BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Rolland, L. and Dewaele, Jean-Marc and Costa, B. (2019) Planning and conducting ethical interviews: power, language and emotions. In: McKinley, J. and Rose, H. (eds.) Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in Applied Linguistics. Routledge Handbooks in Applied Linguistics. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 279-289. ISBN 9781138501140.

Chapter 16 – Planning and conducting ethical interviews: power, language and emotions[1]

Louise Rolland, Jean-Marc Dewaele & Beverley Costa
Birkbeck, University of London

Introduction

In many cultures, interviews are ubiquitous in the media, so that the question-and-answer format is a well-known way of gleaning and presenting information about people's opinions or experiences. Indeed, their use as a source of knowledge can be traced back to ancient Greece (Kvale, 2007). It is perhaps unsurprising, then, that interviews are the most common method of data collection in qualitative studies. In applied linguistics, the methodology is employed in a wide variety of studies (see for example, Burck, 2005; Gibson & Hua, 2016; Koven, 2007; Prior, 2016; Samata, 2014).

This chapter discusses how to prepare for and conduct a research interview. In particular, questions of power in the relationship between research participant and interviewer are discussed within the context of striving for ethical practice. Within applied linguistics it is particularly relevant to examine how to work with multilingual participants – including what language choices to offer and corresponding adaptations to the methodology. We also focus on affect, incorporating lessons from psychotherapy on identifying one's own vulnerabilities and potential for vicarious traumatisation, and working safely with vulnerable groups. This includes considering how language intersects with an individual's trauma.

When to use interviews

Interviews are particularly appropriate for studies investigating individuals' experiences, beliefs or constructions of a particular phenomenon (Braun & Clarke, 2013). They are also used to explore self-reports of behaviours, including language practices, or to produce conversational data as evidence of linguistic patterns. Depending on the researcher's epistemological stance, the interview may be viewed as a tool to gather facts, or from the postmodern perspective as a "social construction of knowledge" (Kvale, 2007, p. 22).

Some important ethical questions to consider from the start are: What will the researcher get out of the interviews, and what will participants get out of the interviews? For although interviews for qualitative research have some similarity with therapeutic conversations, in therapy, the encounter is constructed for the participant to learn something, whereas in research the encounter is constructed for the researcher to learn something (Hollway, 2016). As such, alternatives to interviewing

---

[1] Rolland, L., Dewaele, J.-M. & Costa, B. (to appear) Planning and conducting ethical interviews: power, language and emotions. In J. McKinley & K. Rose (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

vulnerable participants include interviewing gatekeepers or practitioners who work with them.

Three types of one-to-one interview are normally distinguished: structured, semi-structured and unstructured. Structured interviews consist of predetermined questions and responses, much like a questionnaire (see Iwaniec, this volume) which is administered in person. Semi-structured interviews, in which the researcher refers to an interview guide with pre-prepared questions but leaves room to explore topics raised by participants, are the most common (Braun & Clarke, 2013). Finally, unstructured interviews are driven by participants' response to the study topic with fewer prompts from the researcher. The researcher's theoretical approach will dictate which is most suitable; for example, unstructured interviews are favoured by grounded theorists (Charmaz, 2006; see also Hadley, this volume). Depending on the study aims, interviews may also be structured around an activity, such as the creation of a language portrait (Busch, 2012). The activity or output then form the basis of discussions between researcher and participant. Here we focus on the semi-structured interview.

Planning for interviews

Interviews require extensive planning, from recruiting an appropriate sample (see Miyahara, this volume) to developing an interview guide. Other parameters which need to be considered include: how many sessions to conduct, by which medium (face-to-face or virtual), in which location, how much time to allocate and how to record the conversation.

Developing and using an interview guide

The interview guide should cover the topics of interest to the researcher, using open-ended questions to allow participants to frame their responses according to what is important to them. The aim is to elicit detailed accounts in the participants' own words; this means avoiding leading questions, assumptions and jargon when formulating the questions (Kvale, 2007).

