

University of Groningen

A story of stories

Wubs, Susanna Dorothea

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2018

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Wubs, S. D. (2018). *A story of stories: The impact of caring for a foster child with a history of sexual abuse on family life*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

CHAPTER 3

A story on collecting stories

This chapter is based on : Wubs, D., Batstra, L., & Grietens, H. (2018)
Researcher reflections on the use of meta-level sensitivity in system-oriented qualitative research. (submitted).

Abstract

In qualitative research on sensitive topics the relationship between researcher and participant is of utmost importance. In this paper meta-level sensitivity is suggested as a helpful tool when collecting narrative data. During reflections on a project on the impact of foster children's history of sexual abuse on foster families, three types of meta-level sensitivity emerged: instrumental, contextual, and professional sensitivity. First, interviewers should be sensitive in providing interviewees the adequate opportunities to narrate. Second, interviewers should be sensitive to the contextual embedment of their research. Finally, interviewers should be aware of their professional and personal contribution in the co-constructing of participants' narratives. Meta-level sensitivity enables researchers to reinforce relationships with participants and may improve the quality of qualitative research.

Keywords: Sensitive data, narrative research, sensitivity, child sexual abuse, foster care, qualitative data collection

Introduction

'...our foster child touched my genitals... If I use that terminology, does that shock you? Should I say things like that or shouldn't I? Or should I use an euphemism?' To reassure this foster father the interviewer of Project Iris responded that the participant could use language that felt most comfortable to him. Afterwards she reviewed the situation in the interviewer log: 'His concern was quite interesting as none of the participants had asked me this before. I explained him that such terminology doesn't shock me that much (anymore).'

Project Iris was set up to study the expertise, needs, and experiences of families who foster a child with a putative history of sexual abuse prior to placement in foster care. Although some studies focus on the impact of the traumatic history of foster children on family life (for instance, Farmer and Pollock, 2003; Grietens, Van Oijen, & ter Huizen, 2012; Macaskill, 1991), little is known on this issue from a systemic family perspective. In Project Iris a narrative approach is adopted to create an understanding of 'life as experienced' by members of families fostering a child with a history of sexual abuse, a research topic many would call sensitive (Coles & Mudaly, 2010; Stoler, 2002).

In the literature on sensitive topics authors focus on how to establish, nurture, and maintain a research relationship (Bahn & Weatherill, 2013; Caetano, 2015; Coles & Mudaly, 2010; Connolly & Reilly, 2007; Johnson & Clarke, 2003; Lalor et al., 2006; Warr, 2004). In narrative research especially the relationship between the interlocutors is of great influence on the sensitive nature of a topic (Hydén, 2013). This relationship includes cultural and contextual features as well as the personal views of both parties on the topic. Regardless of the experience of the interviewer or how many times the teller has told a story, each time a researcher and participant come together for the first time a new relationship has to be built (Corbin & Morse, 2003). Moreover, as the behavior of a researcher affects a participant's response, each researcher elicits a unique story (Finlay, 2002). Research is a joint product of researchers, participants, and their relationship, as stories are constructed by both parties within a particular social context.

An ethical research approach is partly determined by the research relationship. According to Josselson (2007) every aspect of narrative research is touched by the ethics of the research relationship. Therefore, the author stresses the importance of the connection between researcher and researched. Issues of harm truly surface during fieldwork (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004): Potential harm to participants is rooted in the nature of interaction between the researcher and participant. Therefore, being sensitized to such possible risks in practice is the key to an ethical

research practice. In addition, Corbin and Morse (2003) argue that researchers and participants co-construct ethical realities during the course of an interview.

Often, the quality of qualitative research is linked to the nature of the research relationship (Yardley, 2000). For instance, Riessman and Quinney (2005) state that specific attention to the context of production of data, in terms of the research relationship among other things, is an important standard to assess the quality of narrative inquiry. According to Finlay (2002) it is essential to find ways to analyze how intersubjective elements influence a study in order to establish the integrity and trustworthiness of the study. Furthermore, sincerity, as one of the criteria for excellent qualitative research, can be achieved through self-reflexivity by researchers on their impact on the scene (Tracy, 2010).

