

Using a narrative approach of double-listening in research contexts

Jay Marlowe

Jay Marlowe is a lecturer within the School of Counselling, Human Services and Social Work at the University of Auckland. Email: jm.marlowe@auckland.ac.nz; phone: +64 9 623 8899 ext 48248.

This paper introduces the process of using the narrative principles of double-listening and double-storied testimony as an approach to conducting research with Sudanese men who have resettled in Australia. It highlights the value of documenting not only the trauma story but also a person's response to it. While double-listening has been used in professional practice and community engagements, this approach also offers a valuable insight into how research can be conducted in respectful and resonant ways that create safer spaces to engage people's lived experiences.

Keywords: refugee, double-listening, narrative, trauma, research

INTRODUCTION

'A prerequisite for the regeneration of war-affected societies is rejection of their pathologisation.' (Pupavac, 2002, p. 507)

This paper introduces the process of using the narrative principles of double-listening (White, 2004) and double-storied testimony (Denborough, 2006) as an approach to conducting research with Sudanese men who have resettled in Australia. The study endeavours to critically engage with these participants' lived experience in relation to forced migration and resettlement by not only documenting the effects of trauma but, importantly, how people *respond* to traumatic events. The research question was informed through social work practice, and a major catalyst occurred when working with a Sudanese man who spoke of his experience in gaining refugee status, securing a humanitarian visa, and accessing support services here in Australia. He summarised these encounters by stating, 'I had to prove that I was damaged goods'. While there is little argument that refugees often experience very difficult and traumatic events related to forced migration, the psychological sequelae and people's associated trajectories are poorly understood. Though many people from this emerging community had experienced difficulties and trauma associated with forced migration, 'damaged goods' did not seem an apt or just descriptor of them.

Australia grants 12,000 to 13,000 humanitarian entrants protection to its shores annually (Department of Immigration and Citizenship, 2009). According to the most recent UNHCR reports (2006, 2007, 2008), Australia has had the second- or third-highest rates for refugee resettlement in the last several years (these statistics do not include asylum seekers). Since 1996, more than 24,000 Sudanese refugees have immigrated to Australia via the humanitarian program visa scheme (Department of Immigration and Citizenship, 2007). The Australian Census 2006 shows that the Sudanese population has grown by more than 287% since the 2001 count and identifies this group as the country's fastest growing ethnic community (Department of Immigration and Citizenship, n.d.). Many of these

recent Australian arrivals have come from Southern Sudan as a direct consequence of Sudan's civil wars, and have often survived highly dangerous experiences that include displacement, multiple forms of violence, and living in refugee camps for numerous years (see Duffield, 2003; Johnson, 2003; Jok, 2001; Rogier, 2005; Ruiz, 1998).

There are now numerous autobiographical and fictionalised accounts of people's experiences of living through the civil war in South Sudan (Bixler, 2005; Deng, Deng, Ajak, & Bernstein, 2005; Dul Dau, 2007; Eggers, 2006; Hecht, 2005; Walzer, 2009). Many of these stories refer to the 'Lost Boys' which relates back to J.M. Barrie's fictional tale, *Peter Pan*. This label has been used to characterise a group of boys who were displaced by war and separated from their parents as they walked across vast deserts and survived dangerous conflict settings to seek relative safe haven in neighbouring countries (Jeppsson & Hjern, 2005). This refugee journey and the sensationalised descriptor of 'Lost Boys' are often what captivates the attention of the reader and what largely places their story within the sympathies and compassions of other people's hearts and minds (see Marlowe, 2010). While there is a value in knowing about these experiences, there is also a potential danger that people and their histories can be predominantly encompassed within traumatic events accompanied by political violence and conflict. There have been several recent contemporary critiques of this predominant focus (even fascination) with Sudanese resettlement and war trauma (Khawaja, White, Schweitzer, & Greenslade, 2008; Marlowe, 2009b; Tempany, 2009; Westoby, 2009; Westoby & Ingamells, 2009). However, it is critical to acknowledge that those who experience trauma from forced migration do not necessarily represent traumatised people or communities. This important distinction is unfortunately a perspective often neglected in numerous media presentations (see Gale, 2004; Klocker & Dunn, 2003; Robins, 2003; Windle, 2008) and at times, the academic literature (Bracken, Giller, & Summerfield, 1995; Ingleby, 2005; Miller, Kulkarni, & Kushner, 2006; Pupavac, 2001, 2008; Summerfield, 1999, 2001).

