

Video recording and still image capture for research purposes Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester

Summary

The Manchester Institute of Education (MIE) is located within the School of Environment, Education and Development (SEED) and engages in research activities which utilise a wide range of research methodologies, methods and instruments. Researchers within MIE may wish to use video recording, video playback, and still image recording and review for research purposes. Such approaches are recognised by researchers internationally and may be classified within the broad area of *digital ethnography*.

From the viewpoint of research risk and integrity those video or still image recording and review activities researchers may wish to engage in have been divided into four categories, namely:

1. Still image or Video resources available from a library or archive;
2. Still image or video recorded independently by the researcher using their own or local available resources;
3. Still image or video produced by the researcher within an independent production team;
4. Still image or video production initiated by the researcher and recorded independently by research participants.

In the first case (1), access to archived video material is similar to research involving printed media. As a secondary data source it is considered to be of low risk.

In other cases (2)-(4), the production and review of video and still image research material is generally considered to be of low risk, but this is subject to the nature of the research investigation undertaken. For example:

- i. still image or video recorded in a school classroom location with all appropriate and pre-approved permissions, and where the recordings are retained and stored securely by MIE, is considered low risk.
- ii. video interviews conducted by the researcher with appropriate participant consent and ethic approval for all other documentation, and which adopt one or more standard interview subject camera framings, are considered low risk.
- iii. video recording in the style of vox-pops (ad-hoc short interviews) with members of the public previously unknown the researcher may be considered to be medium or perhaps high risk owing to increased risks to the researcher and any other colleagues assisting.
- iv. still image collection by research subject participants undertaking a research activity as outlined and instructed by the researcher may be considered to be medium or perhaps high risk owing to the increased risk to the research participants and the activity requirements to operate independently of and perhaps unobserved by the researcher.

In the longer term, access to original and unedited video recordings and still images may be required by MIE and/or the University for audit purposes or for complaint investigation purposes. To this end this document proposes researchers submit encoded and compressed copies of their original video recordings and still images captures to an archive. Archived materials would not be accessed by School of Education or other University staff other than for review in response to one or more complaints, or for audit purposes.

Guidelines for the ethical use of video recording and still image capture for research purposes

Mike O'Donoghue

1.1 Introduction

The Manchester Institute of Education is committed to developing and supporting the highest standards of research in education and its associated fields. The *Research Risk and Ethics Assessment* (RREA) and other resources have been created in order to guide and assist students and supervisors in maintaining these high academic standards and associated codes of good research practice. The research portfolio within the Manchester Institute of Education (MIE) covers a wide range of fields and perspectives. Research within each of these areas places responsibilities of a differing nature on supervisors and students subject to course, level, focus and participants involved.

The vast majority of research in MIE utilises research methodologies, methods, and research instruments in the collection of primary data and professional practice review which are well documented. Guidelines on ethical practice relating to the use of questionnaires, focus groups, personal interviews, and observations, amongst others, are already available. A number of research projects are seeking to utilise video materials and/or still images to review, record and/or capture events, places and people for research purposes. The use of moving and still images for these purposes present a series of specific challenges in relation to data protection to those researchers who wish to utilise them as a research tool. The purpose of this document is to focus on these challenges and to develop a body of good practice in the utilisation of research related video materials and recording.

1.2 A summary of the general factors relating to the utilisation of video for research purposes.

Video, as both a medium for recording and for playback, has undergone significant change in the last two decades due to advances in technology and social uptake. What was once an expensive medium used exclusively by technicians and television production professionals is now widely accessible to many people in a wide number of ways. Netbooks, laptop computers, mobile phones, digital cameras, and purposely manufactured video cameras, amongst other devices, each have video recording and playback features built into their functionality. The ease of access to such devices means that people - yourself included - may have their image, actions and voice recorded, either inadvertently or deliberately, without their knowledge or consent. Such clips or sequences can be shared with relative ease on social networking or other specialist online video sites (e.g. *You Tube*), for entertainment or other purpose, with little-to-no awareness or without the permission of the subject.