Hence, existing literature discusses how much is rooted in the personal exchange between a researcher and a participant, and, therefore, how the course of research is determined during fieldwork. The majority of literature considers reflexivity on the micro-level; however, little is written on reflexivity on the meta-level of research relationships and dialogues in field work specifically. In our view, considering and reviewing research relationships from this meta-level during data collection benefits qualitative research. Therefore, in this paper we aim to illustrate how a researcher of a complex topic can apply meta-level sensitivity to reinforce the research relationship and, in that way, how sensitivity contributes to more rigorous qualitative research.

Background

The study

In Project Iris the personal narratives of participants aimed to give an understanding of what it means to foster a child with a history of sexual abuse. Such narratives, as Salmon and Riessman (2013) conclude, are fundamentally co-constructions. As this study was exploratory in nature with roots in constructivism (Guba and Lincoln, 1994), we considered reality to be subjective, dynamic, and contextual. Consequently, the dynamics of the research relationship were deemed influential in the constructions of participants' narratives (Finlay, 2002; Riessman & Quinney, 2005).

Research procedure

In collaboration with a foster care organization in the northern part of the Netherlands, we recruited families who currently fostered a child with a putative history of sexual abuse prior

to placement in the foster family. These foster children were referred to as index children. After a thorough selection and recruitment process of participants, our sample resulted in 31 participants from 11 families. To each of these families, two researchers were assigned. With the assigned interviewer(s) a face-to-face acquaintance was held during which more detailed information was given and further questions on either side were answered. Only those family members that were familiar with the suspected abuse history could be involved in the study. One researcher was assigned to interview the foster parents of the family, the other spoke to their children. Therefore, some researchers spoke to more than one person of the same family. All participants were interviewed two to four times, depending on their available time, energy, and their need to continue telling their story. Six field researchers conducted interviews in this study, most of whom are female. In terms of age, seniority, and experience the research team was diverse.

Narrative instrument

According to Riessman and Quinney (2005) narrative inquiry is a fitting approach to study topics in social work, as narrative research as well as social work centers human interaction in relationships. Thus, In Project Iris the narratives of the foster parents and the biological children older than sixteen years of age were collected through consecutive narrative interviews following an episodic structure (Flick, 2000; 2009). Similarly, a booklet containing nonverbal activities was used to elicit a conversation with the children below the age of 16.

In the interviews special attention was paid to situations or episodes the interviewee thought to be relevant to share with regard to the topic of the study. Thereby, in this cross-section between a semi-structured interview and a narrative interview, participants controlled the agenda of the interview to some extent (Corbin and Morse, 2003). We considered a series of episodic interviews a participant's personal narrative, as the multiple interviews gave an extended account of different episodes in the past, present, and future.

Following each interview, a short debriefing session was held with the main researcher. In addition, each interviewer wrote their observations, perceptions, and emotions during the interview in a log. This log facilitated self-awareness and reflective thinking (Stoler, 2002; Rager, 2005; Warr, 2004), yielded starting points for further debriefing within the team, and was helpful when preparing follow-up interviews. This paper draws on the reflections of the field researchers who collected the data of this study.

Reflections on meta-level sensitivity

Several challenges arose in collecting narratives of individuals in foster families. After examining our fieldwork experiences, it appeared that being sensitive and attuned to the context of the narration helped us in navigating these challenging situations. The following discussion presents three types of meta-level sensitivity, which were especially beneficial in conducting our sensitive narrative study. First, the interviewers of Project Iris were sensitive using the instrument and aimed to provide interviewees the adequate opportunities to narrate. Second, our study called for sensitivity to the embedment of the studies' topic in familial contexts. Lastly, we needed to acknowledge our professional and personal contribution in the co-construction of the participants' narratives. In this section we explain each type of meta-level sensitivity and illustrate them with two examples of our fieldwork experiences.

Instrumental sensitivity

To apply narrative instruments adequately, researchers are to reflect on all dimensions of a narrative before and during data collection, as narratives are built on verbal as well as nonverbal accounts. Especially when a narrative turns to a sensitive topic, nonverbal cues such as vocal features, facial expressions, eye contact and body language are very valuable to a researcher, as nonverbal communication allows 'the presentation of self' and 'expressive functions' (Payrató, 2009, p.168). Moreover, it functions in managing the context, regulation of interaction, and emotional expressions of interlocutors.

