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|  |
| --- |
| **UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE**  APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF A PROJECT INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS, DATA OR MATERIAL  **Registration No.** *(office use only)*  **Period of Approval** *(office use only)**....../....../…………* to …*..../....../............  The UREC approval period is for two years from the date the full approval letter was issued or six months after the study is due to be completed,*  *whichever is greater. Programme applications are approved for a total of five years.* |

This application form should be completed by Staff, MPhil/PhD and other professional doctoral researchers at Oxford Brookes University; and external researchers wishing to seek approval to recruit participants from the university.   
Taught postgraduate and undergraduate students should seek approval via Faculty procedures:

[www.brookes.ac.uk/research/research-ethics/ethics-review-forms](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/research/research-ethics/ethics-review-forms)

Further details about the research ethics process, including deadline dates, templates for participant information sheets and consent forms are available at [www.brookes.ac.uk/research/research-ethics](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/research/research-ethics)

To ensure a high standard of research ethics review, **a maximum limit of 12 applications** will be reviewed at each UREC meeting. Once this limit has been reached, applications will be held over to the next meeting date. For a list of UREC dates and application deadlines see: [www.brookes.ac.uk/research/research-ethics/university-research-ethics-committee/#dates](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/research/research-ethics/university-research-ethics-committee/" \l "dates)

Applications must be completed on the form; answers in the form of attachments will not be accepted, except where indicated. **No handwritten applications will be accepted**. Applicants should contact the appropriate Research Ethics Officer (REO) to establish procedures for ethics review in the Faculty *(*[www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/Research-ethics-officers](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/Research-ethics-officers)).

**Applicants must go through Faculty procedures and be signed off by the Faculty or Departmental Research Ethics Officer before being submitted to the University Research Ethics Committee.**

Once the application is complete and has been signed off by all parties (see page 2 of this form), it may then be submitted to the UREC administrator based in the Research and Business Development Office, Buckley Building, Headington Campus, Gipsy Lane. Only the first 12 applications received by the submission deadline date shown on the University’s Research Ethics web site ([www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/University-research-ethics-committee](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/University-research-ethics-committee)) will be considered at the next meeting.

**Potential participants must not be contacted until written approval has been received from the Committee.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PROJECT TITLE:** | **Chemicals and their users in the British home, 1930s to 1980s** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **THIS PROJECT IS:** |  | **Staff Research Project** |
| *(tick as many as apply)* |  | **Research Student Project**  Has your research degree programme already been approved by the relevant Research Degree sub-committee:  Yes  No |
|  |  | **Project by External Researcher**  *(please give details)* |
|  |  | Project by member of staff at another institution  (*please give details of Post and Institution, including address)* |
|  |  | MPhil/PhD or professional doctorate student at another institution  (*please give details of Department and Institution, including address)* |
|  |  | Masters student at another institution  (*please give details of Department and Institution, including address)* |

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S):** *PhD and doctoral students can be listed as Principal Investigator after their supervisors. The Director of Studies should also be identified.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *TITLE & NAME* | *POST* | *DEPT & FACULTY* | *PHONE* | *EMAIL* |
| Dr Viviane Quirke | Supervisor | History, Religion and Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences |  | vquirke@brookes.ac.uk |
| Dr Glen O'Hara | Supervisor | ditto |  | glen.ohara@brookes.ac.uk |
| Catherine Rushmore | PhD student | ditto |  | 12010923@brookes.ac.uk |
| Dr Christiana Payne | Director of Studies | ditto |  | cjepayne@brookes.ac.uk |

**OTHER INVESTIGATORS:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *TITLE & NAME* | *POST* | *DEPT & FACULTY* | *PHONE* | *EMAIL* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE (PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR):** | Catherine Rushmore  C/o April Cottage,  Low Road  Thurlton  NR 14 6RL |

**DECLARATION BY INVESTIGATORS**

The information contained herein is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, accurate. I have read the [University’s Code of Practice for Ethical Standards for Research Involving Human Participants](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Documents/Research/Policies-and-codes-of-practice/ethics_codeofpractice/ethics_codeofpractice.pdf), and accept responsibility for the conduct of the procedures set out in the attached application in accordance with the guidelines, the University’s Code of Practice, where appropriate, the [guidelines for observation and handling of animals in field research](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/Guidelines-on-the-observation,-handling-and-care-of-animals-in-field-research/), and any other condition laid down by Oxford Brookes University’s Research Ethics Committee. I have attempted to identify all risks related to the research that may arise in conducting this research and acknowledge my obligations and the rights of the participants.