In this article, it will be asserted that the narrative approach of double-listening provides a

framework to enquire into the effects of trauma while also documenting how the Sudanese male participants respond to them. It further discusses the value of double-storied testimony in garnering rich descriptions and sophisticated insights within research contexts in resonant and respectful ways.

DOUBLE-STORIED INITIATIVES

A narrative perspective assumes that a person's life can be viewed as multi-storied (White & Epston, 1990). Expressed more simply, there are many stories that a person can tell about one's life. The principle behind double-listening is that it opens spaces for the telling of both the trauma story and the response to trauma. This form of enquiry does not necessarily privilege the negative effects of trauma but, rather, approaches a person's story and history as an opportunity to explore multiple paths. From this perspective, it is possible to trace further within a person's response(s) to trauma the transformative initiatives, special skills, and values and beliefs that have strengthened their forms of resilience and resistance to traumatic experiences (Denborough, 2006). White (2006b) notes that double-listening can help practitioners go beyond thin description of trauma's effects and hear other important considerations of a person's life including their responses to trauma. These responses inform what White (2006a) refers to as 'the other half of the story'. Double-listening thus provides space to validate and dignify the trauma experience while also creating opportunities to uncover and illuminate the skills and knowledges embedded within the responses that individuals and their associated community have enacted.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND DOUBLE-STORIED TESTIMONY

The research design involved conducting semi-structured interviews with Sudanese men. These interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed, and consisted of two parts: (1) receiving and documenting the person's interview with a focus on double-listening, and (2) after transcription, meeting with the individual again to ensure that all information was recorded accurately, allowing for any changes that the participant thought necessary.

Once the interview was transcribed, the participant was given a written copy that included a two-page summary of what the author thought were the main themes of the interview. This summary was an overview of three distinct interview sections (discussed below) and provided an opportunity to acknowledge a person's agency, values, and aspirations in a way that was also validating of their experiences. In subsequent meetings (ranging from one to six additional interviews), the participant could make any omissions, changes, or additions to the interview transcript and summary as he saw fit. The amended transcript was then imported into the qualitative software package NVivo 8 to help sort, manage, and code the data. Analysis was carried out through a process of initial and focused coding, writing memos, theoretical sampling and using the constant comparative method as per constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006). In total, 70 interviews with 24 participants were conducted.

The interviews were conducted with a focus on double-listening or double-storied testimony where keeping both the trauma story and a person's response to it in mind was central to the interviewing process. The interview questions were initially informed by Denborough (2006) and were modified after consultations with community leaders, elders, and respected clergy within Adelaide, so that the interview format was more likely to resonate with the Sudanese participants. This group of respected leaders emphasised active engagement with their community and offered the opportunity to make public announcements at church and other community events. These people were viewed as cultural consultants with expert knowledges about the Sudanese community that went beyond textbook and academic understandings. In particular, they emphasised the importance of my visibility within the community. This included recommendations to attend church on Sundays and make public announcements about the research *and* my personal background at community events that I was invited. They spoke of the importance of not only talking about, and enquiring into, the past, but also to ascertain these people's experiences of resettlement and current vision. Remaining a passive bystander was not a viable option, as the community demanded a two-way

interaction. Numerous participants and elders asked my opinion about negative political and media-based commentaries on their community. They wanted to know my perspective on the two civil wars between North and South Sudan. Thus, my role within this community was an active one where I was expected to both participate and listen before conducting any interviews (see Marlowe, 2009a for an account of engaging the Sudanese community and the importance of incorporating reciprocity in the research process).

While documenting a participant's experiences and expressions related to trauma, the interview also sought the person's responses to these situations. These responses could be informed through how participants maintained hope, memories they held onto, cultural or religious teachings, and the influential people in their lives. When establishing a person's response to trauma, care had to be taken not to diminish the actual experience of trauma events (i.e., because a person has been able to respond to a trauma, this in no way diminishes the magnitude of what happened). A few participants emphasised that there are some experiences that are very hard to recover from. They spoke of concepts such as 'having a hangover from war' which illustrates the suffering and injustices of Sudan's protracted conflicts, life in countries of first asylum, and difficulties in resettlement contexts.

The interview process was broken into three distinct (but not linear) sections as discussed by Denborough (2006, p. 123):

1. Setting the scene as to why the participant had chosen to share his story.
2. Documenting the effects of trauma in the participant's and/or community's life.
3. Participant responses to trauma.

Examples of questions within each section are discussed below and further illustrate the interview process. Following the overall intent of this framework and recognising the complexity of engaging with the participant's stories/histories, it is necessary to note that these questions were not asked in a rigid or sequential order. Denborough (2006, pp. 123–125) provides a more complete list of examples of questions that can be asked, and highlights the importance of modifying questions

through community consultation to ensure that these are more likely to have relevance with participants. This framework is also very clear about the dangers of re-traumatisation. Some questions were not asked of all participants to better ensure their wellbeing and particularly to reduce this risk. The flexibility built into this interview framework allowed for the development of questions that were acknowledging of participants' experiences and interests. Participants could choose to stop the interview at any time, take a break, and decline to answer any questions (see Denborough, 2006, p. 131 for a list of examples of the multiple settings in which double-storied testimony has been used).

SECTION ONE: SETTING THE SCENE

Every audio-recorded interview started formally by thanking the person for participating in the study and this was followed with a question as to why they had decided to share their story. From this enquiry, it was possible to ascertain something that was important to this person and to trace the history of these values. For example, if a participant stated that they were sharing their story due to concerns they had about how the Sudanese community was portrayed in Adelaide, it was then possible to enquire further about what they valued in their community, who had informed these values, and why these were important to them. Examples of questions asked included:

- Why have you decided to share your story with me today?
- What does your reason for deciding to tell your story say about what is important to you? Has anyone informed these reasons?
- Would people be surprised that you have chosen to share your story today? Why?

These questions helped to ease into the interview and demonstrated an interest beyond detailing a trauma-dominated account of forced migration (something that most participants said that they had provided before on multiple occasions). Through richly characterising a participant's values, background, history, skills, and beliefs, the interview not only documented the experiences of trauma but also highlighted people's agency to respond to it.

SECTION TWO: DOCUMENTING THE IMPACT OF TRAUMA

The second part of the interview framework attempted to document the impacts of trauma in the participant's life from either forced migration or resettlement contexts. After the initial purposes for participation had been established, general questions regarding their migration trauma were asked with a strong emphasis placed on participant safety (Blackburn, 2005). This emphasis was restated in the interview process and made very clear on multiple occasions before participant consent was obtained. Examples of questions asked included:

- Did you or your community experience any difficulties in your journey leaving Sudan and making your way to Australia?
- Is there anything that you would feel comfortable to tell me about the trauma or difficult experiences from forced migration that you were subject to?
- What were the effects of these forms of trauma on your community?

While this section had a focus on documenting the impact of trauma, the awareness to listen for responses was important. For example, if a person decided to share a particularly difficult experience or situation, it was possible to ask follow-up questions that focussed upon what sustained them through such experiences, what were the pathways to healing, or how they had reclaimed their lives from such difficult situations. Often, participants would offer to speak about experiences relating to trauma after establishing preferred values and understandings of themselves as evidenced through their culture, parent teachings, spirituality, and commitment to community among numerous others. While documenting the impact of trauma is a focus of the second section of Denborough's (2006) framework, in this research, participants would often not elaborate in detail about the impact of trauma until their responses to this trauma had been significantly discussed and expanded.

As participants offered to speak about their experiences of leaving Sudan and coming to Australia, it was important to establish what had been or what was of greatest concern to them.

To differentiate the multiple expressions of trauma and to find what the men found most salient in their experience, they were asked to identify if they thought there were any particularly difficult or ongoing effects arising from their traumatic experiences. As these questions were fairly confronting and could highlight a person's sense of vulnerability and/or lack of agency, they were not 'pushed' on participants. There were a few interviews in which I reframed these questions in a less direct form, such as: 'What do you think are some of the most difficult effects that your community has undergone related to the experiences of forced migration and resettlement?' This framing of the question on a broader community level was used early in the research process after ongoing consultation with elders. Because most men chose to participate in the study in order to address community-based issues and how Sudanese people were portrayed in the broader public domain, this question was highly resonant with their interests and concerns. After participants spoke about their community, they would often volunteer to speak about the most difficult effects in their own lives.