Amongst the drivers of MIE's research integrity processes are those practices which relate to Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998, which states: "Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence." The research ethics and integrity process within MIE addresses the seven principles which follow this statement, namely that all research conducted within MIE will show Respect for Human Dignity; Ensure Integrity and Quality; Respect Free and Informed Consent; Respect Vulnerable Persons; Respect Privacy and

Confidentiality; acknowledge Participation should be Voluntary; and that any Procedures used should avoid Harm.

Consequently, the code of conduct expected of all research practitioners in MIE also apply to the use of video recording and playback as a means of data collection (primary or practice review) and/or analysis. The clarification of this code of good practice and research integrity in relation to video resources and its related technologies and methods, require the categorization of a number of specific uses and creation of bespoke guidelines.

1.3 Theoretical and practical aspects in the utilisation of video in research.

Video, as a mechanism to capture one or more moving images, is a *rich* medium; it can be used record a wide variety of elements relating to one specific event, location, or activity, and can include any associated audio. The video camera may be the tool of choice for those researchers wishing to capture and analyse specific practices or cultures. Such applications of video are related to those methods and methodologies associated with ethnography. This area of work has been the subject of exploration of a number of authors, not least Ricki Goldman who has written of and developed the practice of *digital video ethnography* (Goldman-Segall, 1998; Goldman et al., 2007). Such approaches also fall into the classification of what is known as ‘*fly-on-the-wall*’ recording in which the ‘camera is set up to capture an event in situ’ (Thornhill et al. 2002, p19).

Video is also an *indiscriminate* medium, insofar as whatever is in the frame of the camera at the time of recording will be recorded whether such inclusion is intended or not. This aspect of recording adds to the responsibility of the researcher when selecting what, where and when to commence and end their recording. There are circumstances and situations where the possibility of unwanted subjects, objects or actions are more likely to occur within the frame of recording than others. Consequently researchers intending to use video recording for data collection and analysis should consider these aspects carefully and plan accordingly.

This latter aspect of control over the image to be recorded leads to a number of different possibilities for the research activities; not all research studies involving video material require the researcher to produce new recordings. In some cases the researcher may wish to study those recordings or images others select and may recruit participants to assist in this process. Alternatively, such recordings and images may already exist as part of a collection or archive for which the researcher requires access and playback facilities to view and analyse these recordings. The relationship between the researcher, their degree of control over the subject of the recording, and the execution of the recording, requires development of a number of working classifications for the recording, review and analysis of video and image sources for research purposes.

2. Classification and associated risk factors of video recording activities.

For the purposes of this document, four categories of still image and video recording activities and material have been identified. These are:

1. Still image or video resources available from a library or archive;
2. Still image or video recorded independently by the researcher using their own or local available resources;
3. Still image or video produced by the researcher within an independent production team;
4. Still image or video production initiated by the researcher and recorded independently by research participants.

These categories relate to the following modes of recording execution respectively:

1. Persons external to the researcher have already selected the subject and recorded the still image or video material. This data is in the public domain or control of the owner who has authority to grant permission for secondary analysis and publication;
2. The researcher selects the subject and executes the still image capture or video recording themselves, within the auspices of a recognised organisation (e.g. a school classroom);
3. The researcher selects the subject and colleagues or peers assist the researcher in the execution of the still image capture or video recording;
4. The researcher recruits participants who select the subject and execute the still image capture or video recording themselves at the request of, and with guidance from the researcher.

In the context of this document:

- the terms **'frame'** and **'framing'** are used to as a reference to organisation of the image appearing in the viewfinder of the still, video, or motion image camera used for capture or recording;
- the term **'subject'** is used as a reference to the person, persons, or other objects appearing within the frame of still or video camera used to capture or record the desired image;
- the term **'execution'** is used to indicate the capture of a still image, or the video recording of the moving image and corresponding audio i.e. when the shutter release or similar button on a still camera is activated; when the record button on a video camera is activated; or when a video recording or capture device connected to a camera is activated.
- the term **'video recording'** is defined here as the capture of a moving image and its associated original audio elements.

The nature of the risk involved in the execution of each of these categories increases incrementally with the general decrease in control by the researcher when recording. A summary of the risks and associated factors is provided in the sections below.

2.1 Still image and/or video resources available from a library or archive

General description: Still image and video materials in this category are not created by the researcher. These include video resources stored in libraries, specifically designated archives (e.g. the North West Film Archive), or available via online resources such as *You Tube* or *Vimeo*. Institutionally captured or recorded lectures are also included in this category as are video recorded materials used in the analysis of teaching for PGCE programmes. In essence, someone other than the researcher has executed the recording and made these available for use; such materials were not produced at the specific request of the researcher.

Risk: Whilst the researcher has no control over the recording of the subject, s/he has control over those materials they wish to select for analysis. There is no direct contact with the subject nor with those executing the recording of the video material – at least, not through the viewing and analysis of video sequences alone.

Associated current ethics practice: Secondary source data

Specific actions required: A letter requesting permission to access an archive or associated resource outlining intended use may be required where the resource is privately owned.

2.2 Still image and/or video recorded by the researcher

General description: These include video interviews, scripted dramatic sequences, events, vox-pops, or any other resource recorded by the researcher her/himself. In essence, if the researcher executes the capture of all images or the video recordings themselves, the resulting material falls into this category.

Within this category the researcher is responsible for the selection and location of each shot (i.e. what appears in the viewfinder or screen of the video camera), its framing, and the choice of person or persons (subjects) to be recorded. When the researcher is satisfied with each of these and any associated audio elements, s/he will execute the shot by pressing the record button on the camera. During recording, events may take place which are beyond the control of the researcher – for example, people may stray into the background of a shot, possibly adding colourful gestures, or interviewees may make statements of a slanderous or other defamatory nature. In general, the researcher cannot be held responsible for such events providing they have adequately prepared their shots and subjects. What constitutes ‘adequate preparation’ for recording will vary according to circumstances and to the nature of the research enquiry; the researcher should be guided on such matters in their preparation in discussion with their supervisor.

Risk: Within this category the researcher has a good degree of control over the location and framing of the material to be recorded, and in determining the role of the subject(s) within a recording. However, the possibility of risk is increased when recording in some areas and at certain times of the day or night. The reaction of the public when recording vox-pops, for example, may be aggressive or even hostile. Consequently video or audio recording in this category has to be classified as medium risk, or as high risk subject to the nature of the content to be recorded or the context within which it will be executed.

Associated current ethics practice: Primary data collection; practice review

Specific actions required: Subject to requirements, in addition to providing participant information sheets, individual still image capture or video release forms for recording and editing of material from subjects recorded should be collected; and written permission from the owner(s) of premises to photograph or video record in certain locations may be required e.g. airports, railway stations, named art galleries, etc.

2.3 Video produced by the researcher within a video production team

General description: This includes video recorded at the request of the researcher and which involves a production team of two or more persons including the researcher. In short, the researcher initiates and guides the recording, but the execution of recording may be carried out by a person other than the researcher. Items included in this category are researcher-led interviews where one or more colleagues or peers execute the recording; dramatic sequences in which the researcher may be identified as the director; or recorded or video captured events made at the request of the researcher.

In this category the researcher may be identified with a video *producer* or *director* role in the recording of the required material. Whilst the researcher may not be the person who executes the recording, those peers or colleagues doing so are following the guidance of the researcher as to what s/he requires. Consequently the researcher has a high degree of influence over the style and location of individual shots and of those subjects involved, but the framing of the shot may be wholly or partially left to the video camera operator. Any permission required for recording in

specific locations and individual subject video release forms are the responsibility of the researcher, as is provision of clear participant information sheets. The researcher also carries responsibility for briefing the production team and subjects, before recording, of any related health and safety issues, and for the general safety of individual production team members during the recording. Provided 'adequate preparation' is demonstrated (as previously discussed), they may not be responsible for the actions or reactions of individual production team members.

Risk: As the researcher has more to consider when managing the production team, subject to the nature of the material to be recorded and the size of the production team, any video recording within this category should be considered at least medium risk and potentially high risk.

Associated current ethics practice: Primary data collection; practice evaluation.

Specific actions required: Subject to requirements, individual video release forms for recording and editing of material from subjects recorded should be collected after informing participants about the nature of participation. Release forms may be presented in the form of a research participant consent form which has been modified to include image capture or video recording and subsequent editing. Written permission to video record in certain locations may be required e.g. airports, railway stations, some public areas in the centre of London, named art galleries, etc.. Briefing sheets should be available for video production team members and a signed video production participation record from individual production team members indicating they have read all necessary health and safety and other related documentation.