I and my co-investigators or supporting staff have the appropriate qualifications, experience and facilities to conduct the research set out in the attached application and to deal with any emergencies and contingencies related to the research that may arise.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Signature(s):* |  | *Date* | *....../....../…………* |
|  | *Principal investigator(s)* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Print name(s) of Principal Investigator(s) in block letters |  |  |

# DECLARATION BY dept/faculty RESEARCH ETHICS OFFICER (brookes staff and students only)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date application received: | ....../......./………… |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *DATE ETHICS REVIEW COMPLETED* | ....../......./………… |

*The Faculty Research Ethics Committee has reviewed this project and considers the methodological/technical and ethical aspects of the proposal to be appropriate to the tasks proposed and recommends approval of the project. The Faculty Research Ethics Committee considers that the investigator(s) has/have the necessary qualifications, experience and facilities to conduct the research set out in the attached application, and to deal with any emergencies and contingencies that may arise.*

Comments/Provisos:      

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Signature(s):* |  | *Date* | *....../....../…………* |
|  | *Research Ethics Officer* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Print name in block letters |  |  |

# university research ethics COMMITTEE USE ONLY

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Date application received:* | *....../....../…………* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Date of meeting:* | *....../....../…………* |

***Decision:***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Date:* | *....../....../..........* | *Approved* |  | *Approved,*  *subject to specific conditions* |  | *Not approved* |  | *Returned for further clarification* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Date:* | *....../....../.......* | *Approved* |  | *Approved,*  *subject to specific conditions* |  | *Not approved* |  | *Returned for further clarification* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Date:* | *....../....../.......* | *Approved* |  | *Approved,*  *subject to specific conditions* |  | *Not approved* |  | *Returned for further clarification* |  |
| Date of final approval | *....../....../…………* |  | | | | | | | |

**1. PROJECT DETAILS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.1 | PROPOSED DURATION OF DATA COLLECTION COMPONENT OF PROJECT | From: | May/June 2014 | To: | January 2015 |

# 1.2 LAY DESCRIPTION: Provide a brief outline of the project, including what participants will be required to do. This description must be in everyday language which is free from jargon. Please explain any technical terms or discipline-specific phrases. (No more than 350 words)

The term “Chemical Age” has been used to describe the growth of chemical industries and availability of all manner of synthesised goods resulting from their work (Crone, 1986). "Chemicals and their Users in the British Home" seeks to examine the position of domestic users of chemicals, who were faced on the one hand with increased restrictions on the sales of ‘simple’ chemicals and on the other with increasingly abundant and apparently complex, branded chemical products. The period of investigation is the 1930s to the 1980s, includes economic depressions and uplifts, wartime restrictions, agricultural revolutions, increased numbers of women working outside the home after marriage and growing awareness of environmental issues. These all affected the availability of, and decisions to use, chemicals in the home. These chemicals promised speed, ease, safety, efficiency, nicer hands or improved personal relationships as well as the job they were intended to.

My research so far has been based on newspaper and magazine articles, policy documents, promotional material and product packaging. Adverts, advice or instructions, and even policy can be ignored or reinterpreted by users, so in order to uncover the user experiences and motivations, the next step of research seeks interviews with people who used chemicals (especially those selected for case studies) to obtain a richer story of how chemicals have been invited into, or excluded from, domestic environments. These interviews will create a record of how chemicals and policies relating to them were experienced in the home.

Participants will be asked to talk about memories of their relatives' use and their own use of chemicals, for domestic chores such as stain removal, “tough” cleaning jobs such as toilets and ovens, weeding the garden, as well as the hobby of developing photographs at home. I am also interested whether they used them for any “off label” uses. Participants will be encouraged to talk about their broader attitudes to chemicals, and what they think influenced the formation of these ideas. Interviews will also cover obtaining and storing the chemicals, as well as succession of products by others (perhaps as chemicals were withdrawn, or others became available).      

# 1.3 AIMS OF AND JUSTIFICATION FOR THE RESEARCH: State the aims and significance of the project. Where relevant, state the specific hypothesis to be tested. Also please provide a brief description of the proposed research, a justification as to why this research should proceed and an explanation of any expected benefits to the community. Please provide full references for any work referred to. (No more than 700 words)

Although there are histories of problematic chemicals in the natural environment and investigations into the health effects of long term exposures to chemicals in everyday domestic or workplace settings (Warren, 2000; Murphy, 2006) scholarly research relating to the deliberate repeated use of chemicals in the home has not been located. Chemicals are a form of labour-saving technology: however they are barely mentioned in histories of domestic technology which tend to focus on durable mechanical appliances, for example Ruth Cowan's "More Work for Mother", or whole systems such as electricity (Hankin, 2013).

Following my study of feature articles, letters and adverts in newspapers and widely available special interest magazines (e.g. Good Housekeeping, Gardening Illustrated, Which?) chemicals with household or garden uses have been selected for case studies; soda, toilet cleansers, dry cleaning fluids, sodium chlorate and paraquat. In order to include other dimensions of leisure, gender and age, developing photographs at home is also included. Beyond passing mentions, thoughtful reflections on the topics of obtaining chemicals, and how this changed over time, and the ways that they were used have not been forthcoming in written archival sources, so oral history provides an opportunity to record material behind the decisions to use these products.

The flexibility of semi-structured oral history interviews allows for the discussion of wide ranging contextual subjects which will enrich the story of how the interviewees relate to chemicals in general and to branded products in particular, perceptions of housework and garden care, what various and tangential occurrences (friends or acquaintances, school curriculum, film, TV, books) might have had an impact on the interviewee's motivation to use certain chemicals or products. The benefit of interview over written testimony is that the interviewer can tease out topics of particular interest. Sales figures can show that complex branded products have crowded out simple chemicals on shop shelves, but oral history can probe what the users' perspective on this has been.

Interviews will shed light on personal decisions to use chemicals, where and how chemicals were obtained and the general practices of using of chemicals in the home and garden between 1930 and the 1980s. Although there are limitations associated with oral histories, they provide perspectives and insights not available elsewhere (Perks & Thompson, 2006). ± 10 interviews is a manageable number to arrange and process. Interviews will include men and women who lived in urban areas, rural settings, areas near to and far from chemical industries (which might divide up into North and South) to provide material for comparison. The focus on use, rather than avoidance, is deliberate as although rejection may be an important part of choice, the aim of these interviewees is to give voice to people who are not anti-chemical activists. There is a body of literature concerned with actively rejecting corporate, mass produced chemical products, but the majority of people who continue to buy products of sometimes dubious effectiveness have not been encouraged to expound on their actions and attitudes, which might even be contradictory.

The users may have been concerned with their own and others’ health and the health of the environment. The desired outcomes of the chemical use, financial costs of chemicals or branded preparations and the type of convenience they offer, all contribute to and sometimes conflict, decisions to use particular chemicals. Considering users' experiences will provide the opportunity to look at questions of gender, especially with ideas of hygiene and family safety, and to examine necessity (e.g. housework, growing food) and leisure (e.g. other gardening, photography). This also involves discussions of class, as space to garden or develop photographs, and the investment in specialised equipment, are dependent on financial income.

The benefit of this research is that information and reflection on everyday life with special focus on chemicals will be recorded. Mass Observation reports and diaries do not contain the details required for this study. Those who might remember the early portion of my time frame are dwindling. The chosen topics are worthy of study because there are so many factors – including views of self, family and environments, economic considerations relating to time use and financial costs, branded and unbranded products – that impact them.

Cowan, Ruth Schwartz. *More Work for Mother : The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Hankin, Emily. *Buying Modernity? The Consumer Experience of Domestic Electricity in the Era of the Grid* PhD Thesis, University of Manchester 2013

Perks, Robert, and Alistair Thomson. *The Oral History Reader*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Murphy, Michelle. *Sick Building Syndrome and the Problem of Uncertainty : Environmental Politics, Technoscience and Women Workers*. Durham (N.C): Duke University Press, 2006.

Warren, Christian. *Brush with Death: A Social History of Lead Poisoning*. Baltimore; London: John Hopkins University Press, 2000.

**1.4 PROPOSED METHOD:** *Provide an outline of the proposed method, including details of data collection techniques, tasks participants will be asked to do, the estimated time commitment involved, and how data will be analysed. If the project includes any procedure which is beyond already established and accepted techniques please include a description of it. (No more than 500 words.)*

Over the course of my research, I have met people who have indicated that they would like to talk to me about their relationship to household chemicals. These people would be contacted as part of a formal recruitment approach, where the potential participants will be sent the information sheet so that they can read, consider and ask questions in advance of agreeing to take part. They are free to pass on the invitation to anyone else that they think would be interested. These people can then contact me.

If they are keen to take part, understand what is involved and agree to audio recording, then we will arrange an interview. I will provide a clear information sheet, copyright information, a consent form and recording agreements in advance of the interview and be available to discuss the implications. The aim is to avoid an interview being recorded, then the interviewee declining permission to use their words. The ideal situation will be to get full, informed consent to record, store and use clips for every interviewee. I would prefer all participants to be recorded for accuracy. If an interviewee gives permission for written quotes (anonymised or not) to be used but declines permission for audio clips to be used, this is still a viable and desirable situation.

The semi-structured interview will be recorded at the participants' homes or in a suitable (quiet) public venue. Sample questions and prompts which should elicit thoughtful statements relevant to the topic are appended. The interviewee will not be given the questions in advance, but from the recruitment process and information sheet they will know that they will be talking about their own memories and experiences of using chemicals at home as part of housework or garden-care routines and reflecting on their more general attitudes towards chemicals. This is an established and acceptable way of undertaking an oral history interview, which should allow for relaxed discussion of the topic in question, rather than the delivery of rehearsed answers recorded for posterity.

The information sheet, recording and copyright agreements will be reviewed before the interview commences, to ensure that the participant understands the nature of their involvement in the project, and they will be reminded that they can take a break or finish the interview without reason.

If they wish to terminate the interview and withdraw from the research, which they can do without giving a reason, then I will note their decision and delete the recording. I will destroy the notes and details made relating to that individual. The recording is deleted because withdrawing invalidates any permissions given to use the material and without permission there is no reason for the recording to exist. I wish to avoid situations where the participant's time and my time has been wasted.

Each interview is anticipated to take between 45 minutes and 2 hours, some may be shorter and others may be longer, depending on what the participant's loquacity. Consent and means of identification will be reviewed and confirmed at the end of the interview. The principal investigator will then transcribe the interviews as soon as practical, either in long note form or exactly. An estimate of how long this can take is for every hour recorded, allow eight hours for processing. This lengthy process improves the familiarity of content which facilitates interrogation of the text to find themes, using close reading or technological methods such as NVivo. A copy of the interview and transcript will be sent for accuracy checking to the participants; it will be explained to them that they will have 3 weeks to respond, and that after this time I will contact them to check that the lack of response means that they are content.    

