# EPISTEMIC UNCERTAINTY AND ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN CROSS-CULTURAL RESEARCH

*Dr.* **Zahra Hosseini**
*University of Helsinki, Finland*

*Prof.* **Thomas Olsson**
*Tampere University, Finland*

## Abstract

This study explores the epistemic and ethical complexities of examining migrants' trust in public services through qualitative cultural inquiry. Trust is addressed not only as the central subject of investigation but also as a condition underpinning the credibility of research findings. Drawing on implicit findings, such as unexpectedly low participation and inconsistencies in participant narratives, which introduced layers of uncertainty in the findings. The study points to indications of self-censorship, social desirability, and cultural bias, which raise concerns about the trustworthiness of the findings. These complexities present researchers with interpretive dilemmas, where their roles in decision-making regarding the trustworthiness of narrative authenticity and participant autonomy may conflict with established ethical principles. Rather than merely dismissing these patterns as mere limitations, this analysis interprets inconsistencies in implicit findings as meaningful indicators of how trust is negotiated and constrained in sensitive institutional contexts. These insights reveal deeper uncertainty in how trust is measured, narrated, and understood, and raise ethical and methodological dilemmas for researchers. This study contributes to ongoing debates about the fragility of trust-related data in vulnerable populations. It highlights the need for critical reflection when interpreting implicit findings of meaning in qualitative research.

**Keywords:** *trust, cultural studies, inconsistency, trustworthiness, ethical dilemmas*

CULTURE CROSSROADS

## Introduction

Trust is a multifaceted concept, interpreted differently across disciplines. Watson and Moran [2005] emphasize its link to risk and uncertainty, particularly in contexts of social vulnerability and institutional power. This interdisciplinary perspective deepens understanding of trust's role in social and cultural settings, especially in public institutions, where it underpins governance, service delivery, and political legitimacy [United Nations 2021].

Studying trust poses methodological challenges, especially among migrant populations [Alexander et al. 2018; Van Liempt & Bilger 2012]. This paper critically examines these challenges, focusing on migrants' trust in public services. It explores epistemic uncertainty by analysing implicit findings rather than findings that correspond to predefined questions. The main aim of this study was to explore immigrants' trust in public services within the host country; however, the implicit findings also revealed the researchers' dilemmas regarding the trustworthiness of participants' narratives. While qualitative research indicates that participants' narratives can yield rich data [Ahmad 2022; Zabko 2024], this study explores the participants' narratives as a reflection of their perceived trust and its trustworthiness. Trust in this study has two aspects: the primary focus of the subject and a methodological challenge, which underscores the importance of the findings' trustworthiness. This paper addresses how selection bias in data collection and inconsistencies in participants' responses question the trustworthiness of results and contribute to epistemic uncertainty and ethical dilemmas that influence data interpretation and reporting.

## 1. Theoretical perspective: Ethical dilemmas

Ethical research practices are an essential part of every research, particularly when working with vulnerable populations such as children, the elderly, and ethnic or racial minorities [Alexander et al. 2018]. Despite existing ethical guidelines, scholars have identified ethical dilemmas as situations where researchers face conflicting moral obligations that cannot be fulfilled simultaneously, without a clear hierarchy to resolve the conflict [Swain 2025; Taquette et al. 2022; Fuji 2012; Colnerud 2015]. Several common ethical dilemmas include confidentiality, informed consent, researcher's positionality, and trustworthiness.

Confidentiality involves clarity about what personal information is collected, who has access to it, and under what conditions. It also includes participants' rights to understand the scope of their involvement and to maintain control over how their data is used [Bos 2020]. However, many studies highlight confidentiality as a frequent source of ethical tension in qualitative research [Fujii 2012; Ngozwana 2018; Taquette et al. 2022; McMillan & Schumacher 2006].

The most important instrument for securing confidentiality is informed consent, which means that participants should be fully informed about the study's purpose, procedures, potential risks and benefits, and their rights, including the right to withdraw at any time [Swain 2025]. The asymmetry of power embedded in the informed consent can create dilemmas [Fujii 2012].

The researcher's position plays a critical role throughout the research process. Numerous scholars have highlighted how role confusion between researchers, therapists, observers, or friends can lead to ethical dilemmas [Taquette et al. 2022; Fujii 2012; Ellis 2017; Rallis et al. 2007; Shah 2024; Ahmad 2022; Lee 2015; Zabko 2024]. In cross-cultural research, the complexities of the researcher's insider-outsider position have been critically examined by many scholars [Yeh & Barber 2024; Markova 2009; Lee 2015]. Markova [2009] argues that the insider status is shaped not only by shared ethnicity or language but also by intersecting social categories like class, education, and migration background. While insider researchers may benefit from contextual familiarity, they also risk intellectual isolation or being confined to studying their own communities.

