

#2 Asking Questions

Practising ethics guides to built environment research

Yael Padan

When planning

1. How do I choose and approach my interviewees?
2. Have I found out enough about the local social/cultural/political context?
3. How do I ensure my interviewees understand the purpose of our interview?
4. If my questions make my interviewees uncomfortable, what can I do?
5. How will I store and manage the information I gather?

While interviewing

6. How am I treating my interviewees?
7. Can I sense tensions/sensitivities/expectations?
8. Am I making anyone feel uncomfortable?

Before writing

8. Have I stored my data securely?
9. Have I made sure that information remains confidential?
10. Will I share the transcript of the interview with my interviewees?
11. Will I share my interpretations with my interviewees?

Practising Ethics: Guides

These guides, curated by the [Bartlett's Ethics Commission](#) in collaboration with [KNOW \(Knowledge in Action for Urban Equality\)](#), and edited by Jane Rendell, (Director of the Bartlett Ethics Commission 2015-20), offer insights by experienced researchers into how to negotiate the ethical dilemmas that can arise during a research project. The aim is to help you practise built environment research ethically. David Roberts (Bartlett Ethics Fellow 2015-20) devised the format and structure of these guides to follow the ethical issues that arise during the development of a research process – from planning, to conducting, to communicating and producing outcomes – and Ariana Markowitz wrote some of the introductory text that runs across all guides. The guides focus on the different kinds of ethical issues you might encounter as a result of using specific processes or methods, and pay attention to the particular contexts and ways in which these methods are practised. Because when practising research, methods and context inform one another, we consider this series of guides as embedded in a mode of applied ethics called **situated** or **relational ethics**. Where you see words that are highlighted, they refer back to our definitions of key **ethical** principles and to terms contained in institutional protocols as found on [Practising Ethics](#).

1. *Making Images* (David Roberts)
2. *Asking Questions* (Yael Padan)
3. *Co-producing Knowledge* (Yael Padan)
4. *Staging Research* (David Roberts)
5. *Researching, Risk, and Wellbeing* (Ariana Markowitz)
6. *Researching Internationally* (Emmanuel Osuteye)

Acknowledgements

The Bartlett Ethics Commission worked alongside the Bartlett Ethics Working Group from 2015-8, and so benefitted greatly from the input of Martin Austwick, Claire Colomb, Helen Dougal, Helen Fisher, Efrosyni Konstaninou, Rowena Lamb, James O'Leary, Niamh Murtagh, Hedley Smyth, and Steve Ridge, but in particular Jens Kandt, Mike Raco, Michelle Shipworth, and Michael Walls. The project was supported educationally and economically by the Bartlett Faculty, and specifically its former Dean, Alan Penn.

Guide # 2 Asking Questions by Yael Padan

[W]e can explore... the texture and weave of everyday life, the understandings, experiences and imaginings of our research participants, the ways that social processes, institutions, discourses or relationships work, and the significance of the meanings that they generate.'

Jennifer Mason, *Qualitative Researching*, (London: Sage, 2002), 1.

About this guide: why and how built environment researchers co-produce knowledge

Built environment research is as much about people as it is about places: the people who use and inhabit the places you are researching, the people who engage with those places emotionally or spiritually even if they are not physically present, the people who build them, and the people who own or manage them. In addition, you the researcher are necessarily a key actor: you devise the research approach, become a participant in the place where you gather data, and you determine how to interpret that data and what to do with it. Because people are unpredictable, research can also be unpredictable, and as a researcher you are likely to encounter unexpected **situations** that require you to think on your feet whilst navigating high expectations with limited time. Even the best-laid plans often go awry when they come into contact with reality and real people and you will need systems in place to support you throughout that process, minimising **harm** to those you are researching and participating with, as well as yourself. **Ethics** is about what kind of lives we should lead, what actions are right and wrong, what qualities of character we should develop and what **responsibilities** we have for each other and our ecosystem. To conduct research **ethically** it is important to consider the **benefits, risks** and **harms** to all connected with and affected by it.

Why interview?