**1.5 INVESTIGATORS’ QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE AND SKILLS**

*List the academic qualifications and outline the experience and skills relevant to this project that the researchers and any supporting staff have in carrying out the research and in dealing with any emergencies, unexpected outcomes, or contingencies that may arise.*

Catherine Rushmore has been studying the histories of users and technologies in a variety of scenarios since 2005. This theme has provided two dissertations for MA (navigation aids and museum visitors) and MSc (condoms). Catherine worked as Science Curator at the Museum of Science and Industry 2009 - 2012, having started at the organisation in visitor services, then entered the curatorial department as an assistant curator. As a curator she was trained by colleagues at the museum, which included the theory behind oral history, limitations and benefits of oral history, practical considerations such as personal safety, sound quality and potential uses of recordings, copyright, confidentiality and informed consent, preparation of sound bites, issues around the longevity of digital media with respect to storage and retrieval.

Catherine arranged, conducted and processed oral history interviews to stand in for objects that could not be collected themselves, and to enhance understanding of those that the museum already cared for, as well as to shape exhibition research and to provide future exhibition content.

Undertaking interviews involved traveling to the agreed interview venue, requiring that safe offsite, lone working procedures were followed (notification of colleagues of location and time of expected return, carrying a well charged mobile telephone). Through experience, Catherine developed an interview manner which enabled the collection of relevant and interesting details about objects, events, institutions and practices.

Catherine also attended a session arranged by the Science Museum, London in December 2012 which brought together PhD students using oral history in their research. Experienced interviewers, supervisor Dr Quirke was one, shared their advice on practicalities of recruiting participants, obtaining informed consent and directing interviews to ensure that research needs were met.

Support in the form of regular email contact and face to face supervisions, as per normal PhD supervision is expected to suffice in the general carrying out of the research. Supervisors will be notified of the investigator's progress and any concerns as they arise.

Dr Viviane Quirke has completed comprehensive training with the Oral History Society, and conducted oral history interviews as part of her original research, which are now deposited with the British Library. She is aware of the processes and sensitivities involved and is therefore well situated to support students carrying out this type of data gathering and research. Dr Quirke has completed up to date training at Oxford Brookes University that supports her supervisory capacities.    

1.6 PLEASE EXPLAIN WHEN, HOW, WHERE, AND TO WHOM RESULTS WILL BE DISSEMINATED, INCLUDING WHETHER participants WILL be provided with any information ON the FINDINGS OR OUTCOMES of the project:

 The results will be disseminated to the academic research community and other interested individuals through the availability of the final dissertation and any resulting published papers on the Oxford Brookes research website RADAR. Conference presentations or teaching material could use either sound clips (if consented to) or transcribed extracts.

Participants will be sent a copy of the recording, their transcript and a summary prepared from the oral history material. Participants will be informed that the finished thesis and any related publications will be available online on the freely accessible RADAR repository.  

**1.7 WILL THE RESEARCH BE UNDERTAKEN *ONLY* ON-SITE AT OXFORD BROOKES UNIVERSITY (including all campuses)?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES, only on-site |  | NO, not only on-site | *(If NO, give details of off-campus location, including other sites where research is being undertaken and other countries providing data):*   The interviews will take place at the participants homes, or at a public venue, with the intention that the choice of venue reduces inconvenience to the participant, that it is somewhere they can talk freely, and that audio recording can take place. |

**1.8 OTHER APPROVALS REQUIRED** *Has permission to conduct the research in, at or through another institution or organisation (e.g. a school) been obtained? Individuals proposing to conduct research involving contact with children or vulnerable adults must first get agreement from the individual with appropriate authority in the institution or organization through which the research is being conducted. (Copies of letters of approval to be provided).*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES |  | NO |  | NOT APPLICABLE |

*(If YES, please specify from whom and attach a copy. If NO, please explain when this will be obtained.)*

     

**1.9 IS THIS PROTOCOL BEING SUBMITTED TO ANOTHER ETHICS COMMITTEE, OR HAS IT BEEN PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TO AN ETHICS COMMITTEE?** *This includes an NHS Local Research Ethics Committee or any other institutional committee of collaborating partners or research sites.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES |  | NO | *(If YES, please provide details including correspondence setting out conditions of approval.)* |

# 2. PARTICIPANT DETAILS

# **2.1 DO YOU INTEND TO RECRUIT:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **YES** | **NO** |
| a) students or staff of this University (i.e. recruitment on-site at Brookes) |  |  |
| b) adults (over the age of 16 years and competent to give consent) |  |  |
| c) children/legal minors (anyone under the age of 16 years) |  |  |
| d) patients or clients of professionals |  |  |
| e) anyone who is in custody, custodial care, or for whom a court have assumed responsibility |  |  |
| f) any other person whose capacity to consent may be compromised |  |  |
| g) a member of an organisation where another individual may also need to give consent |  |  |

2.2 NUMBER, AGE RANGE AND SOURCE OF PARTICIPANTS

*Provide number, age range and source of participants. Please provide an explanation for your proposed sample size (including details of statistical power of the sample, where appropriate) and state any exclusion or inclusion criteria.*

Taking the age of 15 as when a person might regularly be doing chores that involve chemical products, participants will be aged 40 and over. There is no upper age limit, as long as participants are capable of giving informed consent to take part in the project. Participants will be selected to cover as varied a geographic area (urban, rural, Northern, Southern) and time span as possible. The anticipated sample size of 16 to 20 detailed interviews is small, due to the workload of processing the interviews.

