Being person-centred in qualitative interviews: reflections on a process
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Abstract

**Background:** In this article we reflect on the first author’s (Berit Margrethe BM) experience of conducting seven qualitative research interviews with public health nurses trained in parenting guidance by International Child Development Program (ICDP) at the University of South East Norway. The interviews focused on how the public health nurses use a particular set of competencies in their daily work at the health center. A person-centred practice framework was used to reflect on whether person-centred prerequisites and person-centred processes could be recognised in the completed interview processes, and how a greater focus on a person-centered approach could improve the quality of data collection. It is the results of this reflection that is presented in this paper.

**Aims:** Understand how a researcher can use person-centred principles to facilitate qualitative interviews.

**Findings:** Being reflexive is essential to a person-centred approach in qualitative research interviews. It is about the researcher’s ability to facilitate an engagement that promotes authenticity, self-determination and reciprocity. Knowing oneself without letting conscious and unconscious values and perceptions overshadow the potential opportunities that arise in gaining an understanding of the informant's values and perceptions is essential. Through being vigilant in all senses, a holistic mutually respectful dialogue can be created, through which new knowledge and understandings are generated.

**Conclusion:** Considering person-centredness in the planning and undertaking of research methods is important. Whilst there is an increasing evidence base about person-centredness in health and social care practice, there continues to be a dearth of publications that focus on person-centredness in research methods.

**Implications for Practice:**
- Developing the ability to facilitate mutually respectful dialogue in research interviews is important in researcher development programmes.
- Facilitating flow and creativity through engaging all senses in the dialogical situation has the potential to create a more person-centred approach to interview practices.
- Being open to and aware of the lifeworlds of others, and the ability to adjust own preunderstanding facilitate an engagement that promotes authenticity, self-determination and reciprocity.
- There is a need for more studies to explicitly use person-centred principles and practices in the conduct of research. This article provides a a reflexive framework for doing that and some principles that can be applied in future research studies.
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**Introduction**
In Norway, national guidelines for health service to children emphasise the importance of good interaction between parents and children, underpinned by parental guidance in order to promote effective parent–child interactions. The quality of this interaction is significant for the child’s health and further development. The task of the public health nurse in this context is to guide parents to health-promoting care for the child, and to identify when care is not good enough (Helsedirektoratet, 2017). The quality of the relationship between the public health nurse and parents is crucial in achieving successful guidance. The quality of this guidance is determined by the public health nurse’s ability to interact with the parents, and thus her ability to provide person-centred care (Sollesnes, 2013).

The public health nurse’s guiding skills are underpinned by the International Child Development Program (ICDP) (Hundeide, 2007). This is an education programme that helps to improve interaction with children and others by developing awareness of their own approach and way of being, how it affects the other, and sensitivity to the other’s initiative and needs. To study how public health nurses with ICDP competence guide parents at the public health center, Berit Margrethe (BM) conducted qualitative research interviews with seven public health nurses. The interviews were informed by principles of phenomenology and hermeneutics (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009).

Although the frameworks and prerequisites for person-centred research are complex, context-sensitive and operate at different levels (McCormack et al., 2017), in this article our reflections are focused on the interview situation. The reflection focuses on identification of signs of person-centered principles and approaches in the interview process and how BM as a researcher focusing on developing person-centered knowledge and skill engaged in these processes. The aim of the reflections is to understand how a researcher can explicitly use person-centred principles to facilitate qualitative interviews.

**Overview of the Qualitative study used as the basis for reflection**

The qualitative research reflected on in this article was informed by Husserl’s phenomenology of perception of human life as it is experienced by individuals, and the interpretation of texts through the lens of hermeneutics (Thornquist, 2003; Malterud, 2011). In phenomenology the subjective experience of phenomena is emphasised. It assumes that, with the help of experience and knowledge, we draw conclusions about what we witness that go beyond what can be registered in the situation. It is the individual's subjective experience of the world that is perceived, and not the world as it actually is. Husserl calls our holistic perception of the world, the world as it manifests and is recognised by the individual subject, when consciousness is directed towards something, and it is intentional (Thornquist, 2003). Therefore, in the context of a research interview, its focus is on understanding someone's personal experience based on professional and personal knowledge, abilities and expertise.

