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i. **Clarification of Terms**

Indigenous Peoples are the tribal peoples in independent countries whose distinctive identity, values, and history distinguishes them from other sections of the national community. Indigenous Peoples are the descendants of the original or pre-colonial inhabitants of a territory or geographical area and despite their legal status, retain some or all of their social, economic, cultural and political institutions.

This review will use the terms “Indigenous”, “Aboriginal”, “Native”, “Indian”, and “First Nations” interchangeably. These terms refer to the first peoples of Canada and, with the exception of “First Nations” which generally refers to Indians who have “status” under the Indian Act, are inclusive of Indians as defined in the Canadian constitution – that is to say, Indian, Inuit, and Metis people.

The term “Western” refers to a mind-set, a worldview that is a product of the development of European culture and diffused into other nations like North America. According to Means (1980) “people are not genetically encoded to hold this outlook; they are acculturated to hold it” (cited in Graveline, 1998, p.23). As the “dominant meaning system” Western discourse is the primary expression of that culture (Minnich, 1990). It is the comprehensive repository of the Western experience that wills into being intellectual, political, economic, cultural, and social constructs of Western society and is therefore embedded within all the standing disciplines of the Western academy. Graveline (1998) clarifies that although the terms “European, Western, and White may be used interchangeably, it is not the race that is targeted” (p. 23) and Stuart Hall (1992) articulates for us that the “West is an idea or concept, a language for imagining a set of complex stories, ideas, historical events and social relationships” (cited in Smith, 1999b:42). ‘Western’ is representative of an “archive of knowledge and systems, rules and values” extracted from and characteristic of Europe and the Western hemisphere (Smith, 1999b, p. 42).

Eurocentrism is the notion that European civilization, or the “West”, has some special quality of mind, race, culture, environment, or historical advantage which gives this human community a permanent superiority over all other communities (Blaut, 1993). These qualities would seem to confer on this community the special duty of advancing and modernizing the rest of the world. Blaut (1993) continues, “the really crucial part of Eurocentrism is not a matter of attitudes in the sense of values and prejudices, but rather a matter of science, and scholarship, and informed and expert opinion” (p. 9). Henderson (2000b) states that Eurocentrism is a “dominant intellectual and educational movement that postulates the superiority of Europeans over non-Europeans…it has been the dominant artificial context for the last five centuries and is an integral part of scholarship, opinion, and law” (p. 58). Although understanding that Eurocentrism has a complex nature, Blaut succinctly states that. “Eurocentrism is quite simply the colonizer’s model of the world” (p. 10).

The term “Community” will be used to refer to the system of relationships within Indigenous societies in which the nature of person-hood is identified. This system of relationships not only includes family, but also extends to comprise the relationships of human, ecological and spiritual origin. Community is a structure of support mechanisms that include the personal responsibility for the collective and reciprocally, the collective concern for individual existence.
Cajete (1994) suggests “community is the place where the forming of the heart and face of the individual as one of the people is most fully expressed” (p. 164). It is the primary expression of a natural context and environment where exists the fundamental right of person-hood to be what one is meant to be. Movement within this community context allows individuals to discover all there is to discover about one-self. In a sense, community is participatory thought in action.
1.0 Executive Summary

It is a positive development that the research institutes, which include the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the Social Sciences and Humanities Council, and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Council (hereafter “the three granting agencies”), are engaging in their own process of critical reflection and are attempting to revise research guidelines and policies to reflect a greater sensitivity to Indigenous knowledge and the rights of Indigenous communities. This literature review is intended to inform the process of review and revision of ethical policies for research involving Aboriginal peoples by synthesizing relevant literature and applying a critical gaze to the three granting agencies’ current policy statement. At the outset, we state emphatically that this review does not represent the views of all Indigenous Peoples in Canada. The content and orientation of this review represents the collective ideas and directions of focus of the authors and the review is intended to contribute a small piece toward the collective expression of Indigenous research ethics in Canada. Working at “ground zero” in Aboriginal health research has provided the Indigenous Peoples’ Health Research Centre (IPHRC) staff with insights and understandings that are not readily available to academics who are often removed, physically, culturally, socioeconomically, and politically from the participants in their research, particularly when the participants are Aboriginal. The lead author of the IPHRC team is a Cree speaker who is steeped in his culture and lives within his historical community. The co-lead and one research assistant are both urban Aboriginal individuals with strong ties to their communities of origin and who have in-depth knowledge of their cultural foundations. The non-Aboriginal participants on the review team have a wealth of experience locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally with Indigenous Peoples as well as in the areas of research and Indigenous research ethics.

In the last few years, Canada’s research granting agencies have endeavored to revise the Tri-Council Policy Statement regarding the ethical conduct of research involving humans. In the spring of 2004, the Interagency Advisory Panel on Research Ethics (PRE) called for input in the form of literature reviews from Aboriginal research organizations across the country. The Indigenous Peoples’ Health Research Centre (IPHRC) in Saskatchewan responded to the call and undertook to summarize the current state of the art in Aboriginal health research ethics. As an Indigenous, community-based health research organization with a mandate to build health research capacity in the Aboriginal community in Saskatchewan, the collective experience and knowledge of the IPHRC review team combine to provide a unique perspective of the current debate on Aboriginal research ethics.

The following summarizes the recommendations arising from the core issues explored in the literature review. This document asserts a primary recommendation that the granting agencies endeavor to incorporate the notion of the ethical space as a framework for the emergence of a new paradigm for research with Aboriginal people.

- The jurisdiction of Indigenous Peoples over their culture, heritage, knowledge, and political and intellectual domains must be explicitly recognized in the Tri-Council Policy Statement. Appropriate mechanisms need to be established by the three granting agencies in concert with Indigenous authorities for the approval and review of research proposals involving Indigenous Peoples.
Further conceptual development needs to take place in regards to an ethical space as the appropriate venue for the expression of an ethical research order that contemplates crossing cultural borders. The conceptual development of the ethical space will require guideline principles put into effect by the three granting agencies that cement practices of dialogue, negotiation, and research agreements with Indigenous authorities in any research involving Indigenous Peoples.

In recognition of Indigenous jurisdiction, research agreements need to be negotiated and formalized with authorities of various Indigenous jurisdictions before any research is conducted with their people.

Empowerment and benefits must become central features of any research entertained and conducted with respect to Indigenous Peoples. Governments, international organizations and private institutions should support the development of educational, research and training centers which are controlled by Indigenous communities, and strengthen these communities’ capacity to document, protect, teach and apply all aspects of their heritage.

Ongoing efforts by scholars and political groups to formulate the parameters of national copyright laws and the protection of Indigenous Peoples’ intellectual and cultural property rights must take extreme urgency. Protection and recognition of Indigenous peoples’ intellectual and cultural property rights by researchers and institutions must be part and parcel of any funding received from the three granting agencies.

Indigenous Peoples must also exercise control over all research conducted within their territories, or which uses their peoples as subjects of study. This includes the ownership, control, access, and possession of all data and information obtained from research involving Indigenous Peoples.

Understanding Indigenous social structures and systems, and the role of education in the process of knowledge and cultural transmission, is a vital necessity in coming to terms with research involving Indigenous Peoples. Education in these respects must be supported with appropriate funding and resources.

Professional associations of scientists, engineers and scholars, in collaboration with Indigenous Peoples, should sponsor seminars and disseminate publications to promote ethical conduct in conformity with these guidelines and develop processes and structures to discipline members who act in contravention.

Steps must be taken to immediately implement policy that will ameliorate inherent conflicts between Research Ethics Board policies and Indigenous ethical requirements, the primary example being the barriers to meaningful negotiation of consent and research parameters on the part of community participants prior to the receipt of formal approval from institutional Research Ethics Boards.
2.0 Introduction

Western knowledge, with its flagship of research, has often advanced into Indigenous Peoples’ communities with little regard for the notions of Indigenous worldviews and self-determination in human development. As a result, the history of Westernization in virtually all locations of the globe reads like a script of relentless disruption and dispossession of Indigenous Peoples with the resulting common pattern of cultural and psychological discontinuity for many in the Indigenous community. As the same script is replayed from nation to nation, reaction by Indigenous academics and other critics of the West will vary. Critique of research processes serves as a ray of hope that the intellectual community is not oblivious to impacts of a research regime that operates solely from a Western standpoint on the Indigenous community.

There exists a growing body of perceptive writings that provides new avenues of thought in decolonizing the research process. Indigenous scholars, with the professional support of non-Indigenous critical analysts from many Western institutions, contribute a much-needed injection of academic guidance in these matters of research. This critical reading of the literature is intended to highlight the body of dissension expressed by various critics to the nature and ethics of research involving Indigenous Peoples. In the first section of this report, a survey of the concerns reveals the broad scope of critique that stands as a testimony to the ethical breaches in the history of research involving Indigenous Peoples in North America and many parts of the globe. Further reading identifies crucial aspects in the research enterprise that, in their present configuration, have a cumulative bearing on the ethical issues and concerns expressed about research involving Indigenous Peoples, and point the way to an ethical order of research. Although at times, this work may be interpreted as another piece of rhetoric protesting the invasion and exploitation of Indigenous people, we understand that the Indigenous perspective must be stated resolutely, explicitly, and unequivocally. History has proven that the collective ‘voice’ of Indigenous resistance must be loud and long in order to have grievances redressed and effective change implemented. Despite the unpalatable nature of colonial history and the neocolonial present to the academy, Indigenous people experience those realities daily. While it may be difficult to read about the realities of Indigenous Peoples, it is without a doubt more difficult to live those realities.

With these issues in mind, Indigenous peoples are now poised to assert the Indigenous perspective on research and reclaim a voice that contributes to the dismantling of an old order of research practice. The old order of research – positivist, empirical, and driven by the agenda of the academy, has not served Indigenous populations whose interests are currently geared towards surviving and thriving through self-determination and control over resources including cultural and knowledge resources. The shift to new paradigms of research is the result of the decolonization agenda that has as a principle goal, the amelioration of disease and the recovery of health and wellness for Indigenous populations. The emerging paradigms utilize Indigenous knowledge and worldview for the development of the ethical foundations of research. The Indigenous Peoples’ Health Research Centre (IPHRC), one among several newly developed Aboriginal Capacity and Developmental Research Environments (ACADRE) centres across Canada, strives to adhere to an Indigenous ethical foundation in its work. This review, therefore, draws heavily upon the practical experiences of the work of the Centre to articulate the Indigenous perspective of research ethics. We anticipate that this dialogue from the research margins will help usher in a new research relationship that is modeled on emancipation and a human vision of transformation.
The format of the literature review will include a discussion of methodology and theoretical orientation, an overview of the relevant literature, an assessment of trends in research ethics, an examination of the current coverage and gaps in the three granting agencies policy statement, and recommendations for the development of Section 6 of that statement dealing with research involving Aboriginal peoples. Thematic and annotated bibliographies are attached as appendices to this review.

3.0 Methodology

The initial search process for this literature review involved compiling sources from the research team and using these bibliographies as springboards to further literature. Sources were compiled from grey literature, academic literature, and Internet literature. The Alberta ACADRE was particularly helpful, supplying the team with an extensive bibliography that they had already compiled. We encountered several challenges in accessing grey literature and this is elaborated upon in this report.

The research assistants conducted searches at the University of Regina, the University of Saskatchewan, the University of Calgary, and the First Nations University of Canada using various university database search engines including the expanded Academic ASAP database, Academic Search Premier, Webspirs, and Proquest dissertation search engine. Search strings included: Research methods, Participatory research, Action research, Community-based research, Social Science research, Anthropology research, Health research, Ethnography, Epidemiology, Biomedical research, Archaeology research, Museum, Scientific research, Responsible research, Genetic research, Research ethics, Ethical research, Ethical guidelines, Ethic guidelines, Ethical space, Recommendations, Case study, bioethics, informed consent, Confidentiality, Decolonization, Role + researcher, Role + community, Benefits, TEK (Traditional Ecological Knowledge), Land Use and Occupancy Studies; Intellectual property rights, Cultural Property, Human rights, Non-governmental agencies + role, Collective ownership, Ownership, Circumpolar, Postcolonial theory, Eurocentrism, Race, Western paradigm, Western model, Western thought, Orientalism, Colonialism, Colonization, Imperialism, Critical theory, Indigenous studies, Native Studies, Indian Studies, Native education, History, Indigenous paradigms, Indigenous methodologies, Indigenous knowledge, Local knowledge, Traditional knowledge, Sacred Knowledge, Indigenous researchers, Indigenous perspectives, Native perspectives, Aboriginal perspectives; Indigenous, Aboriginal, First Nations, Native Inuit, Maori, Indian.

The compiled literature was then reviewed and appraised for its value to this review. The research assistants annotated articles deemed relevant for the review and within the time constraints allowed. Thematic bibliographies were prepared based on these criteria as a way to meaningfully compare and contrast different sources and perspectives. These are attached as Appendix I. A comprehensive annotated bibliography is attached as Appendix II.

Bogdan & Biklen (1998) state, “people do not reason or conceptualize outside of the self’s location in a specific historical time and body; hence, this [postmodern] perspective emphasizes interpretation and writing as central features of research” (p. 21). This point is particularly relevant with respect to the theoretical approach of the team given their cultural backgrounds and
experiences; the location of the reviewers being a primarily Indigenous context or an Indigenous academic working environment. We chose to emphasize literature resources written by Indigenous writers and other critics from different countries to demonstrate the degree of concern about ethics in research that involves Indigenous Peoples.

Aspects of primary research, such as individual researcher perspectives, are used to present community views and aspects of knowledge stemming from the Indigenous experience and the oral tradition, inasmuch as the authors can speak about these issues, acknowledging that the words represent their own experiences and perspectives. These serve to highlight not only the differences of perspectives, but also to make the statement that not all knowledge and viewpoints have been recorded, particularly as they are embedded in the oral tradition of the Indigenous community.
4.0 Theoretical Framework

4.1 Historical context

There is an existing body of scholarship by Indigenous Peoples and various other social critics that questions the ethics of research involving Indigenous Peoples brought on by misguided interests, motivations, and assumptions of an old order of scholarship. Various disciplines within the Western academy are implicated in embodying various types of research practices and knowledge claims that contribute to these concerns about ethics. Some of the disciplines that are implicated in concerns include anthropology (Cove, 1995; Barsh, 1996), archaeology (Yellowhorn, 1996; Lewis & Bird Rose, 1985), psychology (Darou, Hum, & Kurtness, 1993), American Indian history (Fixico, 1998), and the social sciences more generally (Deloria, 1980, 1991). Similarly, problems in different contexts and levels of research involving Indigenous Peoples have been discussed: including northern Canadian research (Usher, 1994; Gamble 1986), Cree People (Darou, Hum & Kurtness), Maori (Bishop, 1994; L. Smith, 1999a, 1999), Greenlandic Inuit (Peterson, 1982), Ecuador (Kothari, 1997), Saami-Norwegian (Larson, 1988), and Indigenous Peoples generally (Smith, 1999b). Furthermore, Indigenous communities in many parts of the globe are reminding and openly challenging the research community (Smith, 1999a, 1999b) to be wary of research practices based on exploitation, racism, ethnocentricity, and harmfulness. These practices, where and whenever they have surfaced in the Indigenous community have undermined Indigenous Peoples’ empowerment and self-dependence.

Historically, the means to finding answers to questions about Native people involved the application of qualitative and quantitative projects on willing or unwilling Native people. With the voicing of resistance beginning in the early 1970s, Native scholars and writers have criticized the imposition of Western research on Native populations (Peacock, 1996; Gilchrist, 1997; Barden & Boyer, 1993; Mihesuah, 1993; St. Denis, 1992; Deloria, 1991; Red Horse, Johnson, & Weiner, 1989) and mainstream institutions have recognized and acknowledged that research needed to become more ethically sound, especially for ‘vulnerable subjects’ such as racial minorities (DHEW – Belmont Report, 1976). For the most part, Native people have viewed research with suspicion and hostility as something intrusive, exploitative, and unethical. Researchers have been viewed as intruders and predators (Trimble, 1977; Maynard, 1974) inaccurately representing Indigenous ways of life. Peacock (1996) points out that a large portion of Indigenous culture and history consists of information recounted by researchers and anthropologists that is comprised of non-Native perceptions of Native people and culture. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that Indigenous people, tired of being studied, passively resisted researchers with untruths and deliberately fictitious information (Sinclair, 2003; Peacock, 1996; Swisher, 1993; Stoller & Olkes, 1987; Trimble, 1977).

Among the most repugnant aspects of Western research for Native people in the historical context, has been the emphasis of research on negative social issues; described as the application of a pathologizing lens. The problematic of this issue are elaborated on in Section 5.2 below; however, briefly, Indigenous people argue that research, which has primarily focused on social disarray and pathos, is evidence of a perspective of “deficiency” whereby Native people and their lives are pathologized (Bishop, 1997; Sue & Sue, 1990; Peacock, 1996; Poupart, Martinez, Red
Horse, & Scharnberg, 2000; Sinclair, 2003). These skewed representations are taken for truth and disseminated as the true history and social conditions of Native people. The consequence is that “…a combination of inaccurate research, inadequate education, slanted media coverage, and dehumanizing stereotypes make even the most ‘educated’ professional grossly uninformed about American Indian life and culture” (Poupart, Martinez, Red Horse, & Scharnberg, 2000, p.15). The backlash by Native people to research, has extended to all research projects and all researchers, Native or non-Native, and manifests in contemporary resistance to even insider research. Bands and organizations are immediately suspicious of research inquiries and more researchers are experiencing the knee-jerk negative response to their requests. One Indigenous researcher never uses the word “research”, favouring benign terms such as “project” (Sinclair, 2003). This is discussed more fully in Section 6.4 below.

Resistance to the history of outsider research has resulted in a body of literature by Native and non-Native scholars who are making recommendations and suggestions as to how research can be made more relevant and applicable to Native people. One research milieu that incorporates the means to address social inequity is found in participatory action research (PAR). The participatory action research approach to community issues is a culturally relevant and empowering method for Indigenous people in Canada and worldwide as it critiques the ongoing impact of colonization, neocolonialism and the force of marginalization (Brant Castellano, 1993; Davis & Reid, 1999; Dickson, 2000; Haig-Brown & Dennenmann, 2000; Hudson, 1982; Lockhard & McCaskill, 1986; Macaulay, Delormier, McComber, Cross, Potvin, et al., 1999; Ryan & Robinson, 1990; Severtson, Bauman, & Will, 2002). Government and institutional research and intervention have failed because Western methods have historically exploited Native people and results have often been used to perpetuate the status quo (Davis & Reid, 1999; Wax, 1977). Participatory action research gives a voice to the oppressed and marginalized, and the methods and processes promote empowerment, inclusivity, and respect (Dickson & Green, 2001; Green, George, Daniel, Frankish, Herbert, et al., 1995; Webster & Nabigon, 1993; Jackson, 1993; Castleden, 1992; Castellano, 1986; Hudson, 1982). Most importantly, this approach serves to deconstruct the Western positivist research paradigm that is, and has always been, antithetical to Indigenous ways of coming to knowledge on many levels; theoretically, cognitively, practically, and spiritually (Haig-Brown & Dennenmann, 2000; Lockhart & McCaskill, 1986). PAR can, therefore, be quite significant to the inclusion of Indigenous epistemology in the discourse of research.

Concurrent with the PAR movement has been the movement towards “insider” research which is research conducted by a member of the target population (Swisher, 1993). In the Indigenous context, this means Indigenous researchers conducting research. By contrast, ‘outsider’ research would characterize much of the history of research on Aboriginal populations; non-Aboriginal researchers engaging in primarily bench science research on Aboriginal people. Contemporarily, research is tending towards insider research or research that takes place in collaboration with Aboriginal people. Research with Indigenous populations can be currently characterized as primarily qualitative, participatory, collaborative, and community-based. It tends towards certain criteria; the research team includes one or more members of the target population in a meaningful role, and there is Native involvement in the design and delivery of research (Macaulay, Delormier, McComber, Cross, Potvin et al., 1999; Macaulay, Delormier, McComber, Cross, Potvin, et al., 1998; Day, Blue, & Peake Raymond, 1998; Anderson, 1996; Bishop, 1996a; Barden & Boyer, 1993; Swisher, 1993), usefulness and benefit of the research to the community is
explicit (Benjamin, 2000; Kothari, 1997; Peacock, 1996; Michell, 1999), research is culturally relevant (Steinhauer, 2002; Weber-Pillwax, 2001; Hudson & Taylor-Henley, 2001; Weaver, 1997; Red Horse, 1993; Trimble & Medicine, 1976), and research is characterized by collaboration and partnership (Gibbs, 2001; Haig-Brown, 2000; Barnes, 2000; Moewaka Barnes, 2000a; Chrisman, 1999; Gibson & Gibson, 1999; Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker, 1998; McQueen, 1998; Macaulay, 1993; Mohatt, 1989).

Most recently, we see the emergence of Indigenous research paradigms founded upon Indigenous worldview, knowledge and protocols (Smylie, Kaplan-Myrth, Tait, C, Martin, C. M., Chartrand, et al, 2004; Brant Castellano, 2004; Sinclair, 2003; Steinhauer, 2002; Pidgeon & Hardy Cox, 2002; Pihama, Cram, & Walker, 2002; Martin, 2001; Wilson, 2001a, 2001b; Moewaka Barnes, 2000b; VicHealth, 2000; Graveline, 2000; Smith, 1999a, 1999b; Nabigon, Hagey, Webster, & MacKay, 1999; McCormick, 1998; Bishop, 1998; Meyer, 1998; Hermes, 1997; Collins & Poulson, 1991). There is little distinction to be made between Canada, the United States, and Australia/New Zealand in regard to research founded on Indigenous knowledge. It is clear from the literature that Maori scholars are in the forefront of the discourse, but a critical mass, with respect to research issues and Indigenous peoples, has been reached worldwide. Native people are no longer willing to act as passive recipients of research activities while non-Native researchers reap the benefits of the research and bear little to no responsibility for how the findings are used or the consequences (Deloria, 1991; Swisher, 1993). As Peacock (1996) stated, “One of the canons of good research is that it should never hurt the people studied” (p.6).

A current manifestation of Indigenous resistance to outsider research is found in the post-1996 trend toward guidelines and research agreements in any research pertaining to Indigenous Peoples (Global Coalition, 2002; Hurtado, Hill, Kaplan, & Lancaster, 2001; Meijer-Drees, 2001; AIATSIS, 2000; Council of Yukon First Nations, 2000; Eades, Read & Bibbulung Gnarneep Team, 1999; Aurora Research Institute, 1998; Donovan & Spark, 1997; RCAP, 1997; Kowalsky, Verhoef, Thurston, & Rutherford, 1996). Guidelines such as the Akwesasne: Protocol for Review of Environmental and Scientific Research Proposals (1996), and the Mi’kmaq Research Principles and Guidelines (2000) assert jurisdiction over community cultural resources and the rules of ethical research conduct within their territories. Other guidelines developed by Western researchers in consultation with Indigenous communities are designed to ensure respect of Indigenous cultural philosophies and adherence to Indigenous cultural protocols in research practice (Akwesasne, 1996; Kowalski, Thurston, Verhoef, & Rutherford, 1996; University of Victoria, 2001; Henderson, Simmons, Bourke, & Muir, 2002). The Ethical Principles for the Conduct of Research in the North (2003) significantly advances the notion of a renewed research relationship between researchers and communities. The guidelines are intended “to encourage partnerships between northern peoples and researchers that, in turn, will promote and enhance northern scholarship” (ACUNS, p. 4). The development of guidelines and the move towards research agreements are often embodied in Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) or research agreements developed by research teams. These are explored more fully in a later section.

Research with Indigenous peoples is predominantly within the qualitative genre because qualitative research frameworks, according to Denzin & Lincoln (2000) provide “congruence and cultural safety” for the tenets of Indigenous worldview. Secondly, Indigenous populations have yet to achieve a critical mass within the bench science disciplines in post-secondary education. For
these reasons, in this report the term ‘research’ is treated as a generic concept because it is perceived as “…an encounter between the West and the Other” (Smith, 1999b; p. 8). The ethical issues of research with Indigenous peoples are the same regardless of the research genre although the emphasis on issues of jurisdiction and protection may be heightened in quantitative research. For Indigenous Peoples, the term ‘research’ implicates and encompasses qualitative as well as quantitative genres of research as practiced in the hard sciences. Research has encroached upon Indigenous cultural property and natural resources manifested as knowledge of plants, herbs and other natural substances. Although attention has been directed towards the problems of quantitative research with Indigenous populations (Weijer & Emanuel, 2000; McDermott, 1998; Greely, 1996; DEHW, 1976) natural sciences and environmental research are specialized concerns that need to be explored further in terms of how they impact the ethics of Indigenous Peoples and the systems for living within their environments. Currently, Indigenous students are populating the disciplines of social sciences and humanities. No doubt, a critical mass of students in the hard sciences will be achieved through access programs and the growing emphasis on natural sciences in Indigenous community schools. Indeed, if the burgeoning statistics of Aboriginal students at MA and PhD levels are an indicator, the numbers of students in all disciplines will grow exponentially within a few short years. Indigenous researchers and communities will then have the opportunity to apply the ethics lessons currently being learned in the qualitative and community based research genres to the realm of quantitative research.

Denzin & Lincoln (2000) outline the various movements of qualitative research through the last several decades and list them as follows: “traditional (1900-1950); modernist (1950-1970); blurred genres (1970-1986); crisis of representation (1986-1990); post-modern, a period of experimental and new ethnographies (1990-1995); postexperimental (1995-2000); and the future, which is now (2000- )” (p.1063). The seventh moment, the authors describe, is defined by responsive research geared to the “moral imperatives” of the human community (p.1062). Contemporary research has, since the fifth movement of the mid-1980s been moving towards inclusivity of voice, worldview, and culture; issues of representation, the location of the “other” and other “ways of knowing” are central to this evolving qualitative discourse (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The more inclusive and respectful research becomes of other ways of knowing, the more applicable Western qualitative research is to Indigenous people, and Indigenous issues. The seventh movement, the “unknown terrain” of research, consists of space within the qualitative paradigm, in particular, where Indigenous theory and method are acknowledged as valuable. Denzin (2003) hints that the new era is influenced by feminist and postmodern theories, taking wisdom and guidance from the sacred epistemologies of Indigenous peoples; a pedagogy that will take into account humanity and other ways of knowing.

What was marked formerly by the firm and rigid shapes of a Eurocentric geometry is now the fluid, shape-shifting image of chemical flux and transformation, as margins move to the center, the center moves to the margins, and the whole is reconstituted again in some new form. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p.1063).

Research has historically drawn “upon frameworks, processes and practices of colonial, Western worldviews and the inherent knowledge, methods, morals and beliefs” (Martin, 2001, p.2). Indigenous theories on the other hand, “challenge the hegemony of Western theoretical
production” (Pillai, 1996, p. 218). Challenging research hegemony involves understanding colonial history, and ensuring that research has practical applications that empower and liberate the people through practical and ameliorative results; which, in contemporary Indigenous contexts, means engaging in the decolonization agenda. The important point to be made is that, given the context of colonization and colonialism, the research agenda for Aboriginal people is very specifically directed towards the amelioration of the impact of those dynamics. In the contemporary context, the research agenda comprises political, emancipatory, and ameliorative objectives (Sinclair, 2003).

In research where Indigenous people control their own agenda, the spiritual and philosophical foundations provide the platform from which research activities unfold. The research agenda is based upon a specific philosophical foundation, is motivated by specific political origins in colonization, and is focused on tangible, practical outcomes that will serve the Indigenous community. Indigenous research is postcolonial research, described by Chatterji (2001) as “liberatory practice within postcolonial contexts…[that] seeks to create knowledge relevant to the communities is purports to serve” (p.1). In the postcolonial context, research engages forces to address colonial problematics and confront existing relations of power. The concept of the ethical space provides a venue within which to articulate the possibilities and challenges of bringing together different ways of coming to knowledge and applying this theory to the practice of research.

4.2 The Foundation of the Ethics Problem

Despite the intellectual efforts of many people to create an ethical order in research involving Indigenous Peoples, for example by developing ethical guidelines, many of the same critiques remain. Issues such as the appropriation of knowledge, and collective versus individual ownership of knowledge remain unclear. Understanding Western social and systems, and the role of education in the process of knowledge and cultural transmission and how they impact cross-cultural relations, is a necessity in coming to terms with Indigenous research. A desire to understand the intellectual undercurrents of unequal power relations and the issues of knowledge contexts brings clarity to the foundation of the ethics problem.

a. Unequal Power Relations

Indigenous Peoples’ considerations regarding the Western research enterprise include the identification of the various pitfalls and snares that exist in the dominant forms of knowledge production and dissemination. The point of contention is that an archaic order of thought can continue to influence university research in a manner that can be recognized by some as the operation of a “time lagged colonial moment” (Bhabha, 1994). This Western body of knowledge unleashed to the world as the singular world consciousness and evolutionary history that presents itself as all encompassing and impartial has grown into an intellectual knowledge system that is now known as Eurocentrism. There is increasing recognition that Western values, motivations and interests, in an alliance with the conditioned diffusion of Eurocentricity, still define formulations to better collect, classify, and represent Indigenous Peoples in amassing its knowledge of human society through the research enterprise. In the pursuit of this objective, subtle claims of a
centralized authority and a single narrative of history positioned in the Western world are postulated as the basic guiding principles of conducting valid and recognized research. In this sense, Shiva (1993) theorizes in *Monocultures of the Mind* that:

The first level of violence unleashed on local systems of knowledge is not to see them as knowledge. This invisibility is the first reason why local systems collapse without trial and test when confronted with the knowledge of the dominant west. The distance itself removes local systems from perception. When local knowledge does appear in the field of the globalising vision, it is made to disappear by denying it the status of a systemic knowledge, and assigning it the adjectives ‘primitive’ and ‘unscientific’” (p. 10).

As Blaut (1993) also challenges, Europeans collected and used information taken from Indigenous Peoples to meet their own needs, “explaining and justifying the individual’s act of conquest, of repression, of exploitation. All of it was right, rational, and natural” (p. 26). This unilateral assumption of a universal model of research with a central authority in knowledge production largely went unchallenged until Indigenous Peoples started to create a discourse around such practices. For Indigenous Peoples, these practices of research were reminiscent of all other experiences with colonialism and imperialism in the West’s drive for dominance and where Eurocentrism was imposed as the appropriate and only vision of the universal. Central to the issue of a singular world consciousness postulated by Eurocentric discourses is the particular discursive strategies and socially determined practices that engender a universal model of human society.

Herein lies one of the faulty generalizations of Eurocentric discourses in identifying and establishing humans of a particular kind as the most significant of all peoples and ones who can set standards for all the rest of humanity (Minnich, 1990). This form of cultural narcissism in the West is postulated as universalism. The principles or objectives of this Enlightenment dream of universalism are such that “one category/kind comes to function almost as if it were the only kind, because it occupies the defining center of power...casting all others outside the circle of the ‘real’” (Minnich, 1990:53). The same society also has discourses that have embedded paradigms and content that puts forward the Western world as a model of progressive humanity that is evolving into higher states of truth where its knowledge can encompass all there is to understand and know in the world. Battiste and Henderson (1998) remind us, “Eurocentrism resists change while it continues to retain a persuasive intellectual power in academic and political realms” (p. 23). In this praxis, Indigenous and other minority peoples, along with their knowledge, are relegated to the periphery as some form of lesser existence. Accordingly, Noël (1994), in his work *Intolerance* suggests:

Whatever the field of thought or the activity considered, the established discourse puts the dominator forward as the ideal model of humanity and thereby justifies the subordinate relationship that the dominated is called upon to maintain with him. These dynamics are at work in learning, art, and language and derive from the official interpretation of the constraints imposed by History, Nature, and even God (p. 45).
These European systems, rules, and values that make up the Western worldview and are espoused as the only reality in the world lack concepts by which the experiences and reality of other cultures can be justly named, described, and understood. People with other intellectual traditions and knowledge are welcome in this milieu, of course, but their knowledge can only occupy a secondary or marginal position in relation to the West. This is due to the social-systemic structuring of institutions and what is conceived as appropriate knowledge within a colonialistic framework. Therefore, adherence to the structures of knowledge production that are complicit in intolerance are not relevant for the pursuit of emancipation. These systems of education will, in effect, prescribe the recreation of the very social conditions that marginalize Indigenous Peoples.

Modes of research prescribed from this ‘archive’ of established Eurocentric thought are a continuing concern for Indigenous Peoples because informational resources derive from “Europeans with very definite points of view, cultural, political, and religious lenses that forced them to see ‘Natives’ in ways that were highly distorted” (Blaut, 1993:24). An old-world order with a narcissistic set of values and principles really does not correspond well with Indigenous Peoples’ worlds because of the different interpretations of reality.

b. Knowledge Context

Henderson (2000b), an avid critic of Eurocentricity, has argued that an ‘imaginality’ exists within Eurocentric thought that rests upon assumptions that an elitist population can be the sole and privileged representative of truth and total human knowledge. The illusion of Western dominance mirrored in the structure of knowledge in the Western world, as brokered by university education, can also be properly called an artificial context because of its disengagement not only from reality but also from the lived experiences of a vast majority of people. Roberto Unger (1987), explains that artificial contexts are the social worlds others have imagined, built, and inhabited, and result from the “lawlike forces that have supposedly brought these worlds into being” (p.5). He contends that if a context allows people to move within it to discover everything about the world freely, it is a natural context. If the context does not allow such movement, it is artificial. For Indigenous Peoples, there has historically been very little room to maneuver within the devised structure of the dominant systems, much less discover everything they could about the world from its limited and restrictive knowledge milieu. This may be understandable because these social worlds that Unger speaks about are built from the deep roots of Western education where the role and perspectives of the Christian Church are inextricably linked. These institutions have occupied a major role in the colonization and imperialism in Indigenous Peoples’ life-worlds.

The body of critique that has latched on to this artificial context of the West also highlights the incapacity of this body to engage in alternate perspectives to find value in multiple and inclusive forms of knowledge as alternate possibilities in social organization. This is, ironically, most evident in attempts to deconstruct dominant paradigms using only the tools and perspectives of that paradigm because they are the only ones available and deemed valuable. Within this repressive approach to human knowledge, minority populations such as Indigenous Peoples, women, the aged, and the handicapped are discursively constructed and have a caged existence that remains invisible and powerless when compared to the mythical norms established in the Western world. This promotion of certain elitist values and interests in Western thought makes
questionable the validity and relevance of any generated knowledge that is assumed to represent the rest of humanity.

There is a danger in discourses and scholarship being grounded in the artificial context. Individuals within the society may recognize the systemic flaws latent in the body of Western knowledge and aspire to check the inequities that colonial discourse creates, but the forged systems that uphold the knowledge system have an embedded doctrine that is largely resistant to resistance itself. The problem with the Eurocentric text is that it goes on telling the same thing forever even in face of new knowledge. Minnich (1990) states that, “old assumptions, built into our modes of thought, our standards of judgment, our institutions and systems, keep inappropriate discrimination functioning long after many have consciously and seriously renounced, even denounced it (p. 18). The perpetuation of intolerant discourses built upon ideals of Eurocentricity and mystified as high knowledge may be a truly classic scheme of colonization in itself. These discourses portray Indigenous Peoples as impervious to the processes of colonization and imperialism. The danger with such messages of Indigenous acquiescence portrayed by dominant discourses is that they derail larger issues of Indigenous Peoples’ political, economic, and historical claims to identity, land, and intellectual and cultural property rights.

In terms of research, the ‘center’ that is presented as the standard and norm of society and which Indigenous Peoples’ worldviews are compared to usually refers to “white, middle class culture” (Darou, et. al. 1993). This cultural comparison, often used inadvertently in research projects, is inappropriate and can have a negative outcome for Indigenous Peoples because it assumes that the same terms of reference for understanding Eurocentric life are applicable to Indigenous Peoples. Indigenous Peoples do not have to dig deep to uncover instances of how ethnocentric comparisons depreciate or totally misrepresent the reality and value of Indigenous cultures, history and knowledge. According to Smith (1999b), “the negation of Indigenous views of history was a critical part of asserting colonial ideology, partly because such views were regarded as clearly ‘primitive’ and ‘incorrect’ and mostly because they have challenged and resisted the mission of colonization” (p. 29). The established norms of knowledge production and dissemination originating from this dominant culture fail to account for Indigenous Peoples’ worldviews and history and thereby circumvent Indigenous Peoples’ claims to intellectual and cultural property rights. Claims to knowledge and the protection of these intellectual products have been framed within Western concepts of property and rules of knowledge production. Henderson (1987) explains the crux of the problem: “to assume that the Aboriginal past or knowledge can be adequately explained from a totally foreign worldview is the essence of cognitive imperialism and academic colonization” (p. 23). This is essentially the context that requires a critical makeover to ensure research involving Indigenous Peoples is pursued from a context of ethical practice.

4.3 The Ethical Space

Roger Poole (1972) coined the term ‘ethical space’ in his book *Towards Deep Subjectivity* to identify an abstract space that frames an area of encounter and interaction of two entities with different intentions. The framework method for this examination is in the notion of constructing an ethical space. Therefore, the intent of this section is to examine the space between the Indigenous and Western worlds, the separation betwixt cultures and worldviews, as the schism of understanding that contributes to the tension riddled enterprise of cross cultural research involving
Indigenous Peoples. These worldviews are each formed and guided by distinct histories, knowledge traditions, values, interests, and social, economic, and political realities that are brought to the encounter of the two solitudes. Creating contrast, by purposefully dislocating and isolating two disparate knowledge systems and cultures represented by the Indigenous and Western worlds is pursued in the interest of identifying and bringing perspective to the current research context. This contrast provides a perspective to a space between entities that lends itself to clarity about the issues and themes of divergence and convergence in the examination of the ethics in research involving Indigenous Peoples. With the proposed identification of the contrasting perspectives, the intent is to reconnect the entities with the notion of a bridging concept called the ‘ethical space.’ This review attempts this bridging exercise by first, identifying and explicating the elusive center, the notion of a dividing space, as the theoretical underpinning of a need for cross cultural linkage that is substantial and ethical. The idea of a divide, produced by contrasting perspectives of the world, entertains the notion of a space where an engaged dialogue sets the parameters for an agreement to interact along with the appropriate and ethical forms for that interaction.

According to Poole (1972), “there are two sorts of space because there are two sorts of intentions. The intentions structure the space in two different ways. When the two sets of intentions…confront each other…then ethical space is set up instantaneously” (p.5). More recently, Ermine (2000) further developed that analogy of a space between two entities, as a space between the Indigenous and Western spheres of culture and knowledge relative to research issues. In his M.Ed. thesis The Ethics of Research Involving Indigenous Peoples, Ermine’s (2000) perspective is that the affirmation for the existence of two objectivities, each claiming their own distinct and autonomous view of the world, and each holding a different account of what they are seeing across the cultural border, creates the urgent necessity for an understanding of what constitutes this cultural divide.

The idea of two spheres of knowledge, two cultures, each distinct from one another in multiple forms, needs to be envisioned since the distance also inspires an abstract, nebulous space of possibility. The in-between space, relative to cultures, is created by the recognition of the separate realities of histories, knowledge traditions, values, interests, and social, economic and political imperatives. The positioning of these two entities, divided by the void and flux of their cultural distance, and in a manner that they are poised to encounter each other, produces a significant and interesting notion that has relevance in research thought. The positioning of the two entities creates the urgent necessity for a neutral zone of dialogue. This neutral zone is the ethical space where a precarious and fragile window of opportunity exists for “critical conversations about democracy, race, gender, class, nation, freedom, and community.” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 1048). The specter of continuing tensions at the contested ground of research prompts the historical actors of both the West and Indigenous communities to seize the moment of possibility to create substantial, sustained and ethical/moral understanding between cultures. As Foucault (1988) states, “the things which seem most evident to us are always formed in the confluence and chances, during the course of a precarious and fragile human history.” (p. 37). The ethical space provides a paradigm for how, at the ‘confluence and chance’, people from disparate cultures, worldviews, and knowledges systems can engage in an ethical/moral manner as we work toward giving substance to what the ethical space entails.
The ‘ethical space’ is a concept, a process that unfolds, that is inclusive of a series of stages from dialogue to dissemination of results, each played out in many different codes and relationships at the level of research practice. As a process, the fundamental requirements of the ethical space include an affirmation of its existence. The ethical space cannot exist without this affirmation. The affirmation of the space indicates that there is an acceptance of a cultural divide and a direct statement of cultural jurisdictions at play. The ethical space also requires dialogue about intentions, values, and assumptions of the entities towards the research process. The dialogue leads to an agreement to interact across the cultural divide. With an agreement to interact, the particulars of cross cultural engagement, along with all the issues of the research process are negotiated towards an amicable research agreement between researchers and Indigenous communities.

These stages of the bigger, complete process, much of which needs further conceptualization, may be addressed by the three granting agencies. For example, the notion of jurisdiction implies that researchers obtain approval to do research in Indigenous communities from the appropriate tribal authorities. The three granting agencies may insist that any funding for research involving Indigenous Peoples obtain this written approval. A clear, concise outline of the dialogue process and discussion of the research issues need to become part of research proposals along with the cost implications of these processes accounted for.
5.0 Divergence – Issues and Analysis

The evolving nature of Indigenous Peoples’ experience is susceptible to being routed by Western discourses with their paradigms that stream understandings into scientific intellectualizations and validation processes. The danger for Indigenous Peoples in routing discourses exclusively into Western social doctrines is that the more inclusive context of the Indigenous Peoples’ experience and the right to name their own worlds will once again be marginalized. The ethics of research involving Indigenous Peoples contemplates the divergence of understanding and process between the West and Indigenous societies that lead to tension riddled issues in research interaction. The divergence is explored and illustrated by discussion of the prominent issues that have emerged from the literature.

5.1 Interpretation of Ethics

At first glance it would appear that culture and ethics are unrelated. But let me state that, in general, men and women conduct their affairs, enterprises and lives according to the values that they have derived from their cultural heritage. And because the values of each cultural heritage differ in some form and degree, there may at times be conflict. It becomes a matter of ethics when the resolution of cultural and value differences and conflicts is made to the advantage of one party and to the disadvantage, harm, and distress of another. (Johnston, cited in McKay, 1976, p.173).

Ethics are the values, principles, intentions, personal sense of responsibility, and self definition that guide behaviors, practices, and action towards others. Respect has been consistently used to underscore appropriate relationships and ways of understanding other historical actors of the universe. Giroux (1992) states that ethics is a “social discourse that refuses to accept needless human suffering and exploitation” (p. 74).

The language of ethics coming from Indigenous Peoples, scholars, and from the communities, indicates that the interpretation of ethics in one society may not necessarily be the ethics of another with a different worldview. Although acknowledgement of issues may converge, the interpretation of terms may be a crucial factor in how they impact the research process. Issues like benefits from research leave room for interpretation from the institutional perspective without regard to what benefits may mean to the community. In a study that examined ethical issues in research, Wax (1991) stated that:

[T]he investigators and the Indians do not share a common framework. While both researchers and researched have standards for assessing conduct, in most cases these standards are incommensurable, for the parties do not share a common moral vocabulary nor do they share a common vision of the nature of human beings as actors in the universe (p. 432).

For example, although the Tri-Council Policy Statement (hereafter TCPS (1998)) emphasizes that the cardinal principle of modern research ethics is “respect for human dignity”, much of the thought behind the principles to support this is couched in terms of fragmentation and
individualism that, paradoxically, serve to create and perpetuate unethical conduct, attitudes, and behaviours in the practice of research with Aboriginal people. Terms such as “principle respect for persons” and “free and informed consent by the subjects” illustrate this argument. For tribal communities, ‘respect’ is often gauged in the context of the collective. The Indigenous Peoples Council on Biocolonialism (2000) states that “Tribal ethic defines and perpetuates a communal identity, language, history and value systems, while Smith (1999b) articulates that ethical codes of conduct ‘serve partly the same purpose as the protocols which govern our relationships with each other and with the environment (p. 121). The desire for an ethical framework in the Aboriginal context is not to ‘return to the teepee’, rather, it is the restoring of order and balance to contemporary daily life which comes with the assertion of traditional values and ethics (Scott & Receveur, 1995; Brant Castellano, 2004). Ethics discourse encapsulates issues of power relations, individualism vs. collectivism, consent, benefit, jurisdiction, and representation. These issues converge and intertwine at multiple junctures. Here we explicate the issues as we understand at them beginning with a critique of power relations arising out of the colonial and neo-colonial relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people. The relationship provides the foundation out of which problematic ethics have evolved. Critiquing the relationship reveals how such an imbalance in power manifests in the hegemony of Western knowledge over all other knowledge systems and impacts on whether Indigenous thought is considered and valued.

5.2 Depiction of Aboriginal People in Research

Indigenous Peoples’ concerns about research include the reluctance of old order researchers to address issues of historical and social processes that contribute to the marginalization of Indigenous Peoples. The neglect of these processes in formulating research objectives plays an important role in biasing knowledge about Indigenous Peoples. For example, researchers trained in Western institutions do not have an adequate understanding of how dominant social systems interface with Indigenous communities and how these can affect cross-cultural research ethics. Researchers in this situation and with projects in Indigenous communities have tended to frame their research in ways that assume that the locus of a particular research concern is the individual or community rather than other social or structural issues that mitigate social conditions for Indigenous communities (Smith, 1999b). Seeing ‘problem’ in Indigenous Peoples is a central theme in imperial and colonial attempts to deal with Indigenous Peoples. As another control mechanism, the assigning of ‘problem’ on any dealings with Indigenous Peoples tactically realigns the focus away from the role of Western institutions and systems in creating the ‘problem’ in the first place. The result of this is that it creates an industry where the ‘Indigenous problem’ is mapped, described in all its different manifestations, getting rid of it, laying blame for it, talking about it, writing about it, and researching it (Smith, 1999b).

In other cases, researchers’ concerns and competition for allocated funding from government or industry are responsible for the negative depiction of Indigenous Peoples. The outcome of such intentions is the overt misrepresentation of Indigenous Peoples because “in the effort to secure grants for research or for services and programs, writers are driven toward magnifying and dramatizing the problems of the local community” (Wax, 1991, p. 433). In this sense, Smith (1999b) extends, “the word research is believed to mean, quite literally, the continued construction of Indigenous Peoples as the problem” (p.92). The ‘Indigenous problem’ is a
recurring theme in all imperial and colonial attempts to deal with Indigenous Peoples and this theme finds a comfortable home in old order research. “It originates within the wider discourses of racism, sexism, and other forms of positioning the Other” (Smith, 1999b; p. 90). Within these intolerant discourses, Indigenous peoples may find themselves described in derogatory terms regardless of the progress they believe they have made and see around them (Deloria, 1991). For Indigenous Peoples, all the knowledge that exists of Indigenous Peoples, all that is heard, seen and read in colonial ideologies and intolerant discourses is the result of “white interpretation of Aboriginal being” (cited in Fourmile, 1989, p. 4).

Negative images and attitudes about Indigenous Peoples, perpetuated and recreated through the scholarship of an established Eurocentric consciousness, continue to have influence well beyond their spatial and temporal origins. Deloria (1991) points out that “after the commotion has subsided, the book remains in the library where naïve and uninformed people will read it for decades to come…so they take the content of the book as proven and derive their knowledge of Indians from it” (p. 459). In this regard, “the public, politicians and policy makers have accepted the prepackaged images of who we are” and these images become influential in the conditions Indigenous Peoples are to encounter in broader society (King, 1989, p. 4). It is inconceivable that dominant research can meet the needs and aspirations of Indigenous Peoples because of the unresolved issues of Western self-perpetuation and its self-enclosed system that recreates and diffuses Western hegemony (Deloria, 1980). Reser & Barlow (1986) argue that research needs to be based upon people in varying and multiple living contexts and adjusted to the realities of those contexts, “rather than operating on cultural stereotypes which are not applicable” (p. vii). Creating the conditions that are respectful of the multiple readings of the world hinges on recognizing the limitations of an old order and going beyond the mechanisms that maintain that order. We emphatically concur with Giroux (1992) who states, “an ethical discourse needs to be taken up with regard to the relations of power, subject positions, and social practices it activates” (p. 74).

5.3 Scientific Discourse

One of the undercurrents that cause contention for Indigenous Peoples indeed has been how research is conducted within the perimeters of scientific thought and discourse. Smith (1999b) tells us that positivist science has a connectedness at the common sense level for those in society who “take for granted the hegemony of its methods and leadership in the search for knowledge” (p. 189). There is a concern though that Eurocentric assumptions pervade much of ‘scientific research’ because ideologies are sometimes smuggled in under the cover of devotion to the ideals of science (Sorbo, 1982). For example, objectivity is a tenet of Western science that is used to make claims that research involving Indigenous Peoples is done in an objective manner free of bias and misrepresentation. The conceptual validity of the detached observer in scientific research, if uncontested, would nevertheless harbor the ideological and value-laden perspectives of the researcher. As a specialist field of knowledge, a researcher is able to simply discard phenomena and data that do not fit their specialist area and still receive the stamp of scientific approval because it is ‘rational’.

Related to this is the influence of the Western scientific theory of evolution, which is used as a convenient framework for viewing minorities (Deloria, 1980). This framework leads to the documentation of differences in races in research data that leaves in its wake the creation or
reinforcement of negative stereotypes of Indigenous Peoples (Wax, 1977). In this regard, Duran and Duran (2000), in *Applied Postcolonial Clinical and Research Strategies*, propose that:

> The problem of irrelevant research and clinical practice would not be so destructive to Native American people if institutional racism did not pervade most of the academic settings for research and theoretical construction. These institutions not only discredit thinking that is not Western but also engage in practices that imply that people who do not subscribe to their worldviews are genetically inferior (p. 93).

This system of selectivity and validation of specific knowledge may be an appropriate method of Western knowledge production, but it fails on one crucial basis from the perspective of Indigenous Peoples. The validity of this ‘scientific’ knowledge only exists through the formal rules of individual scholarly disciplines and scientific paradigms and has not been triangulated to other systems of knowledge or to the natural and metaphysical realms of reality. Subjecting Western knowledge to the validating processes of other views of knowledge and to physical and metaphysical principles of validation should expose the ridiculous assumption that the knowledge is authorized under the imperatives of power, laws of nature, or the will of God as a Judeo-Christian social arbiter. Research under the cover of scientific inquiry is then also really questionable. To reiterate Smith’s (1999b) idea, scientific research is one of the ways in which the underlying code of imperialism and colonialism is being regulated and realized.

### 5.4 Academic Freedom

One of the claims made by university researchers, perhaps as justification for cross-cultural research activity involving Indigenous Peoples, is the inalienable right of an academic freedom to research and publish. This proclaimed right of scholars is embedded within the university institution and is one of the backbone principles of scholarship and intellectual freedom. The Tri-Council Policy Statement (1998) reports that “freedoms include freedom of inquiry and the right to disseminate the results thereof” and that the freedom includes “the privilege of conducting research on human subjects” (p. i.8). However, as Smith (1999b) counters, “for Indigenous Peoples universities are regarded as rather elite institutions which reproduce themselves through various systems of privilege” (p. 129). The claims to academic freedom, individual initiative, unfettered intellectual leadership are no more than elitist aspirations of researchers to keep themselves distinct and distant from the communities they study and as a way of maintaining their positions of ‘unearned advantage and conferred dominance’ (McIntosh, 1998). Linda Smith (1999b) also writes that disciplines maintain their boundaries and develop independently and therefore the “concepts of ‘academic freedom’, the ‘search for truth’ and ‘democracy’…are vigorously defended by intellectuals” (p. 67).

Indigenous Peoples and other critics contest Western researchers’ claims to the inalienable right to research and publish because these are the venues that have led to the systemic infringement of Indigenous Peoples’ intellectual property rights. Unwarranted research encroachment into Indigenous Peoples’ intellectual spaces is overtly predacious whether subsumed under the rubric of scholarship or by any other title (Maddocks, 1992; Lewis & Bird Rose, 1985;
Indigenous Peoples, who have long been the ‘objects’ of Western research, see the defense of concepts such as uncontested researching and publishing rights as a questionable policy used by Western academics because it positions them in power over marginal groups. Battiste (1998) stresses “almost all universities have preserved Eurocentric knowledge and interpretive monopolies and generated gatekeepers of Eurocentric knowledge in the name of universal truth” (p. 23). With the security of this positioning, the inalienable right to research and publish remains uncontested for what it is - a stamp of approval and guise for continued opportunistic activity in Indigenous Peoples’ life-worlds. The TCPS (1998) states that with freedom comes responsibility including “high scientific and ethical standards” (p. i.8). Until issues of cross-cultural jurisdiction, Indigenous Peoples’ interpretation of research ethics, and the Indigenous protocols for legitimizing knowledge are acknowledged, the ethical standards that academics and institutions to be responsible for will be highly compromised. The three granting agencies need to identify and emphasize ethical standards and responsibilities of institutions and researchers pertaining to cross-cultural research.

5.5 Indigenous Experts

The claim of an inalienable right to research and publish is also consonant with the principle of career specialization as an aspect of individual recognition within the Western knowledge field. Expertise in a given area is a valuable asset in academia. Since career concerns of academics in various Western disciplines account for a substantial portion of research in Indigenous societies (Stokes, 1985; Deloria, 1980), various writers express discomfort that the ‘specialization of labor’ inevitably leads to the creation of non-Indigenous experts on Indigenous Peoples. For Indigenous Peoples, the creation of experts is closely linked with colonialism and imperialism because, through this process, the interpretation of Indigenous Being is left squarely in the hands of non-Indigenous people and their interests. In this situation, university ‘experts’ are left with the academic freedom to propagate their interpretations of Indigenous Peoples, speak for Indigenous Peoples, and effectively continue to silence Indigenous Peoples’ voices in the process. Institutional disciplines are just as implicated in the predacious policy of unfettered intellectual freedom because “the disciplinary norms are that you milk a project for as many publications as you can” (Wax; 1991, p. 443). Smith (1999b) recognizes that these publications by experts came to be seen “by the outside world as knowledgeable, informed and relatively objective…with their chronic ethnocentrism viewed as a sign of the times” (p. 83). For Indigenous Peoples, ‘experts’ have been variously labeled as “no more than peeping toms [and] rank opportunists” (King, 1989:2); “interested only in furthering their careers” (Stokes, 1985); “predatory” (Maynard, 1974); “dishonest in research intentions” (Darou, et. al., 1993), and unable to distinguish between ‘public’ and ‘private’ knowledge (Stokes, 1985).

5.6 Appropriation of Indigenous Knowledge

Because of unresolved issues like exploitative practices in research, continuing research into Indigenous spaces of knowledge is seen as the continuation of cultural imperialism. Cultural imperialism is described by Robert Young (1990) as a form of oppression by a dominant society and has the result of assimilating or securing the subordinated status of cultures and is usually characterized by economic profitability. In this way, research lends itself to the appropriation of Indigenous knowledge for purposes of Western gain, power, exploitation, and domination (Smith,
1999b; Henderson, 1996; Whitt, 1995). “The parallels between the dispossession of Native peoples’ land and dispossession of their intellectual products are riveting” (Paredes, 1994, p. v). The language of imperialism and colonialism may have changed over time but the unavoidable perception is that these realities, borne of domination in history, have never been effectively discounted and still exist in their various modern forms and contexts that continue to affect Indigenous Peoples (Smith, 1999b). Indigenous societies find themselves poked, probed, examined, and exploited with each new wave of research undertaken by Western institutions. This situation is particularly offensive to Indigenous Peoples when these same institutions and governments continue to be indifferent to their calls for appropriate development and protection of cultural and intellectual property. As Henderson (1996) states, “at its core, the Euro-centric research methods and ethics are intellectual and cultural property issues” (p. 83). For Indigenous Peoples throughout the world, intellectual property rights consist of efforts to assert access and control over Indigenous knowledge and to the things produced from its application.

Various dangers exist for the release of Indigenous knowledge because, “information we give to researchers becomes their intellectual property protected under Copyright Act” (Fourmile, 1989 p. 4). Greaves (1994) confirms that “the very cultural heritage that gives Indigenous Peoples their identity, now far more than in the past, is under real or potential assault from those who would gather it up, strip away its honored meanings, convert it to a product, and sell it” (p. ix). Lewis & Bird Rose (1985) articulate the suspicion among Indigenous Peoples that “white people do not do anything without the possibility of financial gain” (p. 39). In this sense, research projects are treated as other forms of colonial developments that go into Indigenous communities with complete disregard for the broad variety of Indigenous claims (Usher, 1994). For example, research that gains access to Indigenous Peoples’ communities and their artistic designs is used as part of a broader process to turn the Indigenous creations into commodities to be consumed in mainstream Western society. In this respect, Deloria (1991) poses the question, “if the knowledge of the Indian community is so valuable, how can non-Indians receive so much compensation for their small knowledge and Indians receive so little for their extensive knowledge?” (p. 466). Battiste (1998) maintains that “neither law nor research ethics has kept pace with these commercial developments to protect Indigenous knowledge from unauthorized taking of reproductions in intellectually, culturally, and spiritually sensitive knowledge” (p. 5). The issue of sacred knowledge is highly contentious and the argument exists that sacred knowledge that is passed down through oral teachings must remain in the oral realm. Some stories about ceremonies or powerful spiritual events are deemed inappropriate for relating in a Western research context (Sinclair, 2003). Wax (1991) explains:

At the conference with medicine men, they specified that there were three types of information: Some should never be recorded, because they are so sacred that they should not be put on permanent record. Some may be recorded…it being understood that translation is a great barrier to protect information from those who should not have access. And, finally, some that may be translated (p.442).

As it is now, university research, as an arm of Western knowledge production, continues to formulate processes to better penetrate and extract Indigenous thought through the research enterprise. However, the continuing attempts to formulate research that is respectful to Indigenous Peoples still conform to the fundamental Eurocentric orientation of fitting Indigenous knowledge
into Western frameworks and interests. The way research is talked about assumes that all research is properly undertaken from the perspective and under the auspices of Western centers of authority. Research conducted into Indigenous spaces, as a legitimated process of academic freedom, is seen as problematic process of ethics for Indigenous Peoples because of the latent biases, inherent misconceptions, and outstanding issues of power and control.

With the gazing eye of Western science, and the mental aptitude of Western philosophy, information obtained from Indigenous spaces is reformulated into propositions that stand as the reality of Indigenous Peoples’ lived experience. These propositions, as interpretations and value-laden judgments of Western scholars, then stand as the dominant view about Indigenous Peoples for the eventual consumption of society and inscription into history. The European construction of knowledge about other cultures through a “web of interrelated writings” is a concerted process of creating and subjecting Indigenous Peