

Appendix A



Professor Matthew Weait,

Professor of Law and Society
Social Sciences

T +44 (0)23 9284 6012
E matthew.weait@port.ac.uk

BA (Hons) MA MPhil DPhil FAcSS

Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and

ETHICAL REVIEW – FURTHER INFORMATION

Name: Shonagh Dillon

Faculty of Humanities and Social
Sciences
Park Building
King Henry I Street
Portsmouth PO1 2DZ

T: +44 (0)23 9284 8484 port.ac.uk/fhss

Study Title: A Scold's Bridle – A contextual constructionist account of the silencing of activist feminist discourse on the proposed changes to the Gender Recognition Act 2004 and the potential impacts on female only services for victims of male violence.

Date: 20/11/2018

Thank you for submitting your application to the FHSS Ethics Committee for ethical review in accordance with current procedures.

Following the review there were a number of ethical questions raised by the Committee that require answering, and some additional advisory notes you may wish to consider, before a final ethical opinion can be given.

Ethical Questions

1. Positionality and role conflict: the researcher is very much taking a position as a radical/socialist feminist to this research. This must be made explicit in all documentation: invitation, PIS, topic guide and ethics application. The researcher's potential conflict of interest, as a feminist activist and researcher, needs to be made clear in all the documentation. With regard to recruitment methods, the researcher needs to ensure that she is not recruiting in her organisation's catchment area.
2. Gatekeeper: (11.4). The gatekeeper will be the research supervisor. The researcher runs Aurora New Dan in Portsmouth, VAW charity. It may well be the case that she intends to use

close contacts associated with the charity, hence the appointment of her research supervisor as the gatekeeper. This is far from ideal. Gatekeepers represent the interests of an organisation or cohesive group, and are at least familiar with the positions and circumstances of potential participants. How would her research supervisor fulfil this role?

3. Bias: In the interview Participant Information sheet, the researcher describes the possible benefits of taking part as follows: "I hope that the research I undertake will lead to a better understanding of the motivation of those who aim to silence radical feminist discourse and the impact this has on services for women experiencing male violence in the UK." Trying to understand the motivations of one lobby group by speaking only to members of an opposing lobby group could be perceived as inappropriate and biased.
4. Sites/Locations: The application states that interviews will take place in office spaces or private meeting rooms or in 'community spaces' where no office space is available. It then states that interviews will be conducted in private, not in open or public spaces. What is the difference between a 'community space' and a 'public space'? How will the interviewer ensure that interviews in community spaces are not interrupted?
5. Real-life meetings: Whilst attention is paid to issues surrounding the on-line research and the proposed interviews, apart from mentioning a 'small' risk to herself, there is too little on how the research of real-life meetings will be carried out or what the ethical considerations are. In fact, under ethical concerns, this part of her study is overlooked. What will the researcher be noting during such meetings? How will the information be recorded and analysed? Will the participants be aware that they are being researched? Will they be quoted in any way? Will they have opportunity to consent (or otherwise)? Will they be aware of the proposed study? All these questions need to be addressed.
6. Ethical issues, social media: 7.2 Primary objective/8.1 online ethnography: Application states that the researcher will analyse discourses via social media and that, because this approach is comparable to using a newspaper archive, ethical issues around autonomy do not apply. This is not so clear cut, in my view, because those contributing to this social media discourse did not do so in the knowledge that views they expressed would later be used for research purposes.
7. Assumptions: 8.1 Interviews/11.1 inclusion criteria: section 8.1 states that as far as is possible, no assumptions will be made concerning the views, motivations, etc, of participants. However, the inclusion criteria in 11.1 states that participants will comprise solely of active feminists who campaign against self-id of gender. How is the inclusion criteria compatible with the 'no assumptions' statement?
8. 9. Method/protocol: Number of interviews unclear (stated as 25-30 in section 9 but 25 in section 11.2). In terms of recruitment of interview participants, application acknowledges that that this is a somewhat clandestine group. What measures will PI take if unable to recruit requisite number of interviewees?
9. Consent: 11.7. Consent will need to be obtained from feminist groups organising the meetings.
10. Consent: 11.9. Withdrawal of consent: Section states that participants will be able to withdraw consent until 31/08/19. Having such a specific dates seems a hostage to fortune: it may be better to say 'until completion of data analysis' or similar?
11. Analysis of data: 12.1. How will the data obtained via interviews be analysed?
12. Destruction, retention and reuse of data: 12.3. More information is required.