As an overall structure, the guide should include an introductory question or ice-breaker which puts the participant at ease. Further questions are usually organised by topic area so that the interview progresses with a natural flow. Questions may gradually delve into more personal territory, as rapport is established between the interviewer and interviewee. Finally, the interview is concluded with a closing question or, ideally, an opportunity for the participant to raise anything else which they feel is relevant.

In the example below, the main questions are highlighted in bold and followed by possible prompts for eliciting further detail. In practice, the exact wording and order in which the prepared questions are used by the researcher during an interview will vary according to how the interaction unfolds with each participant. Some questions may not be asked at all if the participant brings up the relevant information beforehand. Other questions will spring to the researcher's mind in connection with the participant's responses and be asked spontaneously. It can also be useful to

have a list of generic question types to use for clarification ("What do you mean by…?"), elaboration ("Can you tell me more about the time you…?"), understanding personal significance ("Why was that important to you…?") and so on. The key is to be flexible to pursue opportunities for rich data generation, while drawing on the guide to retain a focus on eliciting material which is relevant to the research questions. Making moment-by-moment adjustments to what to ask next according to the narrative which is unfolding requires the researcher to be very familiar with the interview guide.

[insert Text Box 16.1 around here]

Beyond the interview guide, silence and non-verbal communication also play an important part in managing the conversation. For example, a participant's short reply can be probed with an "expectant glance" (Fielding & Thomas, 2008, p. 251).

Testing the interview questions and practising one's interviewing skills in advance with a pilot interview (factored into recruitment) or mock interview (with a colleague or supervisor) will help the researcher to identify any problematic areas and make improvements.

Setting up interviews

Interviews are typically conducted in a single session lasting up to an hour, although some qualitative researchers recommend up to three sessions to build rapport, develop more tailored questions and clarify findings as necessary (Polkinghorne, 2005). Face-to-face interviews are the norm; however, technology offers increasingly sophisticated opportunities to carry out virtual interviews, both spoken or written (O'Connor, Madge, Shaw & Wellens, 2009). For example, free video-conferencing software can enable synchronous interviews with participants from across the globe, providing they have access to a reliable internet connection. This may be an option for projects where the researcher(s) cannot travel or collaborate with local researchers. It may be less suitable, however, for sensitive research topics where the non-verbal aspects of communication are particularly important. Different methodologies will also produce different data types – such as text (email or chat outputs), audio, video or other co-produced, on-line media (Hay-Gibson, 2009) – and dictate recording options.

Participants should be made aware before the interview (in a participant information sheet) that they will be asked for their consent to be recorded, since note-taking is unlikely to capture the interaction in sufficient detail. Interviewers need to allow time to brief interviewees on the study and go through the consent procedure before starting the interview, and schedule sufficient time between interviews for reflection and transcription, while the interaction is fresh in mind.

When meeting participants in person, careful consideration should be given to the location in order to ensure safety, privacy, neutrality, participant comfort and a noise-free environment for recording. Whilst video captures additional channels of communication such as facial displays or gestures, it is much more intrusive than a small digital voice recorder which is usually sufficient. Equipment needs to be tested beforehand and having spare batteries is advised. The chairs and other furniture

should be positioned so that the interviewer can make eye contact in a natural way (e.g. seated at an angle rather than directly opposite). The recording equipment should be placed near the participant, and away from sources of potential sound interference such as refreshments.

Transcribing interviews

Preparing interview data for analysis involves the process of transcription. Here we briefly outline key considerations when transforming audio data into a written transcript. For detailed treatments of the process, see Chapter 7 of Braun and Clarke (2013) and Chapter 2 of Liddicoat (2007).

Spoken language differs from written language, in that it includes hesitations, false starts, repetitions and ungrammatical features which would not normally appear in writing. In addition, non-verbal aspects form an important part of the communication. The task of transcribing involves the written representation of the recorded speech. As such, the researcher must choose the transcription style required for analysis: from an orthographic (verbatim) focus on the words, to the inclusion of more or less detailed paralinguistic features (such as pauses, intonation and emotional expression) as needed in conversation analysis (Jefferson, 2004; Liddicoat, 2007), for example. Multilingual data may present additional challenges, particularly if multiple scripts are needed (Halai, 2007).