Evaluation inequity through trustworthiness is recognized as another type of dilemma [Rallis et al. 2007; Taquette et al. 2022]. Rallis et al. [2007] argue that evaluating a study's trustworthiness requires attention to ethical principles beyond methodological formalities. Addressing different biases is crucial for establishing trustworthiness in qualitative research, especially studies involving vulnerable populations such as migrants [Van Liempt & Bilger 2012].

Following the existing literature, this study explores the researcher's dilemmas in interpreting voluntary withdrawal or self-selection bias not only as a challenge to reduce the number of participants [Ngozwana 2018; Markova 2009], but also further examines the intention behind such withdrawal, suggesting that self-exclusion may in itself yield meaningful insights, particularly in sensitive research areas such as migrants' trust.

In parallel, while the narrative nature of qualitative data has been widely acknowledged as central to enhancing data richness and authenticity [Ellis 2017; Ahmad 2022; Zabko 2024], the role of inconsistencies within narratives remains underexplored. This study addresses that gap by analysing contradictions in participants' accounts not as flaws to be corrected, but as revealing the tension between public discourses of trust and private experiences of exclusion. Echoing Sølvberg and Jarness [2019], such inconsistencies are interpreted as expressions of negotiation, concealment, or strategic silence, shaped by the research encounter itself, including the positionality of the interviewer and the sociopolitical context of disclosure [Roulston & Shelton 2015; Sølvberg & Jarness 2019].

## 2.  Research design

This exploratory study examined trust in public services among female migrants from an Asian collectivist culture, residing in a Nordic country. Some information in this paper was not included as predefined research questions in the participant information notice. To maintain ethical standards, avoid cultural stereotypes, and ensure privacy, the identities of the ethnic and host countries have been anonymized. Recruitment was carried out through Facebook groups, where both participants and the interviewer were members. Interviews were conducted in the native language by an experienced female researcher sharing their ethnic and linguistic background. Interviews were tailored to participants' comfort, often held in informal settings like cafés, and conducted in their native language to foster openness. To complement peer review and cross-gender approach, interviews were analysed in collaboration with a male researcher, following Rodríguez-Dorans [2018].

Sessions began with open-ended prompts and gradually shifted toward specific experiences with public services. To minimize methodological bias, interviewees were encouraged to speak freely and without interruption, allowing unstructured narratives to emerge naturally. Each interview lasted between 40 and 75 minutes, depending on the participants' willingness to share their experiences. Interviews were audio-recorded with consent and later analysed collaboratively.

Interviews were audio-recorded with consent. To ensure thorough comprehension and alleviate potential research bias, the analysis of words and themes was augmented by a meticulous manual examination of implicit findings. Transcripts were translated into English and analysed collaboratively by two researchers, allowing for reflexive, balanced interpretation. The transcribed data was coded and grouped into broader themes, which represent the main ideas or topics within the data.

## 3.  Implicit findings

This study aimed to examine migrants' trust in public services. However, the low participation rate and inconsistencies in statements suggest the need for greater caution when assessing the trustworthiness of the data.

### 3.1  Low participation rate

Recruitment for this study targeted a specific migrant group through widely used online community platforms, including some Facebook group pages with up to 2 000 members. Despite being widely circulated, only 21 individuals responded positively after receiving the notice, and 11 eventually withdrew. Some participants cited scheduling conflicts, while others declined further engagement without explanation, indicating possible discomfort or reluctance. Non-responsiveness and withdrawal are considered ethical dilemmas because they reduce the number of participants [Ngozwana 2018; Markova 2009].

While a degree of trust in the researcher, the broader institutional context, or organizations authorizing the study, is essential to participate meaningfully in qualitative interviews and share personal experiences [Shah 2024], the timing of some respondents' withdrawal in this study suggests a possible hesitation rooted in institutional mistrust. Trust is inherently tied to concepts such as risk, vulnerability, reliance, and honesty [Das & Teng 2004]. In the context of migration, this scepticism can be related to their prior or early experiences of surveillance, discrimination, or lack of confidentiality in their countries of origin or host contexts, which may foster persistent wariness toward official institutions [Lenette 2015]. In research settings, mistrust may manifest as withdrawal, refusal, or selective self-censorship, even in ethically approved and participant-sensitive environments [Shah 2024; Essex et al. 2022; Tannenberg 2021]. In examining trust as the focal point of the main study, the authors interpret the low participation and volunteer withdrawal not only as methodological limitations but also as a reflection of deeper trust dynamics.

## 3.2. Inconsistencies in participants' statements

During the critical analysis of this study, several inconsistencies in participants' narratives were observed. Antin et al. [2015] conceptualize the inconsistencies as "conflicting discourses" that can coexist within a single narrative, highlighting meaning-making's internal tensions and fluidity. Instead of treating these contradictions as mere noise, they advocate examining them as markers of discursive complexity. In this study, the following inconsistent narratives pose analytic challenges but provide opportunities for deeper cultural interpretation.

### a) Inconsistency in the perceived concept of trust

Many participants initially expressed trust in government departments and organizations, providing positive responses. However, upon further exploration of their experiences, they highlighted shortcomings in these entities, such as perceived incompetence, unfair treatment, and suspicion regarding official decision-making processes. It became apparent that participants' trust perceptions were more closely linked to notions of privacy and security than to other dimensions of trust, such as competence or transparency. Recognizing this contradiction, the researchers adapted the interview questions to be less structured to let the respondents explain their feelings about different experiences in various situations.

### b) Inconsistency in the statement and the existing regulation

Some interviewees (e.g., A and J) who had arrived in Europe through UN-sponsored resettlement programs appeared reluctant to disclose their refugee status, subtly downplaying or avoiding references to it during the interview process. They presented stories that deviated from standard immigration regulations. However, one

of them, in response to the interviewer's follow-up questions, made another claim that was closer to reality and more consistent with immigration regulations. Another participant, who had obtained residency through refugee status, indirectly disclosed the nature of her entry through side remarks and narrative details that appeared inconsistent with official immigration procedures. The researcher's familiarity with the immigration process and the participant's subsequent conversations enabled the interviewer to identify these inconsistencies and presented claims.

### c) Inconsistency in formal and informal environments

In some instances, notable discrepancies emerged between participants' informal remarks or chat and their recorded interview responses, particularly in their attitudes toward strategies in the public services. For example, Interviewees B and C expressed multiple grievances during the pre-interview conversation but refrained from voicing any negative statements once the formal interview began. Interviewee B even expressed gratitude toward a public service provider that she had previously criticized in the informal discussion. This incongruity may reflect a form of self-censorship or expression management, influenced by norms of respect and politeness often associated with collectivist cultures. Interviewee F claimed to have a continuous full-time contract for many years, which contradicted the interviewer's knowledge of her short-term and part-time work history. However, the interviewer avoided discussing the discrepancy to respect the interviewee's privacy, in line with research ethics. Feelings of embarrassment and social stigma around receiving financial assistance or having a refugee background prompted participants to conceal this information.

### d) Inconsistency in the statement and the real intention

Interviewee A described their decision to settle in the host country as the most significant choice in their life. However, due to the researcher's embeddedness in the same city and immigrant community, prior informal knowledge suggested that the participant had been actively planning to immigrate elsewhere. Such expressions of strong appreciation, when contrasted with indirect, contradictory information, may mislead researchers. In these contexts, expressions of gratitude rather than critique may reflect cultural norms of politeness or respect, particularly within Eastern or collectivist cultures [Sultan et al. 2024; Nkirote 2024]. The interviewee expressed concern about appearing ungrateful to the host country's institutions, reflecting cultural courtesy. This raises questions about the trustworthiness of the data, highlighting the challenge of distinguishing genuine sentiment from culturally influenced self-presentation in qualitative interviews.

## 4. Discussion

This study explores epistemic challenges in interpreting implicit findings. Particular attention is given to examining the potential biases contributing to the low participation rate and the inconsistencies in participants' responses, influencing trustworthiness. Understanding the complex interaction between different forms of bias is essential to strengthening trustworthiness.

### 4.1. Self-selection bias in voluntary participation

Voluntary participation is a foundational ethical principle in qualitative research, ensuring respect for autonomy and informed consent [Swain 2025]. However, striving for inclusion while countering self-selection bias poses a significant methodological challenge, particularly in research involving vulnerable or marginalized populations [Shah 2024; Markova 2009]. Self-selection bias occurs when individuals with certain characteristics are more likely to opt in, while others systematically opt out, leading to interpretive limitations.