2.4 Video production initiated by the researcher and recorded by research participants

General description: This includes still image and/or video recorded by research participant, where still images are captured or video is recorded at the specific request of the researcher. This category differs from the one above in that the selection of subject, framing, and the execution of the recording are determined by the participants alone. Guidance of a general nature as to what may be recorded is provided by the researcher, but the researcher has little-to-no control over the execution of the recording.

Within this category a *research participant* is a person the researcher asks to collect video materials for them. Such persons may be known to the researcher (i.e. family, friends, peers) or not. As the researcher is asking the participants to undertake an activity on their behalf, it is important that the participant has sufficient information in order to make a judgement on whether they are able to participate and meet what is expected of them. Further, the information provided should be sufficient for the participant to be able to provide information to any subjects they plan to record and to collect any necessary permissions for recording from these subjects. This suggests two levels of documentation the researcher needs to prepare: information sheets and consent forms for the research participants, and information and consent forms the participants will be expected to provide to any subject or subjects they chose to record.

In some cases it may be essential that permissions for recording are collected, not least due to anti-terrorism legislation in the United Kingdom, the European Union, and elsewhere. Those research projects which require video recording by participants outside of the United Kingdom should be classified as high risk, even though recording may take place within the European Union, unless a case for medium risk can be clearly made.

Risk: In these cases the researcher has little-to-no control over the material the research participants choose to record, or how they choose to record this. However, the risk involvement will vary according to the *theme* of the research; a participant asked to record short interview

sequences with homeless people in inner city areas carries a greater risk than asking participants to record sequences of local urban architecture, for example. Therefore the risk associated with category will be at least medium and possibly high.

Associated current ethics practice: Primary data collection

Specific actions required: as indicated above, information sheets and consent forms for the participants are required. These should provide sufficient information to allow a potential participant to make a considered and reasonable judgement over their involvement in the research activity. Further, a second set of information sheets and consent forms should be provided to the participants which they can give to any subjects of their recording. The consent form the participant signs should stress they understand and agree to gain the permission of any subject they record, or from the owner of any private location they choose to record at. Should a complaint then arise, if the participant has signed and stated they will collect all such permissions necessary, any consequences due to improper procedures in recording are to be faced by the participant and not by the researcher. Unless it is clear that permissions were gained for any and all still images or recorded video received by the researcher from the participant, such data must be destroyed.

Much of what has been written about video above can be applied to still image recording. Each of the four categories of use (sections 2.1 -2.4) apply as still images can be examined within an archive, may be researcher produced, may be produced by a production team (e.g. in a photographic studio with assistants), or may be recorded by research participants using still image recording equipment provided respectively.

Digital still images can be processed more easily than video materials as they are generally smaller in file size than video materials and have a number of standard file formats (e.g. jpg, bmp, gif, tif, etc.).

Researchers wishing to use still images in their research should follow the guidance of their supervisor at all times and complete the appropriate options on the RREA form. They should also ensure all persons involved in their work have the appropriate information sheets and consent forms and should submit copies of their research image resource set to the RREA administrator for review archiving for review or audit purposes.

2.5 Special cases.

2.5.1 Video diaries

A *video diary* is usually a chronologically ordered series of video sequences created by the researcher (alone, or with assistance) or by one or more research participants. In general, video diaries fall into categories 2.2 (researcher created video), 2.3 (video created by a production team) or 2.4 (participant created video) above, subject to how the video diary recordings are organised.

Current RREA guidelines place a time limit of 10 minutes per day over a period of two month for the completion of a written diary by a research participant. Given that the researcher or participant may need to set up video recording equipment each time they wish to create a video diary entry this time limit should be increased to no more than 30 minutes recording individual video diary entries; this thirty minute period includes the 10 minutes maximum video recording content per session.

The number of daily video diary entries created by a single participant and the period over which these may be recorded will vary according to the nature of the study undertaken. In order to

accommodate these variations, a maximum number of recordings or a total time limit for the recordings may be specified. Initial recommendations for these limits are for no more than 60 individual video diary entries, or a related time equivalent of 30 participant hours involving no more than 10 hours of original video recording, should be expected of any single participant, unless the study can justify an increase to these limits.