Put simply, transcribing involves listening carefully to a short section of the recording and writing the words or sounds pronounced by each speaker along with any other relevant features, according to a predefined notation system, excerpt by excerpt. Transcription software (such as Express Scribe, recommended by Braun & Clarke, 2013) can facilitate aspects such as the playback pace and be coupled with a foot pedal. Once a rough transcript has been produced the process can be reviewed to check for inaccuracies. Transcribing is a time-consuming task which typically takes six to ten times the length of the recording (Braun & Clarke, 2013), or is ongoing in the case of conversation analysis (Liddicoat, 2007), and involves many decisions about what to report, and how. In fact, transcription is often considered part of the data analysis phase: "The transcript is the product of an interaction between the recording and the transcriber, who listens to the recording, and makes choices about what to preserve, and how to represent what they hear" (Braun & Clarke, 2013, p. 162). There is great value in transcribing one's own data, but if time is short the task may be delegated or outsourced.

Power relations and ethics

It is important to reflect on power dynamics ahead of the interview, in recognition that they are co-constructed conversations where speakers' positions and identity claims impact on what is said. Traditionally, the researcher has a more powerful position as a representative of the institution. This imbalance may be exacerbated by the researcher's approach to the interview or the participant's sociohistorical understanding of what "research" means (Smith, 2013, p. 1). Thus, Phipps (2013, p. 19) cautions against treating interviews as a "data 'extraction'" exercise. Relational differences such as gender, ethnicity, language, sexual orientation,

immigration/asylum status, education and social class need to be considered. Together, they intersect to form a complex picture: "The loci along which we are aligned with or set apart from those whom we study are multiple and in flux" (Narayan, 1993, p. 671). The topic also informs how the relationship is approached: for example, an interviewer has a different level of responsibility towards participants being interviewed about their dental history and participants being interviewed about their experiences of bereavement.

Dewaele (2013) describes the difficulties researchers can face when seeking data from individuals of different socioeconomic backgrounds. The researchers' questions and forms can be perceived as intimidating or even threatening, as it can bring back unhappy memories of childhood education or unpleasant experiences with official authorities. For example, with the increased use of language tests to obtain citizenship, migrants may be understandably suspicious about participating in interviews with linguists. Moreover, many non-linguists may feel that their language knowledge is insufficient. The researcher's explanation of the study aims might be misunderstood and educational insecurity might nudge potential participants to a blank refusal. Indeed, nobody wants to look stupid in the eyes of authority. Finally, some questions that seem straightforward to the researcher (for example, 'What language do you typically swear in?' or 'How often do you swear in your foreign language?') may in fact involve self-reflection and require a degree of meta-linguistic and meta-pragmatic awareness that not everybody possesses.

Preparation for interviewing across difference should include an examination of one's own assumptions and prejudice. From a therapeutic perspective, Ryde (2009, p. 16) highlights that noticing and examining problematic attitudes and beliefs is the key to being able to let go of them:

> Non-dual thinking leads us to be *interested* in our experience rather than attached to it in a narcissistic way. If we find an assumption or prejudice we are interested in it. We do not hang onto it for dear life. We see our 'whiteness', for example, and think 'what is this that we take so for granted?' It helps us to loosen our hold on our ego identity and allows us to meet others afresh, without prejudice, including our clients – a way which recognizes our own attachments and assumptions. We do not then punish ourselves for failing to do this which merely creates another dualism. Instead of that we notice it and hold it more lightly.

During the interview, the researcher aims to remain neutral, showing "non-judgmental *interest*" (Braun & Clarke, 2013, p. 96) in the participant's responses, unless adopting empathic interviewing as a methodology (Oakley, 1981). A mental health researcher, Georgiadou (2016) reflects on an interview excerpt, noticing *now* what she missed about her positioning and the influence of her research agenda (p. 365): "this passage indicated the potential unpreparedness or reluctance of the 'white' researcher to accept and recognise the impact of her ethnicity in the research process, as well as the significance of not doing so". Learning from her experience, Georgiadou recommends that researchers acknowledge that power imbalances exist and that they move away from an egalitarian, colour blind attitude. She argues that it is important to be aware of these differences and to reflect, talk about and negotiate power asymmetries. By thought and action, a researcher can strive to appropriately handle those issues and enhance research quality. This is neither easy, nor

comfortable. It means constantly reflecting on how one is being constructed and how one is constructing one's world (Potts & Brown, 2005).