While keeping a focus on double-listening, it is important to emphasise that the intent of this approach is not to privilege a person's responses to trauma over the experiences of trauma. This distinction is important, as there is a danger of invalidating a person's particular experience if there is an exclusive focus on either responses or difficult events. There were times in the interviews where providing space to discuss particularly difficult situations helped to dignify very real and profound experiences of suffering. This narrative approach thereby gives attention and honours both people's *experiences of* and *responses to* trauma, as all stories are potential sites for meaning-making.

The inclusion of both the trauma story and responses is significant. When I first started conducting interviews, I found that there were times that I was very possibly privileging the 'responses' over the experiences of trauma. This emphasis spoke more about my concerns and level of comfort than those of the participants. For example, one participant spoke about the extremely difficult situation of having to walk across a desert without

any resources and the threat of bombs being dropped by high-flying planes called Antonovs. I asked this man if there was anything that helped him to get through this situation, but it was premature. He looked at me and said, 'No, it was a very difficult situation'. This comment reinforced the value of acknowledging where the person speaking about their experiences currently is. By going too quickly to responses, there is a danger of minimising or suggesting that the adversity experienced is or was easily resolved. An exclusive focus on responses can further silence the adversities associated with forced migration and resettlement. While recognising the need to validate and dignify these situations, I did not, however, press my questions (or curiosities) to obtain detailed accounts of the participant's difficult experiences. Some men spoke of traumas associated with forced migration and resettlement without being prompted and this highlighted the care, responsibility, and privilege that accompany hearing such stories of profound significance. Westoby (2006) writes about resettled Sudanese people's lives within the contested landscapes of trauma and recovery:

There is little space for refugee voices to interrupt these colonizing processes and articulate their own aspirations for reconstructing a social world that would facilitate well-being on their terms. (p. 157)

Part of facilitating wellbeing on participants' terms is allowing them to express manifestations of trauma in resonant ways rather than making a priori assumptions about it. An informed and cautious approach to double-listening provides greater contexts where participants can decide when, and if, it is appropriate to share such powerful understandings.

SECTION THREE: PARTICIPANT RESPONSES TO TRAUMA

The last interview section endeavoured to document a person's responses to trauma by tracing its history, who informed it, and what these responses might represent to the participant. This emphasis provided opportunities to situate a person outside the pathologising tendencies associated with trauma-dominated enquiry. To establish these

responses, it was not necessary to obtain detailed reports of trauma which could have given greater likelihood to pushing participants into what Charmaz (1991, p. 275) cautions as an 'emotional abyss'. Similar to the recommendations of both Charmaz (2006) and Denborough (2006), interview questions were slanted towards positive forms of enquiry rather than giving the deleterious experiences of suffering primary or exclusive focus:

- At the beginning of this interview, you spoke about those things that are important to you in your life [reiterate what these were]. How have you been able to keep in touch with these values and hopes in your life, despite the difficulties you encountered?
- Who or what sustained you through these challenging times?
- Have there been ways in which you or your community have been able to reduce these effects? If so, how?
- If someone else went through similar experiences to you, what suggestions would you offer them that would be helpful for them to recover from such experiences?
- What is your vision for the future?

These questions were informed by the person's response to trauma, by what had sustained them, and the history behind their values, hopes, and dreams (for similar questions, see Denborough, 2006). Again, these questions were created in consultation with a number of Sudanese community members. Following their advice, the last question invited participants to comment upon their vision for the future. Overall, the thrust behind these questions was to illuminate how the Sudanese men respond to difficult situations rather than establishing them as passive victims who have experienced negative effects from forced migration. There were times, however, that participants primarily chose to stay in the difficulties associated with forced migration and resettlement. The intent within the interview process was to acknowledge the serious nature of their journey and hopefully validate and dignify these experiences while also trying to elevate understandings of what has helped them to recover.