2.5.2 Clinical video

From the perspective of MIE, *clinical video* resources are those which a researcher may access, record or playback in connection with research into specific cognitive or other conditions. These may be video recordings in the form of observations of participants with particular clinical conditions, or video materials recorded in specific therapeutic organisations which the researcher can access via an established archive. In the latter case, the use of a video resource from the archive of clinical organisation falls within section 2.1 (archive video) above. The researcher should therefore gain written permission to access the archive and to coordinate supervision in their use of archived materials as appropriate.

Where researchers are seeking to capture still images or record video of participants with known medical conditions, the consent of any participant or of their carers or guardians if they are determined not to possess the mental capacity to give consent, is required. Still images or video used in this way is regarded as high risk.

2.5.3 Inappropriate still image or video materials

For some studies it may be necessary for researchers to access and view still image or video resources which may be considered contentious or objectionable for viewing by the general public or for some audiences. Such materials are designated in this document by the term '**inappropriate**'. These materials may include still image or video materials which centre on what may be considered extreme political, racial or religious viewpoints, some forms of pornography, or other such material. Researchers are strongly advised to discuss access and viewing of any such video material with their supervisors. Such research is high risk by default.

Researchers engaged in the review and analysis of inappropriate still image or video material should be aware of the relevant local legislation in accessing or viewing such video content. For example, whilst some forms of pornography may be legal to own, access and view in the United Kingdom, the same may not be true in other countries. Researchers engaged in such areas of study should also be aware that still image or video material which includes any aspect of paedophilia, necrophilia, coprophilia, bestiality, or other such material as covered by Section 63 of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008, United Kingdom, relating to 'extreme pornographic images', are illegal, and should contact their supervisor immediately should they encounter such content.

Research studies requiring the creation of video sequences by researchers, either individually or within a video production team, or through the recruitment and/or involvement of participants, which may wholly or partly include sequences of an inappropriate nature as outlined above, are high risk by default.

2.5.4 Video Conferencing and Video Messaging

Video conferencing is usually a synchronous video connection between two or more people (single and multipoint respectively) located at different geographical locations. Video conferencing may be mediated by personal computers using suitable software (e.g. Skype), or by a video bridge (e.g. as managed by agencies such as UKERNA), or by suitable mobile or other telephone

equipment. *Video Messaging* may be regarded as an asynchronous version of video conferencing, where pre-recorded video messages are created and distributed to one or more persons.

Research studies involving the creation and analysis of video conference communications, recorded or live, or those involving video messaging, should generally be classified within 2.2 (researcher created video) or 2.4 (participant created video) subject to the nature of the study.

2.5.5 Security video

The University of Manchester makes use of a number of video cameras located across the campus for security purposes using a closed-circuit television (CCTV) system. The output from these cameras is recorded and archived and is available for review by authorised persons usually in connection with reported security incidents. Other institutions make use of similar video facilities for the same purpose.

Some research studies may require access to and viewing of CCTV video recorded material by the researcher and/or other research participants. In these cases the video materials accessed are part of the institutional security archive and may be classified within section 2.1 (archived video) above. Appropriate written permission and supervised access should be gained from the appropriate authority.

2.5.6 Covert still image capture or video recording

For the purposes of this document, still image and video material recorded without the knowledge or consent of the subject or subjects at the time of recording are designated as ***covert video recording***. Some research studies may adopt this approach in order to examine specific behaviour patterns of individuals or groups of participants, particularly in cases where knowledge of the recording is likely to affect the behaviour of those participating and so influence the research outcomes.

In general, such procedures would fall in sections 2.2 (researcher created video) or 2.3 (production team created video), subject to how the research and the recording activity is organised. Covert data collection is considered to be high risk. Such recordings may result in stress related or angry responses from participants as and when they are informed the activities they were engaged in have been video recorded. This places additional risk to the safety of the researcher and to any video production team members involved.

Once such recordings are complete any participants involved should be informed that the activities they have been engaged in were video recorded; participants have a right to review those video materials they have featured in before providing post-recording consent for their analysis. It may not be possible for participants to be able to review any video materials they feature in immediately after recording, nor is it reasonable to expect a participant to agree to sign a consent form for the use of these video materials in the research study without seeing these materials nor having time to consider whether they wish these video materials to be included. Researchers should therefore provide participants with an information sheet and consent form relating to the study after recording, indicating options for times and venues where participants may be able to view the video materials they feature in and how an appointment to view these may be made. In common with other aspects of informed consent provided by RREA documentation, participants should be given sufficient time to decide if they wish their video materials to be included in the study. Researchers engaged in studies requiring covert video recordings should note that participants have the right to withdraw any material recorded involving them from the study at any point without future prejudice.

2.5.7 Video Booths

A *video booth* is resource which one or more participants may use to video record their views or reactions on a specific theme or topic. *Video booth* recordings may be made by one or more participants on each use. Participants featuring in video booth recordings usually execute the recording themselves (i.e. they push a button to record in the video booth) when they are ready to proceed. Researchers organising video booth recordings usually have little idea of who and how many participants will contribute, nor over what they are likely to say. These features suggest the creation and analysis of video booth recordings should fall into section 2.4 (participant created video) above.

Researchers making use of a video booth for their study should provide clear information of participant use and rights to access video booth recording on the video booth itself. A clear contact point (email or university office telephone number) should be visible on the video booth. As participants choose to enter and record their views or responses to video when ready, there should be a clear statement that starting to record video images will be taken as confirmation that the participant has read and understood the purpose of the videoing and consents to use the materials created in the research described. Such actions are considered as *implied consent* for the researcher to review and analyse the materials created.

3. Storage and access to video recorded materials.

Current RREA practice requires any video recorded for a research study to be made available on the University's P: drive. This may result in a number of problems, not least on the volume of space required to store these resources and in providing access to them.

3.1 Video storage space requirements.

The amount of disk space required for an uncompressed video recording depends on the frame rate, the frame specifications, and the codec (coder-decoder) used. Typically, a video camera set up to record standard definition (SD) uncompressed video¹, requires approximately 3.5 Mb for each second of recording. Some video camera equipment will permit a degree of adjustment to one or more of these variables. Other video recording devices, perhaps built into the functionality of a mobile telephone or digital stills camera, may record a lower number of frames per second or reduced frame size resulting in reduced image and sound quality during playback. High Definition (HD) video requires more space owing to the higher quality of the image.

Using the figures for standard definition above indicates that one minute and one hour of uncompressed recording will require approximately 210 megabytes (MB) and 12.6 gigabytes (GB) disk space respectively. A research student planning to video record five one hour lectures or events, for example, and conduct video interviews with each individual lecturer or participants for up to 30 minutes afterwards, will generate 7.5 hours of video materials which will require 94.5 GB storage space. Ten students engaged in similar activities will therefore require one approximately terabyte (TB) of storage space.

One way of reducing the storage space requirement is to compress video. A number of formats for compressed video are commonly available and video compression software offers a number of different options as to image and sound quality requirements. Compressing a captured video (SD,

¹ 25 frames per second (fps) with an image size of 720 x 576 pixels per frame with 48,000 Hz 16-bit stereo audio using a DV PAL or NTSC encoder.

.avi file format) to a medium quality Windows Media video file (.wmv), for example, can result in a compression ratio of approximately 20:1 or higher, subject to the compression options selected. Whilst compression may be beneficial when considering disk space storage requirements, using compressed video for editing or other post-production work will result in poorer quality final products, particularly where video is further compressed in later stages. The usual way of addressing this particular quality issue is to edit and carry out post-production work on uncompressed video (where possible) and to compress the final output. Once the work is complete, original source material and final output resources can each be compressed and copied to DVD for archive storage. However, one problem this approach may present lies in subsequent access as compressed resources may require specific decoding software for access.