In applied linguistics research, it is particularly relevant to look at how language may foster asymmetrical power relations. Participants may be at a disadvantage from using a foreign language, for example, or may experience the use of a colonial, rather than indigenous, language as oppressive. These and other language-related issues are raised in the section below and discussed in detail in Andrews, Holmes, Fay & Dawson (this volume). Other interviewer or interviewee characteristics which may tilt the balance of the relationship include student researchers, whom participants may feel they are helping to obtain their degree, and elite interviewees who may have a much higher status than interviewers (see Gibson & Zhu Hua, 2016).

Some researchers aim to match interviewees with interviewers of similar backgrounds to minimise difference (Sawyer et al., 1995, cited in Braun & Clarke, 2013), although this strategy has its limitations (Merriam et al., 2001). Another way to establish common ground with interviewees is for the interviewer to disclose relevant personal experiences. For example, Samata (2014, p. 122) reported:

> In the course of our conversation Aurelio mentions that he has worked as a bartender and seems defensive about this. The interviewer shares the information that she had worked in bars as a student. This amuses Aurelio; we briefly discuss my own life in America after which Aurelio visibly relaxes.

We advise researchers to think in advance about what they are prepared to share about themselves during the interview and what will remain private. They should be aware of participant expectations, as well as the potential impact on power dynamics. While some researchers may be clear on the extent to which they are prepared to share information about themselves to build some rapport, participants may view the disclosure of personal details as an invitation to greater intimacy. Or they may interpret the sharing of information as an indication that the researcher will be willing and able to help with their problems, particularly if they are positioned in their minds as an 'expert' on the topic. To this end, a statement which sets or resets the boundaries for the interview can be incorporated into the interview guide notes. For further reading, see Braun and Clarke's (2013, p. 94) example of when the interviewee's question ("What d'you think") caught the interviewer off-guard and strayed into uncomfortable territory, and Oakley's (1981) influential discussion of self-disclosure in interviewing.

Interviewing multilinguals

The opportunities and challenges of researching multilingually are rarely discussed in the literature (exceptions include Halai, 2007; Holmes, Fay, Andrews & Attia, 2013; Holmes, Fay, Andrews & Attia, 2016; see also Andrews, Holmes, Fay & Dawson, this volume). Holmes et al. (2016, p. 90) recommend a three-stage approach to factoring language choices into data collection methods, namely: "realization, consideration, and informed and purposeful decision-making". Indeed, the impact of language choices when eliciting autobiographical narratives from

multilingual participants has been highlighted by several linguists (Mann, 2008; Pavlenko, 2007) since "the presentation of events may vary greatly with the language of the telling" (Pavlenko, 2007, p. 172). Thus, the body of work which points to language effects on memory, emotional perception and expression (Dewaele, 2013; Pavlenko, 2005, Resnik, 2018), and identity (Burck, 2005; Koven, 2007) cannot be ignored when it comes to selecting methods for researching with multilingual participants.

Foreign language users (Dewaele, 2018) might find themselves in a weak position when interacting with a first language (L1) user of that language. In such an exolingual situation (Dausendschön-Gay, 2003), they may experience a painful lack of control in understanding and expressing subtle shades of emotion. This could affect their sense of self, and drive them to fury, as Hoffman (1989) beautifully recalls from her early days as a teenage Polish immigrant in Canada:

> My speech, I sense, sounds monotonous, deliberate, heavy – an aural mask that doesn't become or express me at all (...) I don't try to tell jokes too often, I don't know the slang, I have no cool repartee. I love language too much to maul its beats, and my pride is too quick to risk the incomprehension that greets such forays (…) I am enraged at the false persona I'm being stuffed into, as into some clumsy and overblown astronaut suit. I'm enraged at my adolescent friends because they can't see through the guise, can't recognize the light-footed dancer I really am. (pp. 118–119)

Researchers may be multilingual themselves and be able to conduct interviews in more than one language. In this case, a choice can be offered to the interviewee. In particular, participants can be encouraged to speak their L1 (if it is one of the interviewer's languages) and to code-switch if they wish to, allowing participants to draw on their full linguistic and affective repertoire. Alternatively, a multicultural and multilingual research team could be formed, enabling researchers to be language-matched with prospective interviewees. Catalano (2017) achieved this by collaborating with students living overseas when collecting migrants' narratives. She observed (p. 101) that "the quality and intimacy of the interviews increased when they were conducted in the mother tongue of the participants". Similarly, Costa and Briggs (2012) trained multilingual researchers investigating the experiences of service users in interpreter-meditated therapy, developing "processes for teamwork, training researchers, translating protocol first into the language of the researcher (and service user) and then back into English for analysis and for achieving consistency across the research team" (p.235).

Yet, in contexts where minority languages have been stigmatised, participants may hesitate to take up language offers and defer to the interviewer instead (Madoc-Jones & Parry, 2012), resulting in a delicate negotiation. Using a language which is foreign for both parties can also be a resource for the creation of a *third space* in the interview. Holmes et al. (2013), citing Ganassin and Phipps' research, argue that such a medium can "provide an opportunity for neutralising the inbuilt power imbalance within research relationships" (p. 294).

The language of the interview is particularly significant in the case of vulnerable participants. For example, the intersection of the interview language(s) with the language in which trauma was experienced has implications for the interviewee's

emotional expression and self-regulation. It may unleash unexpected emotions, which can be overwhelming and for which the researcher needs to be prepared, whereas using another language may provide protection from the trauma.

For researchers used to working in the language of their institution, the prospect of carrying out an interview in their other language(s) may be anxiety-inducing. Identity issues and shame relating to language attrition (Schmid & Köpke, 2013) may result in feelings of vulnerability. These can be mitigated by preparing a bilingual interview guide, identifying key differences between the languages (such as terms of address), and conducting a mock interview in the target language(s). Putting one's professional identity at risk in this way can also be a humbling experience which contributes to building trust between the interviewer and interviewee.

Finally, where no language is shared with the researcher(s), or the participant has a preference for another language, the interview can be facilitated by an interpreter. Working with a third person brings different challenges – such as defining roles, allowing space for the translation and developing relationships – which require reflection and preparation (Temple & Edwards, 2002). Moreover, selecting a professional interpreter whom the interviewee finds acceptable may be difficult within a small close-knit community.

Managing emotions

Emotionality in the interview

Regardless of the interview topic, emotions are present in interviews just as they are in everyday interactions. And despite the traditional view of interviewer neutrality, Prior argues that researchers often "engage in (and withhold […]) displays of understanding and empathy that show participants how they understand and acknowledge their experiences and personal responses to them" (2016, p. 173). Prior (2017a) points out that affiliative and empathic dimensions in the interview are highly dynamic as "interviewer and interviewee move in and out of empathic moments across the interview sequences as they manage their affective stances related to the events the interviewee describes and, in turn, by managing their empathic alignments with each other" (p. 487). It is important to plan how to engage with emotionality, especially when working with vulnerable groups and sensitive topics.

An interviewer must monitor the interviewee's well-being, attending to changes in body language and paralinguistic cues which may signal participant distress. When personal distress becomes apparent, it can be tempting for the researcher to change the topic in order to "neutralize the distressing talk and re-establish a safe and comfortable environment" (Prior, 2016, p. 158). This may be motivated by a desire to protect a vulnerable participant from retraumatisation (see below) or to alleviate the researcher's own sense of helplessness, which parallels the helplessness of the interviewee. However, acknowledging distress and offering a break, drink of water or tissues, so that it is expressed but contained, most often helps participants and researchers to regain their composure (Braun & Clarke, 2013). It is also good practice to ask at the end if they wish any part of the interview to be excluded from the record and future reports, in case they regret any disclosures. If the interview dealt with a sensitive topic, it may be appropriate to offer information about relevant

help lines. Moreover, it is useful to consider beforehand what the interviewer may find uncomfortable or distressing. Self-awareness about personal triggers will help the researcher manage these if they crop up in the interview.