BRINGING THE THREE SECTIONS TOGETHER

Throughout the interview, I offered short verbal summaries to elaborate upon a person's skills, values, and knowledge that have helped them respond to adverse situations. These summaries often served as an impetus for participants to more richly characterise their responses and also correct any misunderstandings or misinterpretations that may have arisen due to the diversity of cultural, linguistic, and historical backgrounds between myself and the participants.

As stated earlier, rarely did any interview follow the three sections in a sequential order and the experiences of trauma were often not disclosed (if at all) until responses were more firmly established. I also found that it was not necessary to obtain detailed accounts of trauma to document a person's response to such difficult experiences. Instead of asking participants to elaborate on these difficulties, it was possible to ask what they did or what helped them to reduce the impact of trauma in their lives. One participant immediately spoke about hope following this question:

Jay: Did you or your community experience any difficulties in your journey of leaving Sudan?

Yes. Hard times. I really had to keep my hope.

Jay: So, how is it that you have been able to keep in touch with hope despite all that you have been through?

Yeah, actually cause our situation is, as I mentioned before, like a long journey. There is hope within hope ... Yeah, toward the hope – it keeps hope alive ... When the people unite, the people can do good. So our culture is still maintained even in the [refugee] camps. So we also find that we stay there in groups, so there is the positive that we know that the hope is very important. We also use our language and practise our traditional dance. Within our culture we do have some advice. Within cultures, there are things that are allowed and things that are not allowed. So if you find that you are doing good things that are allowed by culture, you are respected. In our culture, it is very important that you maintain your dignity.

While not receiving detailed accounts of this man's journey of walking to and living within the refugee camp, this comment opened up new explorations. It became possible to further enquire into who informed hope in his life, how he maintained culture, the history and function of dance, and how one maintains a sense of dignity during difficult times. Of course, if he wanted to speak about the injustices he experienced, this was also accommodated, with an emphasis on creating a safe interview environment and on the understanding that there was no expectation that he needed to disclose such experiences. Another participant spoke about his spirituality and relationship with God as he walked across a vast desert seeking safety:

Jay: When things were really difficult for you, was there anything that sustained you or gave you hope?

It was after I became a Christian. I became a Christian and I read a lot about the Bible, and God was speaking to me through the Bible and I was listening to God through His words. And that was the substance of my strength in whatever difficulty I find myself. I don't lose hope because I know God will help me out in any situation that I find myself. I should not be disappointed. Even though I might be disappointed, I know that one day, one time, that I feel happy. And I take that as a part of life. Life is not sweet all the time.

Again, this man's commentary provided entry points to explore responses to trauma and highlight his rich knowledges towards healing and recovery. Such explorations can be highly affirming of people's values, histories, and influential people in their lives. These questions often opened opportunities for re-membling conversations (see White, 2007) as important people (present and past) were brought into these conversations and were elaborated further:

Jay: And so these times, they were very hard for you – was there anything that helped you through these times?

Yeah, my mom. I can say that my mom – she was always supporting me. She was always guiding me you know. And she did help me a lot.

Jay: In what ways did she guide you?

She guided me, you know, and said, 'We have to find a way out of here so that you can continue your study. And one day you will be alright and you will be able to help your people who are in the war and fighting and all that'. And she said that I can be a better person and yes, I can do this. And every time, if I am feeling down, I just keep telling myself, 'Yep, I can do this. I can overcome my problems'.

Other interviews provided the opportunity to acknowledge important people and spiritual figures that helped them along their journeys both past and present. While the concepts of externalising conversations, recognising unique outcomes, looking for the absent but implicit and re-authoring conversations were approaches that could be recognised within the interview transcripts, it is critical to emphasise that this was not a technically-oriented process. Never once did I think, 'Now I will try to externalise this man's problem and try to initiate a re-remembering conversation'. Rather, these narrative concepts were used as a way of *being* with the Sudanese community and participants so that they could have greater voice and establish themselves as experts in their own lives where people are separate from problems (see White & Epston, 1990). The double-storied approach to this research looked to keep their perspective centred while remaining influential in the conversation (Morgan, 2000).