3.2 Access to video resources.

Principle 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998 requires that researchers ensure that research study participants take part in full knowledge of the research purpose aims and their part in it, and that they do so voluntarily. Participant co-operation and informed consent is an established element of professional video production practice. As documentary film and video producer and director Michael Rabiger notes:

“[If] you make your interests clear and justifiable, many people will set aside their comfort or privacy because making the film seems important.... When someone consents to film knowing all the circumstances of risk to themselves, this is called giving *informed consent* [sic]. If you secure consent and the person is unaware of negatives consequences in the future, you have committed an ethical offence and later may do them actual harm”

(Rabiger, 2004, p.94)

Issues surround ‘levels of possible harm’ relating to digital video and its use are discussed by Hay and Kim (2007, p.533), Nichols (2001, p.13-19) and others. Consequently, individuals participating in research studies in which they may be captured in one or more still images or recorded to video have the following rights:

- A right of access to a copy of their information which is held;
- A right to object to processing their data;
- A right to prevent processing for direct marketing;
- A right to have inaccurate personal data rectified, blocked, erased, or destroyed;
- A claim to compensation for damages caused by a breach of the Data Protection Act.

In the case of paper-based resources – questionnaires and interview transcriptions, for example – researchers are able to identify individual participant contributions and can provide access to these or withdraw them at participant’s request as required. The same access and withdrawal is also required for still image and video material.

Participant access to still image and video material has particular characteristics which differ from other resources:

- *Video materials cannot be viewed without a means of playback and encoding.* Participant access therefore requires the researcher to set-up a time for review with the participant where video materials may be viewed. Sending the recording to the participant for viewing may be possible, either via traditional post or through electronic means, but the researcher must ensure such communications are secure and that the participant is able to view the material.

- *Individual participants are not always easily removed from video recordings.* Participants recorded in individual interviews are able to discretely access video recordings which feature them and to have these deleted on request with relative ease. Participants featuring in group recordings, such as video materials recorded with a focus group, for example, are able to access their recording and review this without breach of confidentiality of other participants featuring; because they were present at the time of initial recording and so were aware of contributions made by other participants. Removing an individual on request from a group recording is possible and can be achieved by visual and audio filtering (e.g. image pixilation and voice distortion or audio track cutting) but such techniques are time consuming and may be beyond the technical capacity of the researcher. Researchers are therefore advised to consider this access at the time of recording and to ensure information relating to post-recording video access is reported on the participant information sheet.
- *Participants may feature in a video recording in a non-subject role, i.e. they may be recorded in the background of a frame whilst the subject features in the foreground.* In such roles non-active participants may make little-to-no contribution to the recording, but that their image features in the recording could be used to locate individuals to specific locations and times. Consequently researchers need to establish a degree of care in their framing when recording where possible. Situations may occur where non-subject recorded individuals may request to view video materials to establish exactly what was recorded. In such cases researchers need to consider their responsibilities to and the privacy of video recorded subjects; it is in such situations where confidential independent video review may be required.

3.3 Complaints and issues relating to still image and video recorded material.

Individual participants may wish to challenge or make a complaint about still image or video materials they feature in. In such cases a review would need to be conducted in order to establish the grounds of the challenge or complaint, and of any appropriate action to be taken. In order to facilitate a review process, access to the original video recordings created by the researcher, or by research participants, is required.

Video production, in particular, has a number of stages. Initial video recordings (*rushes*) are often edited and may be post-produced (e.g. they have graphics or other images added which were not part of the initial recording). Video recordings used for research may have their audio transcribed, wholly or partly, in order to examine in more detail the precise language or points made by a research participant. A review of edited or post-produced video may omit aspects of information (scenes or comments) which underlie a specific complaint; therefore it is important the original recordings or rushes are available.

Professional video production and broadcast organisations make use of an archive for this purpose, where rushes are signed into the archive by the producer or crew who record them. These are then signed out to and returned by staff who need to edit or post-produce them, but the original recordings are stored for inspection or audit should this be required. Such an archive can be expensive in terms of tape stock and storage space. Though MIE is not a professional video production or broadcast organisation, it is important that a process for storage and access to original recordings is maintained for review and audit to demonstrate researcher and School research integrity (i.e. that the researcher recorded only those things they reported in their RREA declaration and ethical approval application). This process should also be low-cost and time efficient.

To this end, researchers creating original video recordings should create a copy of their original recordings to DVD or to mini-DV tape which will then be stored by the Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork. Copies of original materials may be encoded for compression to a suitable form before copying in order to decrease storage capacity. However, subsequent encoding must not be so small as to result in distortion of image or audio to the extent that purposeful inspection of the material would not be possible.