The benefits of empathy are that the interviewer can make use of the here and now relationship with the participant, gaining real insight and perspective into the participant's experience (Georgiadou, 2016). The pitfalls of empathy are that interviewers put themselves in danger of emotional contagion (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994; Prior, 2016) and secondary trauma, as discussed in the next section.

Caring for vulnerable participants and self-care: retraumatisation and vicarious trauma

Since interview studies in applied linguistics research deal with human subjects and their experiences, the potential for uncovering trauma is real. Refugees and asylum seekers – from the language use of Holocaust survivors (Schmid, 2002) to SLA and TESOL studies (Gordon, 2011; Prior, 2016) – and clients of mental health services (Rolland, 2019) are just some of the vulnerable populations which are increasingly examined within the field. As such, stories of trauma can easily unfold and some may be told to the researcher for the first time. Ethical guidelines require that researchers aim to do no harm (British Psychological Society, 2014; see also De Costa, Li, Rawal, & Lee, this volume). In practice, the longer term impact of an interview on the participant's wellbeing is not usually known. However, ethical planning and decision-making *throughout* the interview process can help to mitigate the risks to both participants and researchers. Involving a clinical research supervisor who specialises in working with vulnerable participants can help the researcher to reflect on ethical challenges and to prepare ways to re-ground participants if they become distressed,

The researcher, as the listener, can also be subject to (re)traumatisation. The helplessness invoked by listening to intense pain, can cause secondary trauma (in response to an individual incident) or vicarious trauma. (occurring over time with a cumulative effect), with symptoms which can be surprisingly similar to post-traumatic symptoms. Self-care is therefore recommended (Fawcett, 2003) for all researchers who work with vulnerable participants. The following strategies can be helpful: developing self-awareness; ensuring a balance between work and personal activities; maintaining connections: "Strong relationships afford the best protection in traumatic and stressful environments" (op. cit., p. 7).

Emotional labour does not stop after the interview, as Prior (2016, p. 174) explains: "repeatedly listening to, transcribing and analysing the recorded data further expose[s] researchers to personal distress and even emotional danger". If these responses to the data are not processed, researchers may find themselves significantly affected, both mentally and physically, by vicarious trauma. Prior (2017b, p. 179), whose participants were asylum seekers with traumatic experiences of surviving war and discrimination, describes how "regular breaks away from the data, keeping a reflective journal, and talking about the data (while protecting confidentiality) and [his] reactions to it with trusted advisors and peers" helped to overcome the agitation and fatigue caused by his engagement with the data.

Such issues are not widely acknowledged in applied linguistics. By contrast, in public health research, recognition that "researchers involved in research on a sensitive topic may need some therapeutic support to deal with issues that may arise from the research" (Dickson-Swift, James, Kippen & Liamputtong, 2009, p. 74) is growing. For example, research teams report accessing university counsellors for debriefing after interviews or external professionals for support as necessary. Indeed, the provision of reflective, personal support, where relevant, is an important ethical consideration which falls within the research institution's duty of care towards researchers. This support does not need to be in the form of a therapist or counsellor. The clinical research supervisor can help the researcher to process their own personal responses and reactions within the context of the research. Whereas a therapist or counsellor keeps the focus on the client, the clinical research supervisor keeps the focus on the work – what does their client (the researcher) need to understand and process about themselves, in order to be able to fulfil their research task ethically and successfully?

Conclusion

Researchers will develop their own interviewing style as they hone their skills through practice. Interviews never cease to be unpredictable. However, by giving due consideration to research aims, ethics and reflexivity throughout the planning stages, guiding principles which will serve the interviewer well once in the 'hot seat' can be determined. We have argued that balancing the emotional and intellectual aspects of the interaction is particularly important, as Kvale aptly wrote (2007, p. 22): "The qualitative research interview has affinities to philosophical dialogues as well as to therapeutic interviews, but follows neither the relentless intellectual reasoning of the former nor the close personal interaction of the latter".

Bibliography

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: a practical guide for beginners*. London: Sage.

British Psychological Society (2014). *Code of Human Research Ethics* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from: https://www.bps.org.uk/news-and-policy/bps-code-human-research-ethics-2nd-edition-2014.

Burck, C. (2005). *Multilingual Living: Explorations of Language and Subjectivity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Busch, B. (2012). The linguistic repertoire revisited. *Applied Linguistics*, *33*(5), 503-523.

Catalano, T. (2016). *Talking About Global Migration: Implications for Language Teaching*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage.

Costa, B. & Briggs, S. (2014). Service-users' experiences of interpreters in psychological therapy: A pilot study. *International Journal of Migration, Health and Social Care*, *10*, 231-244.

Dausendschön-Gay, U. (2003). Communication exolingue et interlangue. *Linx. Revue des linguistes de l'université Paris X Nanterre*, *49*, 41-50.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2018). Why the dichotomy 'L1 Versus LX User' is better than 'Native Versus Non-native Speaker'. *Applied Linguistics, 39* (2), 236-240.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2013). *Emotions in Multiple Languages* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dickson-Swift, V., James, E. L., Kippen, S., & Liamputtong, P. (2009). Researching sensitive topics: Qualitative research as emotion work. *Qualitative research*, *9*(1), 61-79.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fawcett, J. (Ed). (2003). *Stress and trauma handbook: Strategies for flourishing in demanding environments*. Monrovia, CA: World Vision International.

Fielding, N. & Thomas, H. (2008). Qualitative interviewing. In N. Gilbert (Ed). *Researching social life* (3rd ed., pp. 245-265). London: Sage.

Georgiadou, L. (2016). "You look like them": Drawing on counselling theory and practice to reflexively negotiate cultural difference in research relationships. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 38, 358-368.

Gibson, B. & Zhu Hua (2016). Interviews. In Zhu Hua (Ed.), *Research Methods in Intercultural Communication: A Practical Guide* (pp. 181-195). London: Wiley.

Gordon, D. (2011). Trauma and Second Language Learning among Laotian Refugees. *Journal of Southeast Asian American Education and Advancement, 6*(1), Article 13. DOI: 10.7771/2153-8999.1029

Halai, N. (2007). Making use of bilingual interview data: Some experiences from the field. *The Qualitative Report*, *12*(3), 344-355.

Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Rapson, R. L. (1994). *Emotional contagion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hay-Gibson, N. (2009). Interviews via VoIP: Benefits and Disadvantages within a PhD study of SMEs. *Library and Information Research*, *33*(105), 1756-1086.

Hoffman, E. (1989). *Lost in Translation: A life in a New Language.* New York: Penguin Books.

Hollway, W. (2016). Emotional experience plus reflection: countertransference and reflexivity in research. *The Psychotherapist*, *62*, 19-21.

Holmes, P., Fay, R., Andrews, J., and Attia, M. (2013). Researching multilingually: new theoretical and methodological directions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 285-299.

Holmes, P., Fay, R., Andrews, J., & Attia, M. (2016). How to research multilingually: Possibilities and complexities. In Zhu Hua (Ed.), *Research Methods in Intercultural Communication* (pp. 88-102). London: Wiley.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G.H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation* (pp. 13-23). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Koven, M. (2007). *Selves in Two Languages: Bilinguals verbal enactments of identity in French and Portuguese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kvale, S. (2007). *Qualitative Research Kit: Doing Interviews*. London: Sage.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Madoc-Jones, I., & Parry, O. (2012). Small languages and small language communities: Damned if you do and damned if you don't: language choice in the research interview. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *215*, 165-182.

Mann, S. (2011). A critical review of qualitative interviews. *Applied Linguistics, 32*(1), 6-24.

Merriam, S. B., Johnson-Bailey, J., Lee, M. Y., Kee, Y., Ntseane, G., & Muhamad, M. (2001). Power and positionality: Negotiating insider/outsider status within and across cultures. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *20*(5), 405-416.

Narayan, K. (1993) How native is a "native" anthropologist? *American Anthropologist*, *95*, 671-686.

Oakley, A. (2013). Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. In H. Roberts (Ed.), *Doing feminist research* (pp. 52-83). London: Routledge.

O'Connor, H., Madge, C., Shaw, R., & Wellens, J. (2008). Internet-based interviewing. In N. Fielding, R. M. Lee & G. Blank (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of online research methods* (pp. 271-289). London: Sage.

Pavlenko, A. (2005). *Emotions and Multilingualism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics, 28*(2), 163-188.

Phipps, A. (2013). Intercultural ethics: Questions of methods in language and intercultural communication. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *13*(1), 10-26.

Polkinghorne, D.E. (2005). Language and Meaning: Data Collection in Qualitative Research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52(2),* 137-145.

Potts, K., & Brown, L.A. (2005). Becoming an anti-oppressive researcher. In L. A. Brown & S. Strega (Eds.), *Research as Resistance: Critical, Indigenous and Anti-oppressive Approaches* (pp. 255-286). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Prior, M. (2016). *Emotion and Discourse in L2 Narrative Research.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Prior, M. (2017a). Accomplishing "rapport" in qualitative research interviews: Empathic moments in interaction. Special Issue: *The social life of methods,* Guest Editors: G. Kasper & S. J. Ross. *Applied Linguistics Review, 9*(4), 487-511.

Prior, M. (2017b). Researcher dilemmas in narrative interview data and analysis. In J. McKinley & H. Rose, H. (Eds.), *Doing Research in Applied Linguistics: Realities, Dilemmas, and Solutions* (pp. 172-181). London: Routledge.

Resnik, P. (2018). *Multilinguals' Verbalisation and Perception of Emotions.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Rolland, L. (2019). *Multilingual selves in psychotherapy: a mixed methods study of multilingual clients' experiences in relation to language practices* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Birkbeck, University of London, London, UK.

Ryde, J. (2009) *White Identity in Psychotherapy: Can dialogic, intersubjective psychotherapy help white people work more effectively in a racialized context?* Marianne Fry lecture, Bristol.

Samata, S. (2014). *The Cultural Memory of Language.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Schmid, M. S. (2002). *First language attrition, use and maintenance: The case of German Jews in Anglophone countries*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Schmid, M. S., & Köpke, B. (Eds.) (2013). *First language attrition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Smith, L. T. (2013). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Temple, B., & Edwards, R. (2002). Interpreters/translators and cross-language research: Reflexivity and border crossings. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *1*(2), 1-12.

Interview guide (Rolland, 2019):

- **What was it about the study that caught your attention?**
- **Can you tell me about your language history?** What are the main languages you speak? How did you learn them?
- **Who do you mainly speak these languages with?** Do you sometimes switch between languages within a conversation?
- **How do you feel when you speak your different languages?** Do you feel different? Do others comment that you seem different? (formal/informal, emotional/rational, sociable…) Which language(s) do you tend to use to express your feelings?
- **What drove language choices in relation to your recent psychotherapy?** Was language/code-switching a consideration when you were choosing/being referred to a therapist?
- **Which language(s) did you use in your therapy sessions?** Did you ever switch languages (even just for a word or expression)?
- **How did that pattern develop?** Did you discuss language(s) at the start of therapy? Did you switch spontaneously? Did you ever consider using the language that felt most natural at the time and then translating for the therapist?
- **(If applicable) Can you tell me about a situation where you switched languages?** (Did it depend on the topic or person you were discussing… how you were feeling… not finding the right word in the other language… needing to remember?)
- **(If applicable) How did the therapist respond to your language switches?** Was there anything about the therapist which made you feel that you could/couldn't switch? Did the therapist use one or more languages? (Which languages did the therapist know?)
- **How did it feel to tell your story to the therapist in this/these language(s)?**
- **Did you feel the therapist empathised with you?** Do you think language played a role in this? (Did you feel understood?)

- **If anything changed for you as a result of therapy, what role do you think language played?** Did the issue of language(s) ever cross your mind during therapy?
- **Have you had any other therapists?** If yes, did you use the same language(s) with them? Did therapy feel different? (More or less good relationship / therapeutic empathy?) Overall, what language practices worked best for you?
- **If you were choosing a therapist in future, what would your thinking process be around language?**
- **Is there anything you would like to add on this topic?**