As previously mentioned, participation in the study remained limited. Although the reasons given varied, the timing and pattern of withdrawal suggest the potential mistrust of authorities or fear of surveillance, often rooted in experiences from participants' countries of origin, can discourage engagement in research perceived as institutional [Shah 2024; Mackenzie et al. 2007; Lenette 2015]. Trust and rapport between the interviewer and the participant are considered critical in qualitative research, not only for obtaining in-depth data but also for creating an open environment that encourages participants to engage with the researcher, particularly in cultural studies [Ahmad 2022; Shah 2024; Lee 2025]. Consequently, the absence of these voices can limit the interpretive depth and reduce the study's ability to fully capture the spectrum of trust-related meaning-making processes [Sølvberg & Jarness 2019]. Researchers must therefore approach non-participation not simply as attrition, but as potentially meaningful data in its own right, an indicator of deeper, often unspoken, dynamics of institutional alienation As Tannenberg [2021] notes, concerns about prestige, social sanctioning, or fear of punishment, can contribute to systematic non-responses and biased answers. These factors not only compromise data quality but may also signal participants' discomfort, distrust, or perceived vulnerability within institutional settings, offering critical insight into the socio-political undercurrents shaping engagement.

### 4.2. Social desirability as a form of participant bias

Social desirability bias is a well-documented concern in qualitative research, particularly when exploring sensitive topics such as measuring citizens' trust

in government [Tannenberg 2021]. It reflects participants' tendency to present themselves in ways that align with perceived social norms or expectations in interviews [Dubie 2021]. The construct of social desirability bias is increasingly recognized as culturally contingent, differing significantly in expression and impact across multicultural contexts [Teh et al. 2023]. Immigrants often strive to position themselves within the host society, which can lead to subtle understatements of their status and experiences. This can contribute to social desirability bias in how they present themselves during interviews [Yeasmin et al. 2021]. Cultural and linguistic differences may influence how individuals manage impressions, often in ways that are not fully explained by cognitive ability alone. Odendaal [2015] argues that applying uniform corrections for social desirability across diverse cultural groups is inappropriate because the mechanisms driving such bias vary significantly by context. In interview settings, participants may consciously or unconsciously tailor their responses to appear more favourable or avoid judgment, especially in contexts involving cross-cultural dynamics or power imbalances [Carian & Hill 2021; Antin & Shaw 2012].

In this study, several participants frequently presented their experiences in a manner that aligned with socially accepted narratives. For example, some consistently emphasized their gratitude, claimed continuous full-time employment instead of acknowledging periods of unemployment, or avoided identifying as refugees, preferring terms like "foreigner" over "migrant" due to the perceived stigma attached to the latter in some media [Bellovary et al. 2020]. Such behaviours, rooted in concerns about appearing ungrateful or disloyal, may reflect internalized norms shaped by prior experiences with authority or surveillance [Lenette 2015]. Social desirability can create discrepancies between what participants say in different contexts and their true intentions during interviews. Acknowledging these impression management strategies is crucial for interpreting implicit findings with increased reflexivity and sensitivity to context.

### 4.3. Cultural bias in the interpretation of trust

The examination of trust in government institutions among migrants is complex and sensitive, having dual significance [Quaranta 2024]. It is both the primary phenomenon under study and a crucial aspect of ensuring the trustworthiness of the research process itself.

A substantial body of cross-cultural research highlights significant differences in how trust is conceptualized and practiced across societies. In Western contexts, particularly in Northern European and Nordic countries, trust tends to be more generalized, extending beyond close relationships to include institutions and strangers [Delhey & Newton 2005]. This pattern has been linked to historically strong,

transparent, and fair institutions that promote social cohesion and interpersonal trust [Yamagishi & Yamagishi 1994; Rothstein & Stolle 2003]. In contrast, many Asian societies exhibit a more particularistic form of trust, where individuals primarily place trust in close social networks such as family members, friends, and long-term business partners [Hofstede 1980; Chen et al. 1998]. These distinctions suggest that cultural norms and institutional environments jointly shape how trust is expressed and toward whom it is directed. Given these cross-national variations, studying trust as a research topic carries a heightened risk of cultural bias, especially in cross-cultural contexts where differences in subjectivity, language, and communication may affect data interpretation [Liamputtong 2011]. It can manifest in various ways and relate to participant perception as well as researcher interpretation. As in a cross-cultural study of the term "privacy", Zabihzadeh et al. [2019] found significant variations in how participants from individualist and collectivist cultures conceptualized it. They noted that cultural bias can be pronounced when addressing culturally embedded notions such as trust, respect, and security.