The creation of the copy of the encoded original recordings may require the researcher to burn these materials to one or more DVDs for storage. The time required for this should not be too onerous, not least where initial recordings were captured as digital files, or where tape-based initial recordings have been uploaded into a video editing package. Researchers requiring assistance with this process should contact staff within MIE for specialist support.

Once prepared, copies of original recordings, submitted in sealed envelopes or closed-labelled, will be securely stored by the Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork and will only be accessed where a review is required as the result of a complaint or an audit request. In this way only the supervisor, researcher, and other designated participants will have access to the materials for analysis and processing and should be assured of the support provided within this system should a complaint be made against them. These video materials will be stored by MIE for a period as required by the University of Manchester Code of Good Research Conduct. Research students working away from the Manchester campus who are using video recordings should make suitable arrangements with their supervisor for the transfer of original recordings to DVD and for the secure transport of these materials to the Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork.

4. Suggested framings for video interview data collection

The following images are put forward as guidelines (guide frames) for research data collection involving video recorded interview:

4.1. On-camera research participant as interviewee:



Features:

- Only the head and shoulders of the interviewee are in the frame. (A little room is provided for interviewee movement, which has been limited by seating the interviewee on a non-rotating or revolving seat) ;
- Plain background (i.e. there are no documents on view featuring specific names or places or promoting specific products);
- Recorded is taking place in a private and closed space (i.e. other people are not likely to be captured on the recording by walking behind or in front of the interviewee);
- Audio recording is focused on the interviewee (i.e. stray background noises or other conversations are unlikely to be recorded);

- In this case, the interviewee was able to view and agree to the framing prior to recording.

4.2 On-camera research participant as interviewee with over-the-shoulder interviewer inclusion:



Features:

- As 4.1 above, but the framing of the interviewee (in the centre and right of the frame) is reduced in size in order to include the interviewer (on the left of the frame) from an over-the-shoulder perspective. As this framing features the interviewee it may be more desirable from the research ethics viewpoint as the actions and questions of the researcher (interviewer) are visible throughout. However, this framing presents greater difficulties in camera set-up than with the example in 4.1 above.

4.3 On camera researcher participant (interviewee) and researcher (interviewer):



Features:

- Both interviewer/researcher (on the left of the frame) and the interviewee (on the right of the frame) are visible throughout the interview;
- The actions and responses of the interviewer can be seen in relation to the interviewee through the recording;
- The interviewer and interviewee are recorded in $\frac{3}{4}$ shot (i.e. from the knees upwards). This requires careful adjustment of seating positions.
- Recording is taking place in a closed classroom space (i.e. other people are not likely to be captured on the recording by walking behind or in front of the interviewee);
- The background in this space has been cleared of any superfluous information (i.e. the whiteboard was cleared);
- In this case, the interviewee was able to view and agree to the framing prior to recording.



**Video and still image capture by researcher(s)
Closed-label and Archive Declaration**

Study Details

Name of researcher:

Title of research study:

Degree programme and unit:

This study utilised: Still image Video recording Still image & video recording

Number of storage devices to be submitted

Image compression software used (where relevant)

The image material captured comprises:

- 1. Still image or video recorded independently by the researcher using their own or local available resources;
- 2. Still image or video produced by the researcher within an independent production team;
- 3. Still image or video production initiated by the researcher and recorded independently by research participants.

I declare that:

I read, understood and fulfilled my responsibilities as a video ethnographer, as outlined in *'Video recording and still image capture for research purposes in the Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester'*²

All still images and/or video captured for this study is provided in original, unedited form on the storage device(s) accompanying this declaration.

The storage device(s) has been labelled³ with the study details given above.

I understand that these original still image and/or video recorded will be archived by the Administrator for Ethics and Fieldwork for audit or inspection purposes, in line with the University of Manchester *'Code of Good Research Conduct'*.

Signed (researcher)		Date:
Received by:		Date:
Archived by:		Date:

² Available from <http://www.education.manchester.ac.uk/intranet/ethics/>

³ Where more than one device required to store the material, each should be labelled and also numbered using the convention - 1 of 2, 2 of 2 etc