The criteria for inclusion is a willingness to talk about their everyday household and/or garden chores and motivation for decisions regarding the use of chemical products to assist in these chores for any period between 1930 and 1989. The participant should talk principally about the experience they had in Britain, although they do not have to identify themselves as British, English, Scottish, Irish or Welsh.     

2.3 MEANS BY WHICH PARTICIPANTS ARE TO BE RECRUITED

*Please provide specific details of how you will be recruiting participants. How will people be told you are doing this research?  How will they be approached and asked if they are willing to participate?  If you are mailing to or phoning people, please explain how you have obtained or will obtain their names and contact details. This information will need to be included in the participant information sheet. If a recruitment advertisement is to be used, please ensure you attach a copy to this application.*

Participants will be recruited through personal approaches by the principal investigator to contacts made during the project. Additionally, participants and other acquaintances of the principal investigator can pass on details of the study (in the form of the information sheet, or simply contact details) to other potential participants, who can then make contact with the principal investigator. All participants will be fully informed about the nature of the research through the necessary Participant Information Sheet and Recording Agreement.

2.4 WILL PARTS OF THIS PROJECT BE CARRIED OUT BY INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES |  | NO | If YES, please explain who the independent contractors are, what their role will be and how their work will be monitored. Responsibility for proper conduct of the project remains with the Principal Investigator.] |
|  |  |  | | |

2.5 ARE ANY OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN A DEPENDENT RELATIONSHIP WITH ANY OF THE INVESTIGATORS, PARTICULARLY THOSE INVOLVED IN RECRUITING FOR OR CONDUCTING THE PROJECT?

Research involving persons in dependent or unequal relationships (for instance, teacher/student) may compromise a participant’s ability to give consent which is free from any form of pressure (real or implied) arising from this unequal power relationship. Therefore, UREC recommends that, where possible, researchers choose participant cohorts where no dependent relationship exists. If, after due consideration, the investigator believes that research involving people in dependent relationships is purposeful and defensible, then UREC will require additional information setting out the case and detailing how risks inherent in the dependent relationship will be managed. UREC will also need to be reassured that refusal to participate will not result in any discrimination or penalty.

NB. Reasons of convenience alone will not normally be considered adequate justification for conducting research in situations where dependent relationships exist.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES |  | NO | *(If YES, please explain the relationship (e.g. teacher/student, student/lecturer, employer/employee) and the steps to be taken by the investigators to ensure that the participant’s participation is purely voluntary and not influenced by the relationship in any way.)* |
|  |  |  | | |

# 2.6 PAYMENT OR INCENTIVES: Do you propose to pay or reward participants?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES |  | NO | *(If YES, how, how much and for what purpose?)* |
|  |  |  | | |

# 3. RISK AND RISK MANAGEMENT

**3.1 DOES THE RESEARCH INVOLVE:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **YES** | **NO** |  |
| 1. use of a questionnaire or similar research instrument or measure? (attach copy) |  |  |  |
| 1. use of written or computerised tests |  |  |  |
| 1. interviews? (attach interview questions) |  |  |  |
| 1. diaries? (attach diary record form) |  |  |  |
| 1. participant observation? |  |  |  |
| 1. observation of participants (in a non-public place) without their knowledge? |  |  |  |
| 1. audio-recording interviewees or events? |  |  |  |
| 1. video-recording interviewees or events? |  |  |  |
| 1. access to personal and/or confidential data? (including student, patient or client data) without the participant’s specific consent |  |  |  |
| 1. administration of any questions, tasks, investigations, procedures or stimuli which may be experienced by participants as physically or mentally painful, stressful or unpleasant during or after the research process? |  |  |  |
| 1. performance of any acts which might diminish the self-esteem of participants or cause them to experience embarrassment, regret or depression? |  |  |  |
| 1. investigation of participants involved in illegal activities? |  |  |  |
| 1. procedures that involve deception of participants? |  |  |  |
| 1. administration of any substance or agent? |  |  |  |
| 1. use of non-treatment of placebo control conditions? |  |  |  |
| 1. collection of body tissues or fluid samples? |  |  |  |
| 1. collection and/or testing of DNA samples? |  |  |  |
| 1. collection and/or testing of gametes or embryo tissue? |  |  |  |
| 1. participation in a clinical trial? |  |  |  |
| 1. administration of ionising radiation to participants? |  |  | |
| 1. research overseas? |  |  | |

# 3.2 POTENTIAL RISK TO PARTICIPANTS AND RISK MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES

*Identify, as far as possible, all potential risks to participants (e.g. physical, psychological, social, legal or economic), associated with the proposed research. Please explain what risk management procedures will be put in place.*

Participants can choose to use a pseudonym if they feel that what they disclose in their interview puts them at risk once the interview is processed for use. The interviews will be stored securely on a password protected computer, backed up to an encrypted hard drive. Whole interviews and transcripts will be offered to the Science Museum, where if they would be available to researchers if the recordings were accepted as relevant to the collecting policy, and extracts could be used in physical or virtual exhibitions.