In this study, to mitigate cultural bias, interviews were conducted in participants' native language using open-ended, participant-led formats. The shared cultural background of both the interviewer and data analyst enhanced contextual sensitivity and reduced the risk of misinterpretation. Early interviews revealed that participants often interpreted trust narrowly, focusing on privacy and security rather than broader aspects such as transparency or institutional competence. This prompted a reflexive shift toward a less structured interview style, allowing for a more culturally grounded articulation of trust. While this adaptive approach helped clarify underlying conceptual frameworks, some biases still affected participants' comfort and disclosure, which was reflected in inconsistencies.

### 4.4.  Self-censorship influenced by participant backgrounds

Self-censorship can influence participant disclosure and pose broader challenges to the scientific process by constraining open communication and silencing critical perspectives. As argued by Väliverronen and Saikkonen [2021], self-censorship can affect both researchers and participants, undermining the richness and authenticity of qualitative inquiry. Self-censorship is a measurement challenge in qualitative research that can have psychological, economic, legal, and political reasons [Bar-Tal 2017]. However, it is significantly influenced by cultural context, particularly in settings involving cross-cultural or migrant research. For example, participants from collectivist or hierarchical societies may withhold critical or sensitive perspectives due to ingrained norms around authority, politeness, or fear of consequences, particularly in some Asian cultures [Adikaram 2018]. In such contexts, expressing dissent or mistrust, as sensitive topics, especially toward public institutions, can be

perceived as risky or socially inappropriate. Sosnowska-Buxton [2015] highlights that the interaction between topic sensitivity in interviews and social context often leads to self-censorship, especially when the research setting reveals power imbalances. Shah [2024] suggests that some participants' disapproval, fear of being recorded, and fabricated excuses can conceal larger dynamics. Similarly, Turner [2013], after studying Asian culture, concludes that cross-cultural fieldwork requires heightened sensitivity, as participants may selectively silence themselves to protect personal or group identity.

Respecting the sensitivity in the topic and target group, self-censorship appears to contribute to the inconsistencies observed in implicit findings in this study. Although the interviews are conducted in a democratic context. However, as previous studies have highlighted, even in democratic contexts, societal norms and dominant ideological values can give rise to self-censorship, shaping individuals' willingness to express dissent or critique within institutional frameworks [e.g., Brutāne & Petkeviča 2022]. Migrant studies show that self-censorship is common among migrants and refugees who have experienced authoritarian regimes [Mackenzie et al. 2007; Lenette 2015]. In authoritarian settings, respondents often engage in "preference falsification" out of fear of consequences, particularly when anonymity is uncertain. These dynamic raises serious concerns about the reliability of interview data in such contexts, as noted by Kuran [1997].

### 4.5. The researcher's bias and ethical dilemmas

Rather than treating bias as a flaw to be eliminated, Roulston and Shelton [2015] suggest that bias in qualitative research is inextricably linked to researcher subjectivity and can serve as both a constraint and a source of insight. In cross-cultural contexts, this subjectivity becomes particularly pronounced. When the researcher's cultural background differs from that of the participants, interpretations may unconsciously reflect the researcher's own values and assumptions, a phenomenon known as cultural bias [Creswell & Creswell 2018; Liamputtong 2011]. Misalignment in cultural frameworks can lead to misrepresentation of participants' perspectives and, ultimately, undermine the credibility and transferability of findings [Squires, 2009]. When a study investigates a sensitive topic such as trust in public services among culturally diverse and vulnerable participants, the task of assessing the trustworthiness of the data becomes significantly more complex and demanding for researchers, due to the heightened risk of multiple, often overlapping, forms of cultural bias [Adikaram 2018; Shah 2024].

Implicit findings of this study uncovered various biases behind inconsistencies in participants' narratives. In this context, the interviewer encountered situations where participants' statements deviated from established factual information.

**Table 1: Ethical dilemmas in qualitative research**

| Researcher positionality | Ethical implications | Trustworthiness |
|---|---|---|
| The junior researcher may not recognize the inconsistency or remove the suspicious inconsistent data | High research ethics (confidentiality) | Low trustworthiness (unreported bias) |
| The researcher acknowledges the inconsistency as a limitation in the study. | High research ethics (confidentiality) | Low trustworthiness (unaddressed bias) |
| The researcher pressures the participant or uses leading follow-up questions to elicit the "truth". | Low research ethics (violates informed consent) | High trustworthiness (factual accuracy, but ethical integrity is compromised) |
| The researcher verifies facts through external sources and reports them without participants' consent. | Low research ethics (violates informed consent) | High trustworthiness (keeping high data accuracy but undermining legitimacy) |

Table 1 illustrates the researcher's positions in trade-offs between critical conflicts and those aimed at increasing analytical trustworthiness, like verifying for inconsistencies or validating data externally. The study highlights an imbalance of power in the informed consent process when researchers possess a deeper understanding of the participants' context than the participants [Fujii 2012; Ellis 2017]. In these situations, researchers have access to additional information that could help identify inconsistencies. However, ethical principles, such as informed consent and conditionality, restrict their ability to use this information to increase trustworthiness, creating a dilemma (see Table 1).