13. Confidentiality: 12.6. "All participant data will be kept anonymous. If offenders are discussed, information will be kept anonymous unless a crime has been committed that has the potential to endanger the lives of any member of the public. If such a disclosure takes place, the interview will be immediately terminated, and the police informed with the consent of the victim". This needs to be communicated to the interviewee in the PIS as well as the consent form.
14. Checking of transcripts: As this is a sensitive piece of research, member checking could also be good. i.e. printing out transcripts and getting interview participants to check them before analysis.
15. Participant information sheet: The 'Why have I been invited' section rightly states that the PI's position is as a student researcher and that this is wholly removed from any other capacity in which participants may know her. However, the 'Further information and contact details' section states that the PI will be happy to support participants directly should they wish to discuss any issues that may affect them. These two statements seem contradictory and scope for role conflict.
16. PIS: Consent forms only need to be retained for 10 years.
17. PIS: As this has been reviewed by the FHSS EC, any concerns should be addressed to this Committee and not the ICJS Committee.
18. Consent form: Remove 'video recorded'.

If you would find it helpful to discuss any of the matters raised above or seek further clarification from a member of the Committee before you resubmit your amended application, you are welcome to contact amy.valentine@port.ac.uk who will circulate your query to the FEC.

Resubmission Instructions (Please read)

A written response to each of the ethical questions/conditions should be produced in the form of a letter (or similar document) returned to ethics-fhss@port.ac.uk. Comments on any of the advisory notes are welcomed, but not necessary. It is acceptable to respond that "all proposed changes have been adopted as suggested" or similar wording, but where specific questions have been asked, please answer those in the resubmission letter. The Committee will assume that all conditions will be complied with unless these are challenged in the resubmission.

Along with the letter, if any of the responses have resulted in changes to the application document, then **please show those changes in MS Word *Track-Changes* (or similar)** and submit an updated application document(s) with the resubmission letter. Please remember to update application documents with an updated version number and resubmission date.

Your resubmission will be reviewed by the Committee within 15 full working days from submission. You can expect a response on the next working day following this review period.



Interim Chair

Mr Richard Hitchcock

Email: ethics-fhss@port.ac.uk

Annex

A - Documents reviewed

Statement of compliance

The FHSS EC is constituted in accordance with the University Ethics Policy.

Feedback

You are invited to give your view of the service that you have received from the Faculty Ethics Committee. If you wish to make your views known please contact the administrator at amy.valentine@port.ac.uk

Documents reviewed

The documents ethically reviewed for this application

<i>Document</i>	<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>
Application Form	1	05/11/2018
Invitation Letter	1	25/10/2018
Participant Information Sheet	1	25/10/2018
Consent Form	1	25/10/2018
Supervisor Email Confirming Application	1	25/10/2018
Interview Questions/Topic List	1	25/10/2018



UNIVERSITY OF
PORTSMOUTH

Professor Matthew Weait,
Professor of Law and Society
Faculty of Humanities and
Social Sciences

T +44 (0)23 9284 6012
E matthew.weait@port.ac.uk

BA (Hons) MA MPhil DPhil FAcSS

Dean of the

FAVOURABLE ETHICAL OPINION (with advisory)

Name: Shonagh Dillon

Faculty of Humanities and Social
Sciences
Park Building
King Henry I Street
Portsmouth PO1 2DZ

T: +44 (0)23 9284 8484 port.ac.uk/fhss

Study Title: A Scold's Bridle – A contextual constructionist account of the silencing of activist feminist discourse on the proposed changes to the Gender Recognition Act 2004 and the potential impacts on female only services for victims of male violence.

Reference Number: FHSS 2018-082

Date: 04/02/2019

Thank you for resubmitting your application to the FHSS Ethics Committee and for making the requested changes/ clarifications.

I am pleased to inform you that FHSS Ethics Committee was content to grant a favourable ethical opinion of the above research on the basis described in the submitted documents listed at Annex A, and subject to standard general conditions (*See Annex B*). With this there are a number of ethical conditions to comply with, and some additional advisory notes you may wish to consider, all shown below.

Advisory Note(s)¹

- A.** PIS: Richard Hitchcock is the Chair of the FHSS EC Committee not the Head of Department. The study has been reviewed and given a favourable opinion by the Faculty of Humanities

¹ The comments are given in good faith and it is hoped they are accepted as such. The PI does not need to adhere to these, or respond to them, unless they wish to.

and Social Science Ethics Committee rather than the Institute for Criminal Justice Research Ethics Committee.

- B.** In 11.2, it states: "I will interview 30, participants, 15 from each side, comprising of a mixture of active feminists who campaign against the proposed changes of the GRA 2004...". A bit more clarity on the meaning of 'campaign' would be useful (e.g. what activities are included? Does entail lobbying, going on marches, posting on Facebook, attending meetings, etc?) **C.** Revisit the formatting of the consent form.

Please note that the favourable opinion of FHSS Ethics Committee does not grant permission or approval to undertake the research/ work. Management permission or approval must be obtained from any host organisation, including the University of Portsmouth or supervisor, prior to the start of the study.

Wishing you every success in your research



Chair

Mr Richard Hitchcock

Email: ethics-fhss@port.ac.uk

Annexes

A - Documents reviewed

B - After ethical review

ANNEX A - Documents reviewed

The documents ethically reviewed for this application

<i>Document</i>	<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>
Application Form	2	14/01/2019
Invitation Letter	2	10/01/2019
Participant Information Sheet	2	10/01/2019
Consent Form	2	10/01/2019
Supervisor Email Confirming Application	2	14/01/2019

Interview Questions/ Topic List	2	10/01/2019
---------------------------------	---	------------

ANNEX B - After ethical review

1. This Annex sets out important guidance for those with a favourable opinion from a University of Portsmouth Ethics Committee. Please read the guidance carefully. A failure to follow the guidance could lead to the committee reviewing and possibly revoking its opinion on the research.

It is assumed that the work will commence within 1 year of the date of the favourable ethical opinion or the start date stated in the application, whichever is the latest.

2. The work must not commence until the researcher has obtained any necessary management permissions or approvals – this is particularly pertinent in cases of research hosted by external organisations. The appropriate head of department should be aware of a member of staff's plans.

If it is proposed to extend the duration of the study beyond that stated in the application, the Ethics Committee must be informed.

4. Any proposed substantial amendments must be submitted to the Ethics Committee for review. A substantial amendment is any amendment to the terms of the application for ethical review, or to the protocol or other supporting documentation approved by the Committee that is likely to affect to a significant degree:

- (a) the safety or physical or mental integrity of participants
- (b) the scientific value of the study
- (c) the conduct or management of the study.

5.1 A substantial amendment should not be implemented until a favourable ethical opinion has been given by the Committee.

5. At the end of the work a final report should be submitted to the ethics committee. A template for this can be found on the University Ethics webpage.

6. Researchers are reminded of the University's commitments as stated in the [Concordat to Support Research Integrity](#) viz:

- maintaining the highest standards of rigour and integrity in all aspects of research
- ensuring that research is conducted according to appropriate ethical, legal and professional frameworks, obligations and standards
- supporting a research environment that is underpinned by a culture of integrity and based on good governance, best practice and support for the development of researchers
- using transparent, robust and fair processes to deal with allegations of research misconduct should they arise
- working together to strengthen the integrity of research and to reviewing progress regularly and openly.

7. In ensuring that it meets these commitments the University has adopted the [UKRIO Code of Practice for Research](#). Any breach of this code may be considered as misconduct and may be investigated following the University [Procedure for the Investigation of Allegations of Misconduct in Research](#). Researchers are advised to use the [UKRIO checklist](#) as a simple guide to integrity.

FORM UPR16

Research Ethics Review Checklist



Please include this completed form as an appendix to your thesis (see the Research Degrees Operational Handbook for more information)

Postgraduate Research Student (PGRS) Information		Student ID:	UP838505
PGRS Name:	Shonagh Dillon		
Department:	ICJS	First Supervisor:	Dr Andy Williams
Start Date: (or progression date for Prof Doc students)	October 2016		
Study Mode and Route:	Part-time <input type="checkbox"/>	MPhil <input type="checkbox"/>	MD <input type="checkbox"/>
	Full-time <input type="checkbox"/>	PhD <input type="checkbox"/>	Professional Doctorate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Title of Thesis:	#TERF/Bigot/Transphobe' - 'We found the witch, burn her!'		
Thesis Word Count: (excluding ancillary data)	52,323		
<p>If you are unsure about any of the following, please contact the local representative on your Faculty Ethics Committee for advice. Please note that it is your responsibility to follow the University's Ethics Policy and any relevant University, academic or professional guidelines in the conduct of your study</p> <p>Although the Ethics Committee may have given your study a favourable opinion, the final responsibility for the ethical conduct of this work lies with the researcher(s).</p>			
UKRIO Finished Research Checklist: (If you would like to know more about the checklist, please see your Faculty or Departmental Ethics Committee rep or see the online version of the full checklist at: http://www.ukrio.org/what-we-do/code-of-practice-for-research/)			
a) Have all of your research and findings been reported accurately, honestly and within a reasonable time frame?	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b) Have all contributions to knowledge been acknowledged?	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c) Have you complied with all agreements relating to intellectual property, publication and authorship?	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d) Has your research data been retained in a secure and accessible form and will it remain so for the required duration?	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	
e) Does your research comply with all legal, ethical, and contractual requirements?	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Candidate Statement:			
I have considered the ethical dimensions of the above named research project, and have successfully obtained the necessary ethical approval(s)			
Ethical review number(s) from Faculty Ethics Committee (or from NRES/SCREC):	FHSS-2018-082		
If you have <i>not</i> submitted your work for ethical review, and/or you have answered 'No' to one or more of questions a) to e), please explain below why this is so:			
Signed (PGRS):	<i>S K Dillon</i>		Date: 18/02/2021