Participants will be assured at the start of the interview and reminded at any appropriate point during, that if they feel uncomfortable or distressed by remembering and discussing their experiences with cleaning or gardening products, or their beliefs about chemicals, that the interview can be stopped, temporarily or permanently. The small number of interviews means that if someone could identify an anonymised participant from a particularly unusual or unique activity revealed in their interview. It is unlikely, but a remote possibility that the interviewee could reveal some kind of criminal activity involving household chemicals. During the consent giving process, the interviewee will be made aware that there are limits to the maintenance of confidentiality should activity that harmed people, animals or property be disclosed during the interview. The wording used by the Oral History Society is "A person or organisation in possession of information relating to criminal activities is legally obliged to disclose it to the police, if legal proceedings or investigations are under way in connection with those activities. There is no legal obligation to disclose information if no investigation is in progress and there has been no approach from the police". The period I am interested in is likely to have already been investigated. If it appeared that the interviewee was divulging information on a previously uninvestigated situation, I would have to terminate the interview and inform the police. If a situation that had seemed innocuous during the interview then on further consideration seemed unclear, I would seek clarification from the interviewee and support from my supervisor. Interviewees will be made aware of this during the consent process.

3.3 ARE THERE ANY SPECIFIC RISKS TO RESEARCHERS THAT ARE GREATER THAN THOSE ENCOUNTERED IN NORMAL DAY TO DAY LIFE? *(Where research is undertaken at an off-campus location, whether in the UK or abroad, researchers should consult the University guidelines regarding risk assessment. Further details are available at:* [***www.brookes.ac.uk/services/hr/health\_safety/docs/index.html***](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/services/hr/health_safety/docs/index.html)sections OBUHSN 36 & 38. *The Dean of Faculty or the Director has the overall responsibility for risk assessment regarding the health and safety of researchers. Useful advice for the safety of researchers is available on the Social Research Association website at:* [**www.the-sra.org.uk**](http://www.the-sra.org.uk/) *and where appropriate, researchers should read the guidelines on observation, care and handling of animals in field research* [***http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/Guidelines-on-the-observation,-handling-and-care-of-animals-in-field-research/***](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/Guidelines-on-the-observation,-handling-and-care-of-animals-in-field-research/)*.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES |  | NO | *(If YES, please describe)*: Interviews take place off campus, in the homes of partiicpants or in other public places. The researcher will follow appropriate lone working procedures, including informing relevant people of their location and intentions, and to check in on return. |

3.4 PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF THE RESEARCH OUTWEIGH ANY RISKS TO PARTICIPANTS*. Briefly describe the main benefits and contribution of the study. Include any immediate benefits to participants as well as the overall contribution to knowledge or practice.*

The main benefits are access to memories, personal thoughts and reasons behind decision making that are rarely recorded as there are few platforms or opportunities for the non-activist person to do this, giving insight into product choices, everyday practices and thoughts relating to the use or avoidance of chemicals in the household. Some of this information is available separately through receipts, or diaries but these tend not to gather the details together, or with the kind of reflection elicited through these interviews. There have been substantial shifts in the visibility and availability of potentially harmful chemicals, there have been changes in labeling, packaging and retail in general, so to hear about these from the people who shopped and handled the goods complements the discussions on these topics recorded in parliamentary debates and newspaper articles. "Chemophobia" has been blamed for hostility to the chemical industry, reduced numbers of chemistry students, for the rise in "chemical free" sloganeering, but it has not been investigated appropriately to help understand how so many people *do not* come to behave in a particularly chemophobic manner. Nor does it help to understand why the variety of chemical products available to aid chores has continued to burgeon during the period under investigation. With serious concerns that still have not been resolved about pervasive, environmentally persistent chemicals, with perceived effects ranging from ozone layers to fertility to autism, it is important to know about how people made decisions about how to live and where they got their information from. Much effort related to public understanding of science is directed towards attitudes regarding academic research rather than applied or corporate science, so these interviews offer an opportunity to see the role of science in culture and how some of the public understandings of chemicals are formed and held, with respect to products and actions in everyday life.

**3.5 ADVERSE / UNEXPECTED OUTCOMES**

*Please describe what measures you have in place in the event of any unexpected outcomes or adverse effects to participants arising from involvement in the project.*

If a participant should become distressed during the interview, a break can be taken, or if preferred (or necessary) the interview can be terminated. The principal investigator should not attempt to advise or counsel the participant, if for example they have questions about what to do with waste chemicals or they are worried about exposure to a chemical being responsible for a health effect, but direct them to other sources of support.

Care will be taken during the interview set up and construction of the participant's information sheet and consent form to avoid raising false hopes of "starring" a participant in any resulting outcomes, so that they are not disappointed or offended about how the content of their interview is used.      