Researcher practices in managing bias highlight the epistemological and ethical challenges in interpreting data findings in cultural research. When ethical implications and trustworthiness conflict (Table 1). This poses a dilemma for researchers. Given the important role of the researcher in fostering trust in data and affirming research ethics, researchers must be aware of these dilemmas.

## 5.  Conclusions

Emphasizing the researcher's position, this article examines a complex ethical dilemma in research in which achieving trustworthiness conflicts with other ethical principles such as confidentiality and informed consent. It highlights that some participants' accounts were intentionally crafted to obscure or avoid factual disclosure. These narratives may be shaped by feelings of discomfort, a desire for self-protection, or a sense of mistrust. These are not merely vague statements, but

ethically sensitive instances of false or selectively framed information that cannot be simplistically reported, ignored, or titled as the limitation of the study. In such cases, the researcher's positionality is crucial for enhancing research credibility and minimizing misinterpretation.

The study suggests utilizing implicit findings regarding the meaning-making from participants' reactions, silences, and words that lie beyond the boundaries of informed consent and verifiability, which are ethically complex to examine in analysis. It adds a new aspect to the existing literature by recognizing that trust is not only a subject of inquiry but also a condition that shapes the trustworthiness of participants' narratives, which could be perceived as indicators of trust or distrust. Further, while previous studies have identified participants' withdrawal as an ethical dilemma [e.g., Ngozwana 2018], some other studies interpret this phenomenon as a fear or discomfort in sharing information [e.g., Shah 2024]. Our discussion goes a further step and suggests concepts of withdrawal and refusal to participate as they relate to trust and mistrust when studying public trust in government.

As an implication, the study suggests that a uniform template for informed consent may not adequately address all ethical dilemmas, especially when researchers need to make sense of implicit data. It highlights a critical need for ethics oversight bodies to provide clearer guidance in navigating unforeseen ethical considerations during data interpretation. It highlights a critical need for ethics oversight bodies to provide clearer guidance in navigating unforeseen ethical considerations during data interpretation.

This study contributes to ongoing debates about ethical dilemmas, especially regarding trustworthiness, informed consent, and researcher positionality, while placing greater emphasis on inconsistent narratives in interpretations. It also contributes to broader discussions on how trust is conceptualized, measured, and interpreted in migration-related research. It challenges researchers to drive meaning-making from unexpected results or implicit findings, rather than reporting them as limitations.

The study analysed implicit and emergent findings beyond the original research focus and consent framework. The researchers in this study employed various strategies to minimize biases, such as peer review, participant-led narratives and flexibility, empathetic interview settings, and verbatim analysis. The authors do not claim to identify all forms of inconsistency and bias. There are numerous sources of bias, ethical dilemmas, and paradoxes, many of which are beyond our control and unavoidable. To build on these insights and address the limitations mentioned, future studies should implement more purposeful designs and explicit consent to explore these dynamics in greater detail and with reduced uncertainty.

### Acknowledgments

## References

Adikaram, A.S. (2018). Being sensitive to the culture: Challenges in researching sensitive topics in an Asian culture. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 18(2), 125–137. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-D-17-00044

Ahmad, M. (2022). Care and Migration: A Reflexive Account of a Researcher with a Migration Background. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(7), 1341–1358. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5398

Alexander, S., Pillay, R., & Smith, B. (2018). A systematic review of the experiences of vulnerable people participating in research on sensitive topics. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 88, 85–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2018.08.013

Antin, J., & Shaw, A. (2012). Social desirability bias and self-reports of motivation. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Available: https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/2207676.2208699 (viewed 31.10.2025.)

Antin, T.M.J., Constantine, N.A., & Hunt, G. (2015). Conflicting discourses in qualitative research: The search for divergent data within cases. *Field Methods,* 27(3), 211–222. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X14549926

Bar-Tal, D. (2017). Self-censorship as a socio-political-psychological phenomenon: Conception and research. *Political Psychology*, 38, 37–65. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12391

Bellovary, A., Armenta, A.D., & Reyna, C. (2020). Stereotypes of immigrants and immigration in the United States. *Stereotypes: The incidence and impacts of bias*, 146–173. https://doi.org/10.5040/9798216018902.ch-008

Bos, J. (2020). Confidentiality. In: *Research Ethics for Students in the Social Sciences*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-48415-6_7

Brutāne, L., & Petkeviča, K. (2022). Artistic freedom, censorship and self-censorship in the film industry of Latvia. *Culture Crossroads*, 21, 21–32. https://doi.org/10.55877/cc.vol21.268

Carian, E.K., & Hill, J.D. (2021). Using frameworks of social desirability to teach subjectivity in interviews. *Teaching Sociology*. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0092055X211017195

Chen, C.C., Chen, X.P., & Meindl, J.R. (1998). How can cooperation be fostered? The cultural effects of individualism–collectivism. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 285–304. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1998.533227

Colnerud, G. (2015). Ethical dilemmas in research in relation to ethical review: An empirical study. *Research Ethics*, 10(4), 238–253. https://doi.org/10.1177/1747016114552339

Creswell, J.W., & Creswell, J.D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Das, T.K., & Teng, B.S. (2004). The risk-based view of trust: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19, 85–116. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOBU.0000040274.23551.1b

Delhey, J., & Newton, K. (2005). Predicting cross-national levels of social trust: global pattern or Nordic exceptionalism? *European Sociological Review*, 21(4), 311–327. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jci022

Dubie, E.Z. (2021). Presenting an admirable self: Moral evaluation within the interview. *Ecclesial Practices*, 8(1), 43–59. Available: https://brill.com/view/journals/ep/8/1/article-p43_43.xml (viewed 31.10.2025.)

Ellis, C. (2017). Compassionate Research: Interviewing and Storytelling from a Relational Ethics of Care. In: Goodson, I. (ed.) *The Routledge International Handbook on Narrative and Life History* (pp. 431–445), London: Routledge.

Essex, R., Kalocsányiová, E., & Rumyantseva, N. (2022). Trust amongst refugees in resettlement settings: A systematic scoping review and thematic analysis of the literature. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 23(2), 439–460. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-021-00850-0

Fujii, L.A. (2012). Research ethics 101: Dilemmas and responsibilities. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 45(4), 717–723. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096512000819

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Sage.

Kuran, T. (1998). *Private truths, public lies: The social consequences of preference falsification.* Harvard University Press. Available: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2729412 (viewed 31.10.2025.)

Lee, M.C.Y. (2015). Finding cultural harmony in interviewing: the wisdom of the middle way. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 39(1), 38–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2015.1019455

Lenette, C. (2015). Mistrust and refugee women who are lone parents in resettlement contexts. *Qualitative Social Work*, 14(1), 119–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325013517924

Liamputtong, P. (2011). Cross-cultural research and qualitative inquiry: Methodological and ethical issues. In: Liamputtong, P. (ed.) *Researching the vulnerable: A guide to sensitive research methods* (pp. 3–20). SAGE Publications.

Mackenzie, C., McDowell, C., & Pittaway, E. (2007). Beyond 'Do No Harm': The challenge of constructing ethical relationships in refugee research. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(2), 299–319. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fem008

Markova, E. (2009). The 'insider' position: ethical dilemmas and methodological concerns in researching undocumented migrants with the same ethnic background. *The ethics of migration research Methodology: Dealing with vulnerable immigrants*, 141–154.

McMillan, J.H., and Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in Education: Evidence-based Inquiry* (6th ed.). Cape Town: Pearson.

Ngozwana, N. (2018). Ethical Dilemmas in Qualitative Research Methodology: Researcher's Reflections. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 4(1), 19–28. https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.4.1.19

Nkirote, A. (2024). The Pragmatics of Politeness in Cross-Cultural Communication. *European Journal of Linguistics*, 3(3), 27–39. Available: https://ideas.repec.org/a/bhx/ojtejl/v3y2024i3p27-39id2052.html (viewed 31.10.2025.)

Odendaal, A. (2015). Cross-cultural differences in social desirability scales: Influence of cognitive ability. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 41(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v41i1.1259

Quaranta, M. (2024). The formation of institutional trust among immigrants: what is the role of democracy? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 51(1), 346–365. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2024.2320715

Rallis, S.F., Rossman, G.B., & Gajda, R. (2007). Trustworthiness in evaluation practice: An emphasis on the relational. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 30(4), 404–409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2007.06.006

Rodríguez-Dorans, E. (2018): Reflexivity and Ethical Research Practice while Interviewing on Sexual Topics. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 21(6), 747–760. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2018.1490980

Rothstein, B., & Stolle, D. (2003). Social capital, impartiality and the welfare state: An institutional approach. In: *Generational changes in trust and social capital*. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403979544_10

Roulston, K., & Shelton, S.A. (2015). Reconceptualizing bias in teaching qualitative research methods. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 21(4), 332–342. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414563803

Shah, R. (2024). Conducting Qualitative Interviews Online and In-person: Issues of Rapport Building and Trust. *International Quarterly for Asian Studies*, 55(4), 537–558. https://doi.org/10.11588/iqas.2024.4.24580

Sølvberg, L.M.B., & Jarness, V. (2019). Assessing contradictions: Methodological challenges when mapping symbolic boundaries. *Cultural Sociology*, 13(1), 84–100. https://doi.org/10.1177/1749975518819907

Sosnowska-Buxton, P. (2015). Taboo in qualitative interviewing. In: Roulston, S. (ed.) *Cross-Cultural Interviewing* (pp. 187–198). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315693972-15

Squires, A. (2009). Methodological challenges in cross-language qualitative research: A research review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 46(2), 277–287. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2008.08.006

Sultan, A., Anwar, S., Aysha, S., Ahmad, S., & Sajidl, M.K.M. (2024). The Pragmatics of Politeness in Cross-Cultural Communication: A Comparative Study of English and Pakistani Interactional Norms. *Jahan-e-Tahqeeq*, 7(1), 384–392. https://doi.org/10.61866/jt.v7i1.1147

Swain, M.P. (2025). Ethical Dilemmas in Research: A Systematic Review. *AG Volumes*, 23–30.

Tannenberg, M. (2021). The autocratic bias: self-censorship of regime support. *Democratization*, 29(4), 591–610. https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2021.1981867

Taquette, S.R., & Borges da Matta Souza, L.M. (2022). Ethical Dilemmas in Qualitative Research: A Critical Literature Review. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 21, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069221078731

Teh, W.L., Abdin, E., PV Nair, A., Devi, F., Siva Kumar, F. D., Roystonn, K., Wang, P., ... & Subramaniam, M. (2023). Measuring social desirability bias in a multi-ethnic cohort sample: Its relationship with self-reported physical activity, dietary habits, and factor structure. *BMC Public Health*, 23(1), 415. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-15309-3

Turner, S. (2013). Red stamps and green tea: Fieldwork negotiations and dilemmas in the Sino-Vietnamese borderlands. *Area*, 45(4), 396–402. https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12017

United Nations. (2021, August). *Trust in public institutions: A conceptual framework and insights for improved governance programming*. UNDP Oslo Governance Centre. Available: https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/migration/oslo_governance_centre/Trust-in-Public-Institutions-Policy-Brief_FINAL.pdf (viewed 31.10.2025.)

Väliverronen, E., & Saikkonen, S. (2021). Freedom of expression challenged: Scientists' perspectives on hidden forms of suppression and self-censorship. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 46(6), 1172–1200. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243920978303

Van Liempt, I., & Bilger, V. (2012). 21 Ethical challenges in research with vulnerable migrants. *Handbook of research methods in migration*, 451. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781005231.00031

Watson, S., & Moran, A. (eds.) (2005). *Trust, risk, and uncertainty*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Yamagishi, T., & Yamagishi, M. (1994). Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and Emotion*, 18(2), 129–166. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02249397

Yeasmin, N., Hasanat, M.W., & Ojwang, F. (2021). Understanding Social Justice Towards Immigrants: Finnish Perspective. *Culture Crossroads*, 19, 243–264. https://doi.org/10.55877/cc.vol19.26

Yeh, D., & Barber, T. (2024). Reframing focus groups as deep collective and (sometimes) collaborative conversations: Biographical vulnerabilities, anti-racist East and Southeast Asian solidarities and protective silences. In: Nurse, L., O'Neill, M., & Moran, L. (eds.) *Biographical research and new social architectures: Challenges and opportunities for creative applications across Europe* (pp. 141–161). Bristol, UK: Policy Press. Available: https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/33669/ (viewed 31.10.2025.)

Zabihzadeh, A., Mazaheri, M.A., Hatami, J., Nikfarjam, M.R., Panaghi, L., & Davoodi, T. (2019). Cultural differences in conceptual representation of "Privacy": A comparison between Iran and the United States. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 159(4), 357–370. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2018.1493676

Zabko, O. (2024). Revising the researcher's 'borders': The narrator demands expansion of the researcher's 'presence' in storytelling. In: Nurse, L., O'Neill, M., & Moran, L. (eds.) *Biographical research and new social architectures: Challenges and opportunities for creative applications across Europe* (pp. 162–179). Bristol, UK: Policy Press. https://doi.org/10.51952/9781447368922.ch009