The intention of the interviews was, through a mutual dialogue with the participants, to gain an understanding of their experience of their actions, striving to explore meaning, develop new knowledge and understanding in collaboration with them. In addition BM sought to help the participants to put words on silent or taken for granted knowledge (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009). It is also important to gain access to the authentic experience and story, because sometimes we tell what we think others will hear, sometimes we hope the other will understand more than the words. “Behind the story I tell is the one I don’t. Behind the story you hear is the one I wish I could make you hear” (Allison, 1996, p 39). The intention was to facilitate an equal situation, with respect and recognition for the public health nurses’ and BM’s values, self-determination, knowledge, actions and perceptions of reality, whilst being open to new perspectives and the development of new insights through dialogue. A secondary intention was for the public health nurses to have a positive experience and
outcome of the conversations and feel more empowered, satisfied and conscious of their ability to
 guide parents to better interact with children.

In order for the public health nurses to express their perceptions authentically, emphasis was placed
on creating a conducive atmosphere that included a non-evaluative attitude, approaching
participants’ reflexivity and acknowledging their experiences and thoughts as real for them (Schibbye,
2002). This can be a challenge and it is acknowledged that in a research interview there will be an
asymmetrical relationship between researcher and informant, when the researcher sets the agenda
and is responsible for leading the interview (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009). An unstructured interview
was planned and the questions were adapted as the interview progressed to facilitate an informal
dialogue (Johannessen et al., 2004).

**Acting as a person-centred researcher: prerequisites**

In the definition of person-centeredness by McCormack and McCance (2017), emphasis is placed on
the importance of healthful relationships that are based on mutual respect and understanding
between all significant persons:

> ... an approach to practice established through the formation and fostering of healthful
  relationships between all care providers, service users and others significant to them in their
  lives. It is underpinned by values of respect for persons (personhood), individual right to self-
  determination, mutual respect and understanding. It is enabled by cultures of empowerment
  that foster continuous approaches to practice development (McCormack and McCance, 2017,
  p 3)

Underpinning the person-centered approach are values of respect for persons and personhood as well
as individual right to self-determination, that is realised through mutual and reciprocal interaction in
the relationship between persons. A variety of contextual factors can affect the person-centered
process; the overall macro context, the quality of the care environment, the organisational systems,
physical environment, individual prerequisites and characteristics (McCormack and McCance, 2017).
A culture of respect, equality, empowerment and ability to develop as a person, promote the
possibilities of engaging in a person-centred relationship.

The prerequisites for a person-centred approach to care delivery also apply to person-centeredness
in research. McCormack and McCance (2017) identify 5 prerequisites for person-centred practice:
being professionally competent, having developed interpersonal skills, being committed to the job,
being clear about one’s own beliefs and values, and knowing self. These prerequisites apply to the
practice of research and are reflected in what (Titchen et al., 2017) identify as a researcher’s ability to
cooperate (developed interpersonal skills), ability to create an equal relationship (clarity of beliefs and
values), and ability to be aware and conscious of own ‘understanding horizon’ (knowing self), both as
limitations and opportunities in the quest for new knowledge and understanding. Person-centredness
is expressed through reciprocity, mutuality and presence in relationships that facilitate and motivate
self-determination and development of new insights. The optimal relationship is that of an interaction
between two equal persons, where all senses are active in the dialogue without being limited by
conscious thoughts and where both persons communicate on multiple levels. In the ideal dialogue
situation, both persons have received new understandings and insights into their values and need for
action in their world (Rogers, 1955).

So how can the researcher interact with research participants in such a way in the interview situation?
BM’s understanding is characterised by theory that supports person-centeredness (McCormack and
McCance, 2017) woven and braided into her previous understandings of qualitative methodologies
and methods. This will be the starting point for reflecting on how she prepared for and carried out the
qualitative research interviews.
According to Dewing et al., (2017) we need to adapt a respectful approach to the individual; there is no standard recipe that suits everyone. Referring to Søren Kierkegaard’s well-known postulate, in order to help someone else, first he (sic) must find where the other is in his life. In addition to finding the person in his life and context, one must also strive to understand the person as a unique person (Mead and Bower, 2000). A healthcare practitioner must develop his/her skills in understanding their values, and develop skills in guiding in a way that facilitates the self-determination of others in decision-making processes (McCormack et al., 2017). Experience of self-determination can be decisive for the development of one’s full potential and human flourishing (McCormack and Titchen, 2014). In the interview situation, self-determination can be realised by ‘shared wonderment’ rather than question and answer turn taking that can often interfere with the process the participants are in when searching for words that can cloud the experience they are trying to talk about. Linguistic symbols cover only a small part of the experience (Rønsholdt et al., 2013). As Rogers (1955) points out, the optimal subjective dialogue takes place through all the senses.

Reflections on the interview process
Our reflections on the qualitative research interview experience identify three key considerations for being person-centred in this context: 1) engaging holistically; 2) reflexivity; 3) self and other.

Engaging Holistically
Rogers (1955) points out that the optimal subjective dialogue takes place through all the senses. There is a need for the researcher to be alert to communicating holistically. Through awareness and genuine interest in the lifeworld of participants, the interview process itself can contribute to the development of autonomous functioning (Deci and Ryan, 2008). This way of acting links with the principles of connectivity, as a key principle in person-centred research, or as van Dulmen et al. (2017) suggest, the difference between research ‘with’ rather than ‘about’. Connectivity means the connection to oneself, to the other persons, and to the context (Jacobs et al., 2017) and is consistent with the prerequisite of ‘developed interpersonal skills’ of McCormack and McCance (2017). According to Jacobs et al. (2017) there are two related pairs of principles, which they name attentiveness and dialogue, empowerment and participation. A third principle has been added, critical reflexivity, a useful principle when looking back to consider how the principles of attentiveness and dialogue, and empowerment and participation have been expressed in the pursuit of maintaining the principle of connectivity (Jacobs et al., 2017). Traces of this principle is illustrated in the following interview extract:

Public Health Nurse (P): .... I give praise ... I praise very much ...
BM: To the child ...?
P: Yes, to the child yes ... but also to the parents ... so I feel so ... I have a lot of focus on what they are mastering ... and what I see is good, because then I feel that they are becoming much more receptive ... they open more ...
BM: What do you think makes them more receptive?
P: Well, I think that when I show positive feelings towards the child who is the most lovable they have ... and in a way can put it to the parents ... they become very proud ... I think they feel that I see the children ...

In this extract, BM, through her developed interpersonal skills shows holistic engagement with the Public Health Nurse to help her understand the importance of her holistic engagement with the child and parents. The self-knowing that this generates contributes to adding a rich understanding of what holistic engagement means in different contexts/situations and as a consequence, increased self understanding.
Reflexivity
There is no shortcut to linking critical reflexivity to critical self-reflexity in the interview situation and in the interpretation of the data material. Self-reflexivity (or knowing self) is the ability to observe oneself ‘from outside’ in contact with the participant, and is important for how we refine ourselves in contact with the other. It makes explicit the need for active self-work between persons with different experiences (Rønsholdt et al., 2013). The quality of the connectivity depends on the ability of the researcher to pay attention to all signals from thoughts, feelings and actions as well as words. Words alone are insufficient when experiences are to be described (Rønsholdt et al., 2013). The researcher has to use her/himself as an instrument in the interview dialogue (Xu and Storr, 2012). The dialogue is characterised by the ability of the researcher to achieve connectivity, a relationship characterised by insight and understanding and attachment with self, understanding and compassion for the informant’s intentions, statements, experience of the situation, and reflection on one’s own approach to the subject and the person. All of this represents both the researcher’s unique context and the common context of the situation (Jacobs et al., 2017). The idea of the ‘researcher-as-instrument’ in person-centered research provides an important opportunity for understanding and interpreting data with a backdrop of unique composition of knowledge, experiences, attitudes and personality by being a person in relation to the other unique person (Pezalla et al., 2012). The researcher as instrument is illustrated in the following interview extract:

BM: Mmm ... you said you also gave praise to the parents ... because they matter ... how does the parent respond to it?
P: Well, they become very ... I think very many do not get so much praise ... and they like it ... I really only experience that they open up more and seem to feel more happy and proud ... I’m always looking for something that’s good ...
BM: That’s so good ... see, I have focused on ‘the good’ too ... he he ...
P: It’s almost always, right ... something good

Reflexivity is critical to the research process if person-centred principles and processes are to be worked with in research. These principles in particular are never prescribed, but instead need to be given the space to ‘surface’ in the moment as practices such as 1:1 interviews progress. Reflexivity enables the development of greater expertise (person-centred competence), knowing self and the development of connectivity.

Self and Other
Alvesson and Sköldberg (2008) suggest (drawing on a musical instrument metaphor) that the researcher must play on all strings to get the most out of the situation, and in doing so reflexively, creates a balanced and harmonious interplay between himself, the other and the situation. One-step towards developing one’s own person-centred research ability is to expand insight into ‘who I am’ in meeting with the other and further develop sensitivity for the other person’s holistic expressions. This reflection requires seamless change between sensitivity and interpretation of the informant’s verbal and non-verbal contributions, as well as the response back to the informant. To achieve a constructive interaction in the dialogue, researchers need the knowledge and experience to be able to adjust their action repertoire, just as jazz musicians improvise their music as they adjust to each other (Schön, 2001). This flexible use of internalised knowledge through reflection-in-action contributes to both knowledge and skill expansion as well as the development of new understandings, built up in collaboration. Alvesson and Skölberg (2008) emphasise the necessity for breadth in the interpretation repertoire, in order for reflection and thus the construction of new knowledge to be possible. They also draw attention to the fact that in the interview process there is already a primary interpretation necessary to keep track of all the information that will appear in relevant data (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2008). Thus, as we see it, the primary interpretation has something of the same purpose
as Schön conveys with his jazz orchestra metaphor. Traces of this principle are illustrated in the following interview extract:

P: ... and that’s how it seems to the kids ... So then they have the idea of using the two extra minutes to prepare ... Because it loosens them up a bit ... better prepared ... That’s part of the development, and then we just have to ... that’s our task ...

BM: What you do seems to be that you really help the parents to take the child’s perspective then ...

P: Mmm ... I try ...

BM: And to know their own reaction then in such situations, it helps to see how it is for the child ... and it’s very good ...

In the reflection below, BM draws on her experience of cross-country skiing to illustrate how these three issues emerging from our reflection became embodied in her knowing:

On my skiing trip today, I realised that new insights appeared from the depths of myself. Insights that I gained access to because I did not look for it. It just flowed from some layer of sensory impression. It was a real person-centered approach to myself, or? I first thought that the insight came without words, but it was more than words. I realise that I had a verbal and nonverbal inner dialogue with myself, with my authentic self, while the body's motor functions led me automatically forward in the ski track, pleased with its function, I addressed my appreciation to the fresh cold air, the beautiful sparkling snow, the footprints of a hare close by and the amazing mountain formations in the distance while the inner dialogue went automatically and I experienced a satisfaction and eagerness and motivation for it to continue. Andersen and Hanssen (2012, p 37) claim in their book on Flow in everyday life that it is about ‘both having control and letting go’. When I perform an activity that the body has incorporated as part of its action repetition, it can perform the activity while focusing on something else. Creativity is released when the right hemisphere is activated (Spurkeland, 2012). In my case, attention was directed to the experience of inner and outer nature and towards the inner dialogue - a kind of movement between flow and mindfulness (Anderson and Hanssen, 2012). You want me to tell what the new insight was, but I cannot. I have repeatedly tried to retrieve dreams I have had and experience, but each time it is impossible to find the words to express the memories of the dream. But meet me in the mountains after a wordless walk with an attentive presence to nature outside and within our bodies; as we sit down and focus attention on the beautiful surroundings, I will tell you with fumbling words while our communication takes place between cells and neurons we are out of control. Perhaps I can convey my newly acquired insight and you understand, in a present moment of mutuality.

We believe it is possible to transfer the same state of openness and unconscious vigilance to the interview situation in a qualitative study. Experiencing flow between two worlds, back and forth in a dialectic dance, leaves the subconscious mind to combine the expressions of the two worlds into new insights, and according to Rogers, develops a preliminary and subjective truth and understanding (Rogers, 1955). Csikszentmihalyi (2004) advocated the importance of flow. He believed that it is possible to facilitate a state of flow by, inter alia, providing the opportunity to experience coping in safe situations and in environments that promote creative thinking, sense communication and space for unfinished thoughts (Csikszentmihalyi, 2004; Andersen and Hanssen, 2012). To speed up creativity and openness, the facilitation of spontaneity can be liberating, because when we forget ourselves, we show who we are (Sandvik, 2007). It is possible that the person-centered approach leads to the researcher's subjective understanding of the phenomenon and, to a lesser extent, to the knowledge of the informants understanding, because perhaps the researcher's less relevant and unwanted unconscious experiences may affect the dialogue in the interview situation (McCance and McCormack, 2017). When a researcher uses his/her entire sensory device in the relationship with the participant, control is lost over the unconscious bodily experiences that govern the encounter.
(Aakvaag, 2008). Perhaps that is precisely the source of developing new insights, i.e. letting go of control. Although the researcher and participant work together in an equal dialogue to find new knowledge and insight, this ‘new’ will be different for both stakeholders because they will always be separate persons. But by being person-centered, both contribute to each other’s development and knowledge through a holistic exchange of empathy and understanding – or as McCormack and McCance (2017) suggest, it creates a healthful culture within which there is increased self-knowing and mutually developed relationships.

Conclusion
In this article, we have explored the qualitative research interview as a person-centred experience. Reflecting on the experience of undertaking interviews with public health nurses trained in an ICDP parental guidance programme, we have identified three key considerations in the interview process - engaging holistically, reflexivity; and self & other. These issues are not mutually exclusive and indeed, taken as a whole they provide a holistic approach to the interview process that is person-centred. Overall, we believe that the researcher’s ability to guide themselves and the participant in an engagement that promotes authenticity, self-determination and reciprocity, through the use of all the senses, has the potential to develop shared understanding and new knowledge through holistic and mutually respectful dialogue. Using the person-centred practice framework of McCormack and McCance (2017) has helped us to dialogue the interview process and generate new understandings about how person-centred approaches to research can be generated. We contend that reflexive engagement and critically reflexive dialogue is central to this process and is a powerful approach to generation of new knowledge about person-centred research.

References

Berit Margrethe Sandvik (XXX), Assistant Professor, University College of South East-Norway, Faculty of Health and Social Science, Department of Nursing and Health Sciences, Porsgrunn, Norway.
Brendan McCormack (D.Phil Oxon, BSc Hons, FRCN, FEANS, FRCSI, PGCEA, RMN, RGN), Head of the Divisions of Nursing, Occupational Therapy and Arts Therapies; Head of the Graduate School; Associate Director, Centre for Person-centred Practice Research, Queen Margaret University,
Edinburgh. Professor II, University College of South East Norway, Drammen, Norway; Extraordinary Professor, Department of Nursing, University of Pretoria, South Africa; Professor of Nursing, Maribor University, Slovenia; Visiting Professor, Ulster University.