves to construct a representative sample.

5.4 Interview Team

Future pilots should expand the size of the interview team to allow the team to simultaneously target “seed” respondents for interview and receive referrals at designated locations, and to staff multiple locations at once. All interviewers should also have child protection checks completed well in advance of the start of data collection so that they are not required to be supervised while speaking to children.

5.5. Testing the Mobility of the Tool

It was not possible to test the tool in a second location along the migratory route as hoped in this pilot, due to time constraints. This will be important in future pilots to test if the ‘mobility’ aspect of the tool is feasible and effective. This is particularly important to test in sites where Save the Children does not already have a programming presence. More time should therefore be planned in future pilots to allow for testing in at least two sites.

5.6 Questions to Consider During Future Developments of the Tool

For programmatic purposes, it would be helpful to gather more detailed information on some key issues, for example:

- ⇒ Reasons for leaving home: we would need more information on why the death of one or two parents was a push factor for migration. Eg. Extended family not able to care for child etc.
- ⇒ Travel plans: we would need to know more about the level of preparation (if any) and/or precautions (if any) that a child gets in place before leaving.
- ⇒ A question could be added to find out if the child keeps in touch with the area of origin and, if so, how often
- ⇒ Means of entry into country (when relevant). This will need to be systematised in the data collection tool.
- ⇒ Where children sleep. More info on where they slept etc during travel might be helpful (this is if the length of the journey involves overnight travel).
- ⇒ Questions related to services needed/offered and who offers them might need to be re-worded. We would need to consider asking children who other children in the same situation would trust in terms of receiving services from. Maybe the issue of trust might provide insight into ways in which some services are delivered.
- ⇒ For programming purposes, further follow up questions will be needed to understand why children ranked some services at the top/bottom of their preference scale, in particular those that a programme might want to validate/test e.g. in this case return/reintegration services.