**3.6 DEBRIEFING, SUPPORT AND/OR FEEDBACK TO PARTICIPANTS (as appropriate)**

*What, if any, debriefing, support or feedback will participants receive following the study and when? Participants may need to talk about the experience of being involved in the study or about issues it has raised for them. Depending on risks to participants you may need to consider having additional support for participants during/after the study (e.g., external counseling). Further information on the aims of the research, their own performance and/or the results of the study may also be appropriate.*

At the end of the interview, the interviewee will be thanked for their participation and reassured that as an oral history project looking at everyday experiences, all their memories and views are valuable. The consent form will be reappraised in light of the interview content, and the interviewee can decide how they would like to be referred to in the research (i.e. by their own name, or a pseudonym). They will be able to ask the principal investigator any questions, and they will also be reminded that they have the contact details of the principal investigator and her departmental supervisors on their participant information sheet if any further questions or comments or complaints arise at a later date.

Due to the wide ranging nature of potential concerns, the Citizens Advice Bureau could help with consumer questions, specialist support groups experienced in discussing chemical sensitivity (Action Against Allergy) or local environmental services could be more appropriate.     

3.7 MONITORING

*Please explain how the conduct of the study will be monitored, for example via your Associate Dean for Research and Knowledge Transfer or supervisory team, (especially where several people are involved in recruiting or interviewing, administering procedures) to ensure that it conforms with the procedures set out in this application, the University’s Code of Practice and any guidelines published by their professional association.*

The research will be monitored by the supervisory team according to University Code of Practice for monitoring of research degree students.     

# 4. INFORMED CONSENT

* 1. HAVE YOU ATTACHED TO YOUR APPLICATION A COPY OF THE PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET?  *(Guidelines for drafting this are provided on the UREC web page at:* [**www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/Guidelines-for-informed-consent/**](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/Guidelines-for-informed-consent/)

*Whenever possible, Oxford Brookes University letterhead should be used for information sheets.)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES |  | NO | *(If NO, please explain.)* |
|  |  |  | | |

THE FOLLOWING IS A LIST OF ITEMS NORMALLY EXPECTED TO BE INCLUDED IN AN INFORMATION SHEET. PLEASE USE IT IN CHECKING THAT YOUR DOCUMENTS INCLUDE:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **YES** | **NOT APPLICABLE** |
| 1. clear identification of the University, the Department(s) involved, the project title, the Principal and other investigators (including contact details) |  |  |
| 1. details of what involvement in the project will require (e.g., involvement in interviews, completion of questionnaire, audio/ video-recording of events), estimated time commitment, any risks involved |  |  |
| 1. advice that the project has received clearance by the UREC |  |  |
| 1. if the sample size is small, advice to participants that this may have implications for privacy/anonymity |  |  |
| 1. a clear statement that if participants are in a dependent relationship with any of the researchers that involvement in the project will not affect ongoing assessment/grades/management or treatment of health *(as relevant)* |  |  |
| 1. assurance that involvement in the project is voluntary and that participants are free to withdraw consent at any time, and to withdraw any unprocessed data previously supplied |  |  |
| 1. advice as to arrangements to be made to protect confidentiality of data, including that confidentiality of information provided is subject to legal limitations |  |  |
| 1. a statement that the data generated in the course of the research be retained in accordance with the University’s policy of Academic Integrity and must be kept securely in paper or electronic form for a period of ten years after the completion of a research project.   [www.brookes.ac.uk/Documents/Research/Policies-and-codes-of-practice/academic\_integrity](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Documents/Research/Policies-and-codes-of-practice/academic_integrity) |  |  |
| 1. advice that if participants have any concerns about the conduct of this research project that they can contact the Chair of the University Research Ethics Committee at Oxford Brookes University, including the e-mail address: ethics@brookes.ac.uk. |  |  |
| 1. any other relevant information |  |  |

4.2 HAVE YOU ATTACHED TO YOUR APPLICATION A COPY OF THE CONSENT FORM? - *if you are not obtaining consent in writing please explain how the informed consent process is to be documented. (Guidelines for drafting a consent form are provided on the UREC web page. Whenever possible, Oxford Brookes University letterhead should be used for consent forms.)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES |  | NO | *(If NO, please explain how you consent will be documented.)* |
|  |  |  | | |

**DOES THE CONSENT FORM INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **YES** | **NO** | **NOT APPLICABLE** |
| 1. appropriate letterhead |  |  |  |
| 1. title of the project and names of investigators |  |  |  |
| 1. confirmation that the project is research |  |  |  |
| 1. confirmation that involvement in the project is voluntary and that participants are free to withdraw at any time, or to withdraw any unprocessed data previously supplied |  |  |  |
| 1. confirmation of particular requirements of participants, including for example whether interviews are to be audio/visually-recorded, whether anonymised quotes will be used in publications etc. |  |  |  |
| 1. advice of legal limitations to data confidentiality (in studies where the participants are named or de-identified) |  |  |  |
| 1. if the sample size is small, confirmation that this may have implications for anonymity |  |  |  |
| 1. any other relevant information |  |  |  |