Perception of resistance

The value of nonverbal information is illustrated by the interaction between one of the interviewers and a foster mother. The interviewer experienced some resistance at the participant's

“ being sensitive and attuned to the context of the narration helped us in navigating these challenging situations ”

end answering some of the questions in the interview protocol. Because of this resistance, the interviewer felt challenged to ask non-intrusive though clarifying questions. During a debriefing session we reflected on the content of the narrative, specifically on the parts where the

interviewer felt she pushed boundaries asking clarifying questions. In these parts the interviewer explicitly referred to the index child. We came to interpret this referral of the index child as a child with a history of sexual abuse as a possible cause of the resistance. Therefore, the interviewer

was encouraged to approach the resistance as a part of the narrative of this participant and to create a meta-dialogue on the resistance if encountered again in later interviews.

During one of the follow-up interviews the interviewer indeed experienced reluctance when she asked the participant what the history of sexual abuse of her foster child had meant to her. As prepared, the interviewer started a meta-dialogue on this and in reply the foster mother clarified her narrative: she explained she was cautious to verbalize what the history of sexual abuse had meant to her and her family in order to prevent stigmatization of the child: 'She is not just her past.' The participant did not view herself as a foster parent of a child who had been sexually abused, despite of her being willing to participate in Project Iris. The apprehension of stigmatizing or reducing the child to her traumatic history was a part of her story as a foster mother. The research relationship might have been damaged if the researcher had continued the interview without paying attention to this part of the participant's narrative. Had the interviewer not started the meta-dialogue based on her perception, vital information to this participant's narrative was missed.

Discomfort as a part of a narrative

In our study, participants frequently showed several emotions during the interviews, for instance, sadness, anger, or frustration. Negative emotions were displayed in particular when the interview turned to the sexualized behavior some foster children had shown. Among those episodes that produced discomfort were situations where participants talked about having witnessed excessive masturbation or child-initiated sexual contact. A number of participants seemed to experience a level of discomfort caused by reliving and talking about these situations.

When participants felt uncomfortable to talk about sexualized behavior, they showed nonverbal signs of uneasiness and they often used indirect language hinting what might have occurred. Therefore, it was not always clear what the participant was referring to. Although we needed to respect the participants' boundaries, it was necessary to create a mutual understanding to know what the participant was speaking of. For example, during a third interview one participant spoke of sexualized behavior her foster sibling showed towards other family members. Initially, the interviewer did not understand fully what the participant was talking about, because she was using quite vague terminology. Her interviewer log states: 'It was a lively conversation, although I noticed eye contact lessened considerably when we spoke of more difficult matters.' However, since the participant had made the choice to initiate the dialogue on sexualized behavior herself, the interviewer chose to ask her tactfully to explicate her story. The interviewer logs: 'I notice, as with many people, doing this third interview is appreciated

CHAPTER 3

because at that point you have built some rapport. Therefore, I very consciously asked about difficult matters as to define certain episodes clearly.'

After creating a mutual understanding of what the topic at hand was, the interviewer consciously adopted the words used by the participant in order to prevent more discomfort by using more explicit (sexual) terminology. It was clear that the participant was somewhat embarrassed to speak of these episodes to the interviewer as her direct audience. However, after reflecting on the situation, we, again, saw how nonverbal information revealed another dimension of this participant's narrative. Her embarrassment was a part of her narrative directed towards the broader audience 'behind' the interviewer, as she made the choice to share the embarrassing episodes of her life to educate our readers.

Life as relived

The episodic interview was constructed primarily to elicit a verbal account of the stories of our participants. The protocol contains open-ended questions to give participants the opportunity and power to choose which stories to share with us and to create their 'life as told' (Bruner, 2004). However, as the reflections illustrate, attention to only the verbal 'life as told' was not sufficient, as the interviews became very personal and intimate and, therefore, one can say the 'life as relived' was essential to take into account. These two concepts, as illustrated in the examples, were not always fully compatible. The 'life as relived' adds to the verbal account delivered by the participants, and it illustrates the participants' altruistic motivation. Thus, the 'life as relived' seems to have some performative value, as participants narrate their difficult experiences in hope of changing the world for their peers for the better. The interviewer has the important role to mediate both the 'life as told' and 'the life as relived' by being attuned to the interviewee's willingness to participate, but also remaining attuned to their vulnerability.

The value of nonverbal and situational information is stressed by Warr (2004). She states that significant data is lost if only verbal information is used: data quality is enhanced by the details present in face-to-face encounters between researchers and researched. An interviewer should be processing and absorbing nonverbal information, next to performing the more general task of inviting a participant to narrate. The example of the participant who resisted to her research identity of a foster mother of a sexually abused child illustrates how a nonverbal detail became explicit by meta-communication. This meta-communication, as a result of instrumental sensitivity, helped researchers to use the elicited information to attend to the research relationship. By doing so, we constantly tried to stabilize the balance between the explicit contract (the beforehand stated relationship between the researcher and the participant), as well

as the implicit contract (the relationship between the two parties that is built on interpersonal cues), as Josselson states (2007). The recording of meta-communication in the interviewer logs added to the importance of these documents: the log transformed from a reflection-facilitating document to a vital source of nonverbal and circumstantial data.

Contextual sensitivity

We experienced how the contextual embedment of our research was important to consider on the level of individuals as well as on the level of the system to which the individual belonged: the foster family. Furthermore, we identified a second type of sensitivity needed to collect narratives of individuals to be contextual sensitivity: Researchers should be sensitive to the contextual embedment of the research.

Non-participating family members

The relationship interviewers had with the participants, as well as the system the participants were part of, was partially determined by the information given about the researchers. In every participating foster family there have been non-participating family members either due to the strict inclusion criteria, gatekeeping by the foster parents, or by their own choice. These non-participating children (some already were adults) often did not know that we were interviewers in a study centering their foster siblings, nor did they know of their foster siblings' history of sexual abuse. Hence, if they would find out who we were, they would learn about the abuse history of their foster sibling(s). Our presence created the risk of a deductive disclosure. Therefore, our position as researchers was determined by the choices the family as a system made with regard to the information shared. The interviewers became a part of the reality of the families as a system, as we as professionals 'embodied' child sexual abuse, a topic that in some families was not out in the open. The concept of 'deductive disclosure' has been addressed by Kaiser (2009). However, her discussion of the concept is limited to deductive disclosures through identifiable traits in research reports, whereas the risk of deductive disclosure in Project Iris also occurred during data collection.

This risk of a deductive disclosure during data collection was particularly present when interviews were held in the family's home. We needed to actively consider to what extent we could communicate with non-participating family members if we encountered them in their home. One interviewer logs:

During the interview one of the adult non-participating biological children walked in. He seemed to listen in on our conversation and added something to foster mother's story. I was very aware of his presence and did not continue asking questions about the history of abuse of the index child until I had checked with her if I could speak of it openly.

As the quote illustrates, sometimes non-participating family members were present at the start of the interview or they interrupted interview situations. Some even contributed to the interview, although they did not formally participate in the study. Our interviewees sometimes consciously stopped the interview when this happened. Some, however, did not appear to be affected by this.

Information shared among participants

Additionally, the position of an interviewer was determined by the information given to the interviewees. During our data collection it appeared participating family members differed what they knew regarding the history of sexual abuse of their foster children. As previously stated, some foster parents had decided to give their biological children limited information on the history of sexual abuse of the foster children. This occasionally complicated the work of the researchers interviewing more than one participant in a family.

For example, in the case of one family researchers were assigned to the adults and children that chose to participate and an acquaintance was held. During the interviews with the foster parents the interviewer learned that this family had an extensive history of fostering several children with a possible history of sexual abuse: the foster parents constructed their narrative speaking of situations with different index children. However, the participating children did not all refer to the same foster children, as became clear during the preparation of follow-up interviews. Different biological children were sometimes given different information or had remembered other things. This meant that the involved interviewers learned new information from each participant that possibly was not known to the other participants.

It became all the more clear the participants had to be given control of the agenda of the interview, for it was not acceptable to disclose new information we gained during other interviews. In each interview the narrative of the current participant had to be leading. The risk of 'data-contamination' had to be taken into consideration in the planning which interviewers prepared follow-up interviews together as different interviewers within one family could be coupled to prepare interviews together. Likewise, when one researcher interviewed more than one family member, data-contamination was a possibility.

Creating space

Thus, we experienced how the embedment of our topic within the system of a foster family influenced the narratives collected, or as Hydén (2013) suggests, we experienced how the concept of space influenced the co-construction of our participant's narrative. Hydén defines space as one of the profound factors shaping the relational circumstances in sensitive research. She divides this concept into physical space, being the location of an interview including the bigger context, and discursive space, or the openness of the discourse. Often the physical space influences the discursive space among interlocutors. When the physical space is not optimal, for instance when others are present during an interview, the discursive space can be compromised. In line with Hydén's claims, we did experience how the discursive space was influenced through the presence of others.

Holland et al. (2014) focus on similar problems. They illustrate the importance of ethical practices when researching substance abuse with parents and their children. The authors stress the use of adaptability in the field with regard to interviewing in the home environment, as they too experienced a risk of disclosing unknown personal histories. However, researching topics within the natural environment of participants has benefits, as Warr (2004) states. She argues that research that is taking place in a lived environment generates powerful and very relevant descriptive data.

“ Meta-level contextual sensitivity is sensitivity to the broader context in the moment of the narration ”

The contextual embeddedness of our research was challenging, and we felt a need to be sensitive in order to minimize the risks of damaging the reality of the individuals in the system studied. Yardley (2000) states sensitivity to context is an indicator of the quality of a qualitative study. This concept is described by her as a researcher's awareness of the theoretical context of a study topic, the socio-cultural setting of a study, the social context of the research relationship, and contrasting perspectives. Yardley's definition of sensitivity to context shows some similarities to contextual sensitivity as described in this paper. The concepts, however, do differ. More specifically, Yardley states “sensitivity to the linguistic and dialogic context of each utterance is crucial to interpreting its meaning and function” (p. 221). Meta-level contextual sensitivity, however, is sensitivity to the broader context in the moment of the narration. This proved to be of great influence on the co-construction of an individual's narrative. Our contextually-sensitive response was to follow the interviewee within his/her family dynamics. By doing so, we gained access to individual accounts of the family members and the values and practicalities that frame them (Warr, 2004).

Professional sensitivity

Starting our work in Project Iris, we imagined being exposed to child sexual abuse stories would have an impact on all interviewers. Several precautions had been taken to limit possible negative effects for all interviewers involved. Indeed, during the data collection the effects of studying this sensitive topic were manifested in many ways, the most prominent effect being our own emotions, as many qualitative researchers have experienced (Coles & Mudaly, 2010; Connolly & Reilly, 2007; Dickson-Swift et al., 2007, 2008, 2009; Johnson & Clarke, 2003; Lalor et al., 2006; Sherry, 2013). However, besides the expected emotional impact, we were affected in unexpected manners by the collection of the narratives. This called for professional sensitivity: We needed to be sensitive to all aspects of our contribution in the co-construction of the participants' narratives.

Our responsibilities

Many participants showed emotions during the interviews, negative as well as positive. Many of them expressed an altruistic motivation to participate in the study and mentioned a willingness to contribute to the best of their ability. It seemed they were willing to go back and remember frustration, shock, or disgust in order to help out other families. At the same time, it was our responsibility to prevent the interviews turning into harmful experiences.

For example, in the case of one specific participant the complete set of interviews was held during a four-month time span. The family situation and dynamics of several foster placements caused a very different research context at each interview. At the time of the third interview this foster family was dealing with a variety of difficulties: between the second and third interview the foster parents had experienced problems fostering several children, also related to the sexual abuse history of some of them. These developments were very prominent in the foster mother's experience of being part of this foster family and in the third interview a new dimension to her narrative was provided caused by recent events. Besides speaking of the recent struggles the family faced, the participant showed signs of frustration, defeat, and sadness. She said: 'I really wanted to talk to you about these things.' The interviewer mentions this moment in her log; she states she felt for the interviewee and was very thankful for her doing the interview during such a troublesome time. However, this remark made the interviewer wonder what the interview had brought the foster mother, as it seemed to be rewarding while evoking emotions. The interviewer felt the interview moved into risky territory: She was invested as an eager professional to hear the interviewee's story, but was afraid to harm the foster mother by evoking more emotions than

the participant could handle. Even in later interviews this experience continued to influence the interviewer, especially when other participants became emotional, as she logs:

Since that interview I feel more vulnerable than before. When this particular participant cried, her tears moved me and I must admit I am very aware that I might harm participants by coming to their house, shake things up, and leave again.

The professional researcher

On some occasions participants anticipated on the possibility of our discomfort as people listening to their story. As illustrated in the introduction, one foster father asked explicitly if the interviewer would experience discomfort if he used sexual terms to describe his story. In this particular case it was the participant who was sensitive and felt the need to check the level of discomfort of the interviewer in order to create a mutual understanding of what could be openly discussed. However, this participant took a risk, as the interviewer could have been offended by the use of sexual terms. Professional sensitivity in this case meant the interviewer needed to consider how her reaction to the participant's question could influence the research relationship. The situation illustrates the need for consideration of the professional boundaries of the interviewer. In every research relationship new boundaries are set and maintained as two individuals develop a unique relationship. The use of sexual explicit terms challenges these boundaries, as sexual language is taboo to many. Although one can argue that in a study like Project Iris an interviewer should be able to cope with such language, this is not a given, as every research relationship is dynamic. Each time two interlocutors come together the professional role of an interviewer can be challenged by an emotion as shame.

The dynamics of professionalism

Many skills are required of professional interviewers to structure narratives adequately, one of which is a sensitiveness to one's own unique contribution to the construction of the participants' narratives. In this study the interviewers contributed to our participants' narratives through the way they carried out their responsibility of interviews on this sensitive topic. As previously mentioned, this was sometimes challenging because of the risk of a deductive disclosure through simply being present. Our responsibility to follow each interviewee within the family dynamic sometimes resulted in collecting data in a state of constant alertness. The complexity of confidentiality with regard to the family had to be reviewed constantly, as we had the responsibility to prevent a deductive disclosure. This 'burden' of our responsibilities towards each individual participant, as well as to families as a system could have made us direct the

interviews in a comfortable, less emotional discursive space to us as interviewers (Hydén, 2013). Furthermore, the heightened tendency of protectiveness towards the families or feelings of shame might have created a less open discursive space. With our responsibility questions arose: to what extent were emotions a natural part of the narratives of our participants regarding this topic and (when) should we protect our participants from their own emotions?

Although alertness or shame could be viewed as problematic, it also provided a powerful impression of how this topic is handled in the families studied. It seems our own data collection experience served as a supplement to the actual data collected (Warr, 2004). Even though one's experience as a data collector can have this function within a study, still, caution is needed: an interviewer's interpretation of an experience might prevent seeing things from the perspective of the participant. Moreover, it should not lead away from the main voice in a study: the participant's voice.

In summary, researchers should be sensitive to their contribution in the construction of a participant's narrative, as the researcher's self is the primary tool of inquiry (Finlay, 2002; Josselson, 2007; Warr, 2004), however, excessive sensitivity to the researcher's own contribution to the participant's narrative will distract attention from the participant's perspective (Finlay, 2002; Warr, 2004).

Link between the types of sensitivity

The three types of sensitivity are presented individually. However, they are very much interrelated. For example, the audience of the narrator, present or not, influences what can be said and what remains unsaid. Some narrators in our study experienced discomfort reliving and speaking of episodes in their life. Their personal account of embarrassment was not always clearly expressed in words, therefore instrumental sensitivity was needed to create a mutual understanding that their embarrassment was 'allowed', as it was a part of their narrative. However, one should also recognize the personal influence of the researcher in such a situation: As professionals we needed to discuss possibly embarrassing episodes openly with the participant, in a manner that was most comfortable. Our responsibility was to create the appropriate discursive space in which the participant could narrate his or her shameful or painful reality, regardless if this meant the narrative of a participant might raise emotions in the researchers.

Concluding remarks

No one can foresee how a research relationship will develop and collecting narrative data on a sensitive topic can be a challenging task. In this paper, meta-level sensitivity was presented as a tool to support researchers when collecting narratives on sensitive topics and to structure narratives during complex fieldwork. The three types of sensitivity that were presented as a result of our reflections can be utilized in the process of qualitative data collection to establish, nurture, and utilize the research relationship with participants, as well as the systems they belong to. One can argue that sensitivity of this type is epistemologically relevant, or even essential, during narrative data collection, as the link between narrative data, the researched, and the researchers collecting narrative data on sensitive topics is undeniable. In addition, for us detecting and acting on meta-information during data-collection has proven to contribute to more rigorous research.

Although this paper focused on sensitivity on the meta-level of narration, sensitivity is also needed in other phases of a research process. For example, similar to what Mauthner (2000) experienced in analyzing and reporting on results of inter-related participants, contextualizing our interpretation of participants' narratives is not without risks. Still, decontextualizing our results is also problematic (Corbin and Morse, 2003; Hydén, 2013; Josselson, 2007; Riessman and Quinney, 2005), as results may be reinterpreted (wrongly). Hence, qualitative studies of systems and/or interrelated participants require more than attention to sensitivity during the data collection: sensitivity is also needed when analyzing the data and reporting and disseminating the results.