A very good way of finding out about people's relations to the built environment is to ask questions. Interviews can teach us about many different aspects of the built environment, such as decision-making processes by policy makers and planners; how people understand and use architectural and other spaces; how they feel about them; whether and how they would like to change or improve them.

Interviewing as a method for gathering information is widely used across disciplines. In the social sciences interviews often complement other methodologies such as observations, focus group discussions or census data. They are an excellent way to learn about opinions and experiences of individuals and to understand what matters to them. Interviews can provide insights into the diversity of meanings, as well as how and why they differ. In the humanities, interviews are often used to record oral histories. Narrative research provides insights into the lived experiences and memories of individuals. It may take the form of biographies, life histories, and various methods of life writing. Interviewing allows different voices to be heard and provides insights into notions of subjectivity, representation and voice.

Most interviews employ questions, but whether these questions are planned in advance, and how strict the interviewer is at keeping to a pre-decided list of questions and to the same sequence for each interviewer is partly a matter of choice, but also disciplinary habit. In the social sciences, interviews are generally classified into three categories: structured interviews, which follow a list of pre-determined questions that are rigorously repeated in different interviews; semi-structured interviews, which in addition to planned questions allow for flexibility in response to the content of the interviewee's answers; and unstructured interviews, which allow the conversation to be largely directed by the interviewee, and can be more of a dialogue or conversation. In the humanities, oral history, life history and other forms of interviewing which focus on personal accounts that are unique to each interviewee often use the format of unstructured interviews. Along this continuum, various types of interviews can be designed, to suit various research objectives.

The ethics of interviewing

This guide is designed to support your interviews by making sure you are conducting them in an ethical manner. This means treating the participants with dignity and respect, and considering the benefits, risks and harms to all connected with and affected by the interviews you will conduct.

How to use this guide

These guides to *Practising Ethics* define appropriate ways to engage **ethically** in research. *Asking Questions* aims to assist you in recognising the **ethical** dilemmas which arise from asking questions and to address and **reflect** on these with confidence. It is designed to be a point of reference at any stage of your research – from planning your project, to conducting activities in the field, to communicating what you have learned through the production of particular research outputs.

Asking Questions contains *principles, questions, guidelines* and *resources*. The *principles* in the next section inform best practice. These are not just regulatory hurdles for you to jump through at the beginning stages of your research but concepts that ground **ethical** inquiry throughout. They help you develop and refine an approach that it is **sensitive** to the physical and emotional challenges that may arise in the research process, enabling you to be a more effective researcher. The series of guiding *questions* act as prompts for you to **reflect** on the potential **ethical** considerations which emerge throughout a project, before, during, and after you conduct your research. The *guidelines* expand on the questions, illuminate the different **ethical** concerns they raise, and recommend actions which embody these principles. The *resources* section provides additional information.

These guides are not exhaustive and cannot address all the possible **situations** you will face, particularly for research on **sensitive** topics or in places experiencing violence or instability. But learning from the experiences of others, will help you gain the ability to **reflect** on what you encounter, and to make informed judgements about the best way to practise your research **ethically**. Insightful and imaginative research encompasses a range of sites, cultural contexts, and people and there will always be a need for flexibility and **care**.

Questions

When planning: *Preparing and anticipating*

1. How do I choose and approach my interviewees?
2. Have I found out enough about the local social/cultural/political context?
3. How do I ensure my interviewees understand the purpose of our interview?
4. If my questions make my interviewees uncomfortable, what can I do?
5. How will I store and manage the information I gather?

While interviewing: *Interviewing with care*

6. How am I treating my interviewees?
7. Can I sense tensions/sensitivities/expectations?
8. Am I making anyone feel uncomfortable?

Before writing: *Consulting and checking*

9. Have I stored my data securely?
10. Have I made sure that information remains confidential?
11. Will I share the transcript of the interview with my interviewees?
12. Will I share my interpretations with my interviewees?

Principles

The people, places and research methods you use will each raise their own **ethical** considerations related to a common set of principles that encourage **ethical** conduct and promote interaction based on good faith and mutual **respect**.

Benefit not harm: Your research should have a **benefit** to society and any **risks** involved to participants must be minimized, balanced against the potential **benefit** to the overall community, and clearly explained to participants before they give their **consent**.

Informed consent: You need to inform your participants about the study and what is being asked of them, including any potential **risks** or **benefits**, in order for them to make an informed and voluntary decision about whether or not to participate in the research.

Confidentiality: You need to inform participants of the extent to which **confidentiality** can be assured and **respect** their right to remain **anonymous** in dissemination and display.

Guideline 1 When planning research: *Preparing and anticipating*

A good way to start planning an interview, is to consider that although interviews are planned activities conducted for research purposes, it is a good idea to regard them as conversations or dialogues, which are very different from interrogations.¹ Ethics in the interview involves listening, paying attention and being non-judgemental.² In the dialogue or conversation that takes place during an interview, it can be helpful to consider how knowledge is being co-produced with your participants, rather than extracted from them.

Who are you going to interview?

Decisions concerning your choice of the interviewees can raise ethical issues that require careful considerations. These will of course vary according to context, but may include questions such as whether the interviewees represent a diversity of opinions, whether marginalised or disempowered persons have been included, whether you have paid careful attention to issues such as power inequalities, race, age, gender, and other considerations which may cause the exclusion of important voices. In all cases, recognising your own positionality is an important step in choosing your interviewees.

Once you have chosen your interviewees, take time to **reflect** in a similar way about how you will go about building a rapport with them. Give some thought to the cultural context of the interview, including the linguistic context. Will you need to use a mediator or an interpreter? In addition, consider the power relations between yourself and your interviewees. Different kinds of power dynamics can affect the interview, such as whether you are a young researcher interviewing an established professional/expert, or a privileged researcher interviewing vulnerable people; as well as the implications of differences in gender, age, ethnic, social and other inequalities that might exist between your position as interviewer and the position of your interviewees.

Preparing the interview

In order for your questions to be relevant and ethical, make sure you familiarise yourself first with the context and the topic. In addition, take time to think about how to present your research to the interviewees. Preparing your information sheet and consent form is not only a requirement of any institutional Research Ethics Committee, but also good way to clearly summarise and share the purpose and content of your research.

Information sheet

You need to explain to your interviewees the purpose and content of the project/research; why are you conducting the research? what is being asked of them? are there any potential risks or benefits? The information sheet you prepare will also need to describe how the information and data obtained will be used, processed, shared and disposed of, prior to obtaining consent.³ It is best to write your information sheet with your interviewees in mind, and to make sure that the information you provide is clear and appropriate to people's background, literacy and context.

Consent

Based on the information you provide your interviewees will be asked to make an informed and voluntary decision concerning whether they would like to participate in the research. Consent is usually given by signing a consent form. Like the information sheet, consent forms should also be context-sensitive and accessible. Signed consent may nevertheless sometimes be ethically inappropriate, for example in contexts where people are suspicious and reluctant to sign any kind of form because of specific political or social circumstances; or because they do not speak the language in which the form is written; or are illiterate. In such cases, spoken consent may be obtained, but it must be recorded in writing or on a recording device. However, participants also need to agree to be voice-recorded, and if notes are taken then they need to agree to this too. Consent can be revoked, and the interviewees should be informed that they can withdraw from an interview at any point.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality relates to the use of information that has been collected by researchers, and the extent to which it is made publicly known.⁴ Participants should be assured that the data collected will be securely stored, that information supplied by them to the researchers will remain confidential, and that their identities will be concealed unless they request otherwise.⁵ They should also be made aware in cases where it will be difficult to conceal their identity (e.g. when a small group is involved, or if the information will be disseminated within their community), and given the opportunity to decide how they want this issue to be addressed.

Anonymity

Anonymity relates to ascribing the information to specific individuals, and whether they can be identified from the data or from other information disclosed by the researchers.⁶ In order to protect the privacy and safety of the participants, they should be asked whether they wish to be named, or whether they would like to be **anonymised** or pseudonymised. Unless they clearly state that they agree to being identified, it is advisable that **anonymity** should be your default option.

Framing the questions

Some ethical issues can come up as a result of the way questions are prepared and framed. It is important to consider issues such as: Am I asking a question which presupposes an answer? Do the questions I am asking respect my interviewees' backgrounds and experiences?⁷

Interviewing potentially vulnerable people and conducting sensitive research

Research involving children and young people, those with a learning disability or cognitive impairment, individuals in a dependent or unequal relationship, and other potentially vulnerable groups, will certainly require ethics approval from your institutional Research Ethics Committee. This is also the case with '**sensitive** research', involving '**sensitive** research topics' and 'special category personal data'.

What do 'personal data' and '**sensitive** personal data' mean? According to the General Data Protection Regulation, personal data is any information relating to an identified or identifiable person.⁸ **Sensitive** or special category personal data means: personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin; personal data revealing political opinions; personal data revealing religious or philosophical beliefs; personal data revealing trade union membership; genetic data; biometric data (where used for identification purposes); data concerning health; data concerning a person's sex life; and data concerning a person's sexual orientation.⁹

What are **sensitive** research topics? The Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), lists some examples of **sensitive** topics, including 'participants' sexual behaviour, illegal or political behaviour, experience of violence, abuse or exploitation, mental health, their personal or family lives, or their gender or ethnic status.'¹⁰ This type of research could entail more than minimal risk to participants, third parties or researchers, which must be recognised, managed, and minimised.¹¹

Guideline 2 When conducting the research: *Interviewing with care*

The interview is a social **situation**, involving interpersonal relationships and interpretations. Awareness of these qualities can shift the interview from a session of questions and answers into an informal, dialogic and conversational mode. The interchange that takes place within the interview can be understood as a series of 'relational moments' in which the identities of both researcher/interviewer and interviewee are mutually performed and read.¹² Furthermore, as Lynn Abram points out in reference to oral history interviews, that as these two subjectivities collide, the mode of collision (which may be characterised by collaboration and rapport, but also by power relations and misunderstandings) impacts how the resulting narrative is recounted.¹³

Where to interview?

It is a good idea to find a quiet place where the interviewee can feel comfortable and relaxed. However, depending on the context, care should also be given for the safety of both the interviewee and the interviewer. In this regard, you are advised to consider that meetings in a quiet public place are safer than interviewing people in non-public places, including their homes.¹⁴ Remember that in order to engage in a meaningful conversation, both you and your interviewee should feel safe and comfortable.

Expect the unexpected

A range of ethically-challenging **situations** can arise during the interview. They cannot be anticipated, and there are no ready answers or solutions. It is therefore important to consider different scenarios in advance, and think about ways of handling them. Some examples are:

Causing distress

Some questions can create discomfort or upset your interviewee; and researching **sensitive** subjects can be upsetting for the researcher as well.¹⁵ Marilys Guillemain and Lynn Gillam identify what they call 'ethically important moments', such as when participants are distressed or reveal a vulnerability, or when the researcher must make a decision whether, and how far, to probe a participant about a difficult or troubling experience, or when someone discloses something that gives cause for concern about them or someone else.¹⁶

What can be done?

Prepare to pause the interview and give the interviewee a chance to decide whether they want to carry on; change the topic and return at a later point to the distressing issue; break off the interview and re-schedule; or end the interview altogether.¹⁷ Remember and remind the interviewee of their right to choose not to respond to a question or withdraw from the research at any time, so it is their decision if they want to stop the interview. As Gill Valentine advises: 'Be sensitive to their responses, and never pressurise people to talk about anything which is obviously making them uncomfortable or distressed. If you are planning to carry out **sensitive** research it is advisable to find out about local counselling and support services, so that if necessary you can pass this information on to your informants.'¹⁸

Problematic statements

What happens if an interviewee expresses an offensive view? It is important to think of your reaction in advance. Some researchers argue that the researcher should challenge offensive views, because remaining silent might be understood as agreement, and may therefore reproduce or legitimise these views. Other researchers argue that contesting offensive statements will not change the interviewee's views, but could destroy their trust and rapport, and thus damage the research.¹⁹

Guideline 3 When producing and communicating research outputs: *Consulting and checking*

Anonymising

As mentioned above in Guideline 1, **anonymising** is a way to avoid risk of harm to your participants, and protect their **privacy** and safety. Therefore, in your research outputs, participants should be **anonymised** unless they ask to be named. This can be done in various ways, for example by using pseudonyms (possibly selected by the participants themselves) or interviewee numbers, as well as not specifying the location of the research, and concealing the names of identifying features mentioned by the interviewees, including for example names of other people, places, or institutions.²⁰ In the UK similar guidance about respecting the **anonymity** of respondents is given by the Economic and Social Science Research Council,²¹ and the British Educational Research Association (BERA) advises that ‘fictionalising’ approaches can be used, provided that an explanation is provided by the researcher about how and why this was done.²² This may not always be possible, as in some cases it may be difficult to conceal a participant’s identity. Furthermore, you, the researcher, as an outsider, may not be aware that certain details might potentially disclose the identity of a participant.²³ In addition, researchers have pointed out that extensive removing or changing of details could distort the data and compromise its accuracy and integrity,²⁴ or may even result in making research materials virtually meaningless.²⁵ Researchers need to consider these issues carefully. If you expect such difficulties to come up in your research, it is a good idea to state them in the consent form, and make your interviewees aware of them in advance.²⁶

Storing the data

Research data must be kept securely, and in the UK and EU its storage must comply with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which specifies the way in which personal data can be collected, used, retained and deleted. Guidance to complying with GDPR can be found on the website of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI).²⁷ The British Educational Research Association (BERA) website has useful information about the required arrangements for maintaining the security of research data,²⁸ and the UK Data Services website provides information about storing and preserving data.²⁹

Transcribing

Once you have completed your interview you will need to transcribe it. You can do this yourself, or it can be done using software. There are various software options for automatic transcription of interviews (for example Sonix and Happy Scribe). Automatic transcription saves time and is easy to use, but can be costly, and some errors can occur because of issues such as distance from the microphone, people talking at once, or speakers that have strong accents. To improve accuracy and quality, it is best to go over the automatic transcriptions while listening to the audio files, and type corrections into the text manually. Transcribing your own interviews (or correcting the automatic transcriptions yourself), rather than having someone else do this for you, is extremely important, because you are able recall the conversation. This will assist you in understanding unclear words or phrases. It will also give you an opportunity to add meaningful comments, such as descriptions of non-verbal gestures, to the text,³⁰ and to notice additional or undetected aspects that you had not been aware of during the interview itself.³¹

Providing the interviewee with a transcript

You may want to share the transcribed interviews with your interviewees. There are many advantages to sharing the transcripts. Some of them are practical, such as allowing the interviewee to correct transcription mistakes and make sense of unclear words or segments. Others relate to issues regarding content, such as validation of data, having a more accurate representation of the interviewee's voice, giving interviewees control over making changes to their words, deciding to omit certain segments, and explaining their responses.³² Disadvantages of sharing the transcript include interviewees potentially making changes, editing the text or adding information to an extent that the transcript may no longer represent an accurate **reflection** of the interview. Although this could improve the quality of the data, the spontaneous responses and the immediacy of the interview may be lost.³³

There are some other options, such as sharing with your interviewees a summary of their interview, or sharing your interpretation. Alternatively, you may choose to provide your interviewees with a wider summary of the findings/research results at the end of the research.

It is important that you consider these options and their relevance for your research, and make your decision in advance about the extent to which you will share transcripts with your interviewees. You should then clarify your intentions to them before interviewing.³⁴ It is a good idea to state this on the consent form, so that your interviewees can agree in advance or discuss any reservations with you. In all cases, make sure you deliver what you promise.

Resources

Websites

[Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth](#)

[British Educational Research Association](#)

[ESRC Framework for Research Ethics](#)

[ESRC's Research Ethics Guidebook](#)

[Information Commissioner's Office \(ICO\) Definition of personal data](#)

[Information Commissioner's Office \(ICO\) Definition of special category data](#)

[Oral History Society](#)

[Oxford University 'Best Practice Guidance'](#)

[UCL Acceptor Ethical Standards](#)

[UCL Guidance about Sensitive Research](#)

[UCL's Guidance for Researchers on Appropriate Safeguards](#)

[UCL Personal Data Overview](#)

[UCL Research Ethics Committee](#)

[UCL guide for storing and preserving data](#)

[UK Data Services: Store Your Data](#)

[UKRI 'GDPR and Research – An Overview for Researchers'](#)

References

Abrams, Lynn. *Oral History Theory*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Dowling, Robyn. 'Power, Subjectivity, and Ethics in Qualitative Research.' In *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, edited by Iain Hay, Second edi., 19–29. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Dunn, Kevin. 'Interviewing.' In *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, edited by Iain Hay, Second edi., 79–105. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Guillemin, Marilys, and Lynn Gillam. 'Ethics, Reflexivity, and 'Ethically Important Moments' in Research.' *Qualitative Inquiry* 10, no.2 (2004): 261–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800403262360>.

Hagens, Victoria, Mark J. Dobrow, and Roger Chafe. 'Interviewee Transcript Review: Assessing the Impact on Qualitative Research.' *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 9, no. 1 (2009): 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-9-47>.

Koning, Martijn de, Birgit Meyer, Annelies Moors, and Peter Pels. 'Guidelines for Anthropological Research: Data Management, Ethics and Integrity.' *Ethnography* 1–5 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138119843312>.

Krueger, R.A., and M.A. Casey. *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. 3rd editio. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 2000.

Longhurst, Robyn. 'Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Groups.' In *Key Methods in Geography*, edited by S. Clifford, N.J., Cope, M., Gillespie, T. W., French, 117–32, 2003.

Mason, Jennifer. *Qualitative Researching*. 2nd editio. London: Sage, 2002.

Mero-Jaffe, Irit. "'Is That What I Said?' Interview Transcript Approval by Participants: An Aspect of Ethics in Qualitative Research.' *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 10, no. 3 (2011): 231–47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691101000304>.

Sim, Julius, and Jackie Waterfield. 'Focus Group Methodology: Some Ethical Challenges.' *Quality and Quantity* 53, no. 6 (2019): 3003–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-019-00914-5>.

Valentine, Gill. 'Tell Me about...: Using Interviews as a Research Methodology.' In *Methods in Human Geography: A Guide for Students Doing a Research Project*, edited by Robin Flowerdew and David Martin, Second edi., 110–36. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.

Endnotes

- 1 Gill Valentine, 'Tell Me about...: Using Interviews as a Research Methodology', in *Methods in Human Geography: A Guide for Students Doing a Research Project*, ed. Robin Flowerdew and David Martin, Second edn (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), 111; Robyn Dowling, 'Power, Subjectivity, and Ethics in Qualitative Research', in *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, ed. Iain Hay, Second edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 19.
- 2 R.A. Krueger and M.A. Casey, *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*, 3rd edn (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 2000), xi.
- 3 See Oral History Society <https://www.ohs.org.uk/advice/ethical-and-legal/2/#before-interview>
- 4 Julius Sim and Jackie Waterfield, 'Focus Group Methodology: Some Ethical Challenges', *Quality and Quantity* 53, no. 6 (2019): 3008, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-019-00914-5>.
- 5 Robyn Longhurst, 'Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Groups', in *Key Methods in Geography*, ed. S. Clifford, N.J., Cope, M., Gillespie, T. W., French, (London; Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage, 2003), 127.
- 6 Sim and Waterfield, 'Focus Group Methodology', 3008.
- 7 See also Valentine, 'Tell Me about...' 121, and ESRC's Research Ethics Guidebook <http://www.ethicsguidebook.ac.uk/Asking-questions-of-participants-100>.
- 8 See Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) <https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/guide-to-data-protection/guide-to-the-general-data-protection-regulation-gdpr/key-definitions/what-is-personal-data/>
- 9 See Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) <https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/guide-to-data-protection/guide-to-the-general-data-protection-regulation-gdpr/lawful-basis-for-processing/special-category-data/>. The data protection guidance for University College London, for example, adds that 'Personal data relating to criminal convictions and offences are not included, but similar extra safeguards apply to its processing.' <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/data-protection/guidance-staff-students-and-researchers/practical-data-protection-guidance-notices/personal-data>.
- 10 'ESRC Framework for research ethics, Updated January 2015' <https://esrc.ukri.org/files/funding/guidance-for-applicants/esrc-framework-for-research-ethics-2015/>, 9.
- 11 For example, University College London guidelines specify that 'Research that is classed as "sensitive" carries with it particular risks that need to be managed, with particular consideration being given to the potential consequences of these risks. This includes risks and consequences for individual researchers; research participants; individuals, groups, communities connected either with the research participants or the research topic/focus; the reputation of UCL and its researchers.' For more information, see <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/research/integrity/sensitive-research>.
- 12 Valentine, 'Tell Me about...', 115.
- 13 Lynn Abrams, *Oral History Theory* (London: Routledge, 2010), 10–11.
- 14 See for example a 'Best Practice Guidance' document from Oxford University: <https://researchsupport.admin.ox.ac.uk/files/bpg01researchersafety.pdf>
- 15 ESRC Framework for Research Ethics, <https://esrc.ukri.org/files/funding/guidance-for-applicants/esrc-framework-for-research-ethics-2015/>.
- 16 Marilynn Guillemin and Lynn Gillam, 'Ethics, Reflexivity, and "Ethically Important Moments" in Research', *Qualitative Inquiry* 10, no. 2 (2004): 265, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800403262360>.
- 17 Kevin Dunn, 'Interviewing', in *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, ed. Iain Hay, Second edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 93.
- 18 Valentine, 'Tell Me about...' 123.
- 19 Longhurst, 'Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Groups', 127; Valentine, 'Tell Me about...', 123.
- 20 Dunn, 'Interviewing', 103–4.
- 21 ESRC <https://esrc.ukri.org/files/funding/guidance-for-applicants/esrc-framework-for-research-ethics-2010/>
- 22 BERA <https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2018-online#privacy>
- 23 Sim and Waterfield, 'Focus Group Methodology: Some Ethical Challenges', 3009.
- 24 The Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth: *Ethical Guidelines for Good Research Practice* <https://www.theasa.org/ethics/guidelines.shtml>
- 25 Martijn de Koning et al., 'Guidelines for Anthropological Research: Data Management, Ethics and Integrity', *Ethnography* 1–5 (2019): 2, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138119843312>.
- 26 See for example UCL guidelines, <https://ethics.grad.ucl.ac.uk/accepted-ethical-standards.php>.
- 27 'GDPR and Research – An Overview for Researchers' <https://www.ukri.org/files/about/policy/ukri-gdpr-faqs-pdf/>.
- 28 BERA: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2018-online#footnote-013-backlink>.
- 29 UK Data Services: <https://ukdataservice.ac.uk/manage-data/store.aspx>. See also UCL's Guidance for Researchers on Appropriate Safeguards (<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/legal-services/ucl-general-data-protection-regulation-gdpr/guidance-notices-ucl-staff/guidance-researchers-0>), and a UCL guide for storing and preserving data: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/library/research-support/research-data-management/best-practices/how-guides/storing-preserving-data>.
- 30 Dunn, 'Interviewing', 97.
- 31 Abrams, *Oral History Theory*, 13.
- 32 Irit Mero-Jaffe, "Is That What I Said?" Interview Transcript Approval by Participants: An Aspect of Ethics in Qualitative Research', *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 10, no. 3 (2011): 235, <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691101000304>.
- 33 Victoria Hagens, Mark J. Dobrow, and Roger Chafe, 'Interviewee Transcript Review: Assessing the Impact on Qualitative Research', *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 9, no. 1 (2009): 1–8, <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-9-47>.
- 34 The Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth <https://www.theasa.org/ethics/guidelines.shtml>.

Bio

Yael Padan is a Research Fellow at The Bartlett School of Architecture, University College London (UCL), working on the Knowledge in Action for Urban Equality (KNOW) research programme. Her work is situated in the interface of architecture, planning, cultural studies and sociology. Within the KNOW programme, her research focuses on the ethics of urban research practice (Email: ypadan@ucl.ac.uk).