# 5. CONFIDENTIALITY/ANONYMITY

**5.1 WILL THE RESEARCH INVOLVE:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **YES** | **NO** |
| 1. complete anonymity of participants (i.e., researchers will not know the identity of participants as participants are part of a random sample and are required to return responses with no form of personal identification)? |  |  |
| 1. anonymised samples or data (i.e., an irreversible process whereby identifiers are removed from data and replaced by a code, with no record retained of how the code relates to the identifiers. It is then impossible to identify the individual to whom the sample of information relates)? |  |  |
| 1. de-identified samples or data (i.e., a reversible process in which the identifiers are removed and replaced by a code. Those handling the data subsequently do so using the code. If necessary, it is possible to link the code to the original identifiers and identify the individual to whom the sample or information relates)? |  |  |
| 1. participants having the option of being identified in any publication arising from the research? |  |  |
| 1. participants being referred to by pseudonym in any publication arising from the research? |  |  |
| 1. the use of personal data? *(If YES, you may need to register with the University)* |  |  |

*Please bear in mind that where the sample size is very small, it may be impossible to guarantee anonymity/confidentiality of participant identity. Participants involved in such projects need to be advised of this limitation.*

# 5.2 WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING METHODS OF ASSURING CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA WILL BE IMPLEMENTED? Please select all relevant options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. data and codes and all identifying information to be kept in separate locked filing cabinets |  |
| 1. access to computer files to be available by password only |  |
| 1. other *(please describe)* |  |

5.3 LEGAL LIMITATIONS TO DATA CONFIDENTIALITY: *Participants need to be aware that the confidentiality* *of the information they provide can only be protected within the limitations of the law - i.e. it is possible for data to be subject to subpoena, freedom of information claim or mandated reporting by some professions. This only applies to named or de-identified data. If your participants are named or de-identified, you may need to specifically state these limitations.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES |  | NO *(please explain)* | Not applicable |
|  |  |  | | |

# 6 DATA ACCESS, STORAGE AND SECURITY

6.1 WILL THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR BE RESPONSIBLE FOR SECURITY OF DATA COLLECTED?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES |  | NO | *(If NO, please provide further details including any differences between arrangements in the field, and on return to campus.)* |
|  |  |  | | |

* 1. ACCESS TO DATA

Access by named researchers only

Access by people other than named researcher(s) *(Please explain:)* *If 'data' means the recordings and transcripts, the principal researcher will have sole access during this PhD. The funding body (Arts and Humanities Research Council) would prefer that the oral histories (but no personal information, such as contact details) are available to researchers in the future, which means that they are not yet known or named.*

* 1. STORAGE OF DATA

Stored at Oxford Brookes University  
 In a secure shared repository *(This should be explained to participants in the information sheet)*

Stored at another site *(Please explain where and for what purpose:)*

*In order that I can work on the recorded data, it will be stored on my password protected computer. Contact details will similarly be stored there. Long term storage will be in the first instance at Brookes. If I can persuade a museum or archive that the quality and content of the recordings fit their collecting policy, then the recordings (and the contact details) will be transferred to their as yet unknown site.*

6.4 DOES DATA STORAGE COMPLY WITH THE UNIVERSITY’S GUIDELINES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF RESEARCH DATA AND RECORDS? *(See Oxford Brookes University Code of Practice for Academic Integrity, at:*

[www.brookes.ac.uk/Documents/Research/Policies-and-codes-of-practice/academic\_integrity](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Documents/Research/Policies-and-codes-of-practice/academic_integrity)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES |  | NO | *(If NO, please explain.)* |
|  |  |  | | |

# 

# 7. FUNDING

7.1 IS THIS PROJECT BEING EXTERNALLY FUNDED?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES |  | NO | *(If NO, please skip the remaining questions.)* |

7.2 SOURCE OF FUNDING?   Arts and Humanities Research Council   

7.3 PROJECT GRANT TITLE AND PROPOSED DURATION OF GRANT *(Where applicable)*

  CDA PhD funding, 3 years, Chemicals and their Users in the British Home 1930 - 1980   

7.4 DOES THE PROJECT REQUIRE APPROVAL BEFORE CONSIDERATION BY A FUNDING AGENCY?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES |  | NO |  |

IF YES: DEADLINE FOR THE FUNDING AGENCY?      

* 1. **HOW WILL PARTICIPANTS BE INFORMED OF THE SOURCE OF THE FUNDING?** *The source of funding should normally be explained in the participant information sheet.*

The source of funding is explained in the information sheet.   

# 8. CHECKLIST

Please check that the following documents are attached to your application. Please note that where questionnaire or interview questions are submitted in draft form, a copy of the final documentation must be submitted for final approval when available.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ATTACHED | NOT APPLICABLE | |
| Recruitment advertisement (question 2.3) |  |  |  |
| Participant information sheet (question 4.1) |  |  |  |
| Consent form (question 4.2) |  |  |  |
| Evidence of external approvals related to the research (question 1.9) |  |  |  |
| Questionnaire (question 3.1) | draft | final |  |
| Interview Schedule (question 3.1) | draft | final |  |
| Other (please specify:      ) |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **For further details about completion of this form, please contact your  Faculty Research Ethics Officer in the first instance.** |