All of these discussions involving participant responses were possible without necessarily having to document the trauma story. Almost without exception, participants would begin to sit more and more upright as the interview progressed and a preferred story started to emerge. Again, this process is not about devaluing the trauma story. It is about creating spaces where participants can choose which parts of their narratives they want to share.

I acknowledge that by conducting formal interviews only with men, the research neglects the important voices of women. While conversations with women at community events and within people's homes were possible, it became clear that there were a number of barriers to accessing this group because of very clear gender and cultural considerations. Further, many women living in refugee camps such as Kakuma in Kenya have experienced sexual violence (Lischer, 2005) and discussions about responses to trauma could inappropriately elicit sensitive and gendered issues. It is also necessary to acknowledge that the men interviewed do not include non-English speaking Sudanese community members. Despite initial intentions to use interpreters, it proved extremely difficult to locate interpreters who were acceptable to the different sub-communities of the Sudanese community in Adelaide. While this study has not incorporated these voices, it is important to acknowledge that a better understanding of this population (which is more difficult to access) is very much needed. It is hoped that this research might serve as a flexible framework for other researchers to develop further insights with groups of people whom this study does not accommodate.

CONCLUSION: PRIVILEGING RESPONSES AND DIGNIFYING SUFFERING

Overall, the feedback from the interviews was very positive. Many participants asked for CD recordings of the interviews and multiple copies of their transcripts as these were 'proof' of their story. A participant responded to his perspective of the double-storied interview framework and how our conversation progressed:

I liked the questions, like the way you asked them. I normally don't like these questions – somebody who comes to me already with a ready answer. And they say [starts laughing], 'Are you an (A), (B), or (C)?!'

Jay: So people have come to you with questions asking you if you are an 'A, B, or C'?

Yes; I have now especially refused to answer two of these studies. This person said that they were doing research and they already had their answers – A, B and C ... We

disagree on that. But she kept going and asked, 'Is your life an A, B, C, or a D!?' And I said, 'My life experience may not be answered by these questions which already have answers. So I don't think you will get the information you will need. Besides, you already have your preconceived answers and you only provide your answers to me'.

The use of double-storied testimony provided a flexible framework to enquire into people's lives that allowed them to speak to their own skills, knowledges, and histories. Returning to the participants multiple times allowed for a deeper engagement with the power of their stories and to check my interpretations of what was said. The numerous comments about how participants themselves conceptualised the experiences of forced migration and resettlement highlights the necessity of elevating their voices where possible to capture the multi-storied dimensions of people's lives. This exploration created spaces where these men could speak to their stories of sustenance and hope while dignifying the experiences of profound suffering.

There is a caution that this paper may read, in part, as placing a primary emphasis on people's responses to trauma over their experiences of trauma. Such a conclusion is not my intent. Rather than establishing a false dichotomy of one or the other, this research sought to honour the value and richness of a person or community's history and acknowledge the multiple ways people assign meaning to their particular experiences. Numerous participants spoke to notions of hope, whether in walking across an African desert, living in a refugee camp, or finding pathways to participate as a peer in Australian society. Documenting participants' responses to trauma is not to trivialise or minimise the challenges and adversities associated with forced migration and resettlement. There is no panacea to resolve the pain often related to the multiplicity of refugee journeys and challenges. Experiences associated with trauma should be validated and dignified and, likewise, so too should people's responses. A participant spoke about the effects of trauma and how it can be difficult to heal from the associated wounds:

The war has had so many effects in our community. War is really very destructive;

it has destroyed lives. What I mean by destructive is not just by the buildings, but it actually destroys lives ... It is not easy to heal those wounds. People who have seen their fathers killed in front of them, or their mothers, or their kids dying from hunger. Those wounds are really hard to be healed ... It is not easy to imagine how destructive war is.

While this man maintains that it is not easy to heal from significant trauma, every participant's narrative also offers insight to pathways of healing, recovery, resistance, and survival. It is hoped that this paper presents a critical and respectful research framework where double-listening can be applied (rather than prescribed) to not only dignify and validate the experiences of trauma, but also to provide a platform to look beyond it. For instance, one participant talked about the 'educative centres' that help his people move past traumatic experiences:

So we are looking at three areas of what I call 'educative centres'. One I call the parents, the second from the Biblical teachings, and the third is from education. And all three have really impacted upon me and have shaped the way that I look at things and the way I perceive things. All these three areas have made me as a person. And all of this has helped me to, you know, live in harmony.

These educative centres, among others, provide direction for these Sudanese men to directly respond to trauma and adversity. Responses such as placing faith in Christianity, following parent's teachings, pursuing an education, and surrounding oneself with community were identified as critical elements to healing and survival in the numerous contexts and situations that characterise the diaspora of Sudanese life.

Rather than taking a priori assumptions about the 'refugee journey' and manifestations of trauma, the use of double-storied testimony created opportunities for participants to identify the particularities of experiences associated with forced migration and resettlement. These discussions, when cautiously approached with a critical

self-awareness of what questions we as practitioners, researchers, and fellow community members are asking, *and why*, can provide a vantage point to explore the diverse array of knowledges related to healing and recovery.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank numerous members of the Sudanese community who are living in Adelaide, Lorna Hallahan, Michael White, Cheryl White, and David Denborough for their helpful engagement with developing the study's research design. I would also like to thank the three reviewers for their helpful comments on an earlier draft. The research was funded by the National Health and Medical Research Council, ID # 480482.

REFERENCES

- Bixler, M. (2005). *The Lost Boys of Sudan: An American story of the refugee experience*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.
- Blackburn, P. (2005). Speaking the unspeakable: Bearing witness to the stories of political violence, war and terror. *The International Journal of Narrative Therapy and Community Work*, (3 & 4), 97–105.
- Bracken, P. J., Giller, J., & Summerfield, D. (1995). Psychological responses to war and atrocity: The limitations of current concepts. *Social Science & Medicine*, 40(8), 1073–1082.
- Charmaz, K. (1991). *Good days, bad days: The self in chronic illness and time*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory*. London, England: Sage Publications.
- Denborough, D. (2006). A framework for receiving and documenting testimonies of trauma. In D. Denborough (Ed.), *Trauma: Narrative responses to traumatic experience* (pp. 115–131). Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- Deng, A., Deng, B., Ajak, B., & Bernstein, J. (2005). *They poured fire on us from the sky: The true story of three lost boys from Sudan*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.
- Department of Immigration and Citizenship. (n.d.). *Community information summary: Sudan-born*. Retrieved from http://www.immi.gov.au/media/publications/statistics/comm-sum/_pdf/sudan.pdf
- Department of Immigration and Citizenship. (2007). *Sudanese community profile*. Retrieved from http://www.immi.gov.au/living-in-australia/delivering-assistance/government-programs/settlement-planning/_pdf/community-profile-sudan.pdf
- Department of Immigration and Citizenship. (2009). *Australia's refugee and humanitarian program* (Fact sheet 60). Retrieved from <http://www.immi.gov.au/media/fact-sheets/60refugee.htm>
- Duffield, M. (2003). The root causes of Sudan's civil wars. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 16(2), 219–221.
- Dul Dau, J. (2007). *God grew tired of us*. Washington, DC: National Geographic Society.
- Eggers, D. (2006). *What is the what*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Gale, P. (2004). The refugee crisis and fear: Populist politics and media discourse. *Journal of Sociology*, 40(4), 321–340.
- Hecht, J. (2005). *The journey of the Lost Boys*. Jacksonville, FL: Allswell Press.
- Ingleby, D. (2005). Editor's introduction. In D. Ingleby (Ed.), *Forced migration and mental health: Rethinking the care of refugees and displaced persons* (pp. 1–28). New York, NY: Springer.
- Jeppsson, O., & Hjern, A. (2005). Traumatic stress in context: A study of unaccompanied minors from Southern Sudan. In D. Ingleby (Ed.), *Forced migration and mental health* (pp. 67–80). New York, NY: Springer.
- Johnson, D. (2003). *The root causes of Sudan's civil wars*. Oxford, England: James Currey Publishers.
- Jok, J. M. (2001). *War and slavery in Sudan*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Khawaja, N., White, K., Schweitzer, R., & Greenslade, J. (2008). Difficulties and coping strategies of Sudanese refugees: A qualitative approach. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 45(3), 489–512.
- Klocker, N., & Dunn, K. (2003). Who's driving the asylum debate? Newspaper and government representations of asylum seekers. *Media International Australia*, (109), 71–92.
- Lischer, S. (2005). *Dangerous sanctuaries*. London, England: Cornell University Press.
- Marlowe, J. (2009a). Accessing 'authentic' knowledge: Being and doing with the Sudanese community. *Australian Community Psychologist*, 21(1), 39–49.
- Marlowe, J. (2009b). Conceptualising refugee resettlement in contested landscapes. *Australasian Review of African Studies*, 30(2), 128–151.
- Marlowe, J. (2010). Beyond the discourse of trauma: Shifting the focus on Sudanese refugees. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 23(2), 183–198. doi:10.1093/jrs/feq013
- Miller, K., Kulkarni, M., & Kushner, H. (2006). Beyond trauma-focused psychiatric epidemiology: Bridging research and practice with war-affected populations. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 76(4), 409–422.

- Morgan, A. (2000). *What is narrative therapy? An easy-to-read introduction*. Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- Pupavac, V. (2001). Therapeutic governance: Psycho-social intervention and trauma risk management. *Disasters*, 25(4), 358–372.
- Pupavac, V. (2002). Pathologizing populations and colonizing minds: International psychosocial programs in Kosovo. *Alternatives*, 27, 489–511.
- Pupavac, V. (2008). Refugee advocacy, traumatic representations and political disenchantment. *Government and Opposition*, 43(2), 270–292.
- Robins, M. (2003). 'Lost Boys' and the promised land: US newspaper coverage of Sudanese refugees. *Journalism*, 4(1), 29–49.
- Rogier, E. (2005). *No more hills ahead? The Sudan's tortuous ascent to heights of peace* (Clingendael Security Paper No. 1). Retrieved from Netherlands Institute of International Relations *Clingendael* website: http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2005/20050800_cscp_security_paper_1.pdf
- Ruiz, H.A. (1998). The Sudan: Cradle of displacement. In R. Cohen & F. M. Deng (Eds.), *The forsaken people* (pp. 139–176). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Summerfield, D. (1999). A critique of seven assumptions behind psychological trauma programmes in war-affected areas. *Social Science & Medicine*, 48(10), 1449–1462.
- Summerfield, D. (2001). The invention of post-traumatic stress disorder and the social usefulness of a psychiatric category. *British Medical Journal*, 322(7278), 95–98.
- Tempany, M. (2009). What research tells us about the mental health and psycho-social wellbeing of Sudanese refugees: A literature review. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 46(2), 300–315.
- UNHCR. (2006). *Rethinking durable solutions*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- UNHCR. (2007). *Protecting refugees and the role of UNHCR*. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/4034b6a34.html>
- UNHCR. (2008). *2007 Global trends: Refugees, asylum-seekers, returnees, internally displaced and stateless persons*. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/4852366f2.html>
- Walzer, C. (Ed.). (2009). *Out of exile: Narratives from the abducted and displaced people of Sudan*. San Francisco, CA: McSweeney's Books.
- Westoby, P. (2006). *The sociality of healing: Engaging Southern Sudanese refugees resettling in an Australian context: A model of social healing*. (Doctoral thesis, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia). Retrieved from <http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ:158240>
- Westoby, P. (2009). *The sociality of refugee healing: In dialogue with Southern Sudanese refugees resettling in Australia*. Seaholme, Australia: Common Ground.
- Westoby, P., & Ingamells, A. (2009). A critically informed perspective of working with resettling refugee groups in Australia. *British Journal of Social Work*. Advance online publication, 1–18. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcp084
- White, M. (2004). Working with people who are suffering the consequences of multiple trauma: A narrative perspective. *The International Journal of Narrative Therapy and Community Work*, (1), 45–76.
- White, M. (2006a, October). *Narrative responses to trauma*. Paper presented at the five day narrative workshop on responding to trauma, Dulwich Centre, Adelaide, Australia.
- White, M. (2006b). Working with people who are suffering the consequences of multiple trauma: A narrative perspective. In D. Denborough (Ed.), *Trauma: Narrative responses to traumatic experience* (pp. 25–85). Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- White, M. (2007). *Maps of narrative practice*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Windle, J. (2008). Racialisation of African youth in Australia. *Social Identities*, 14(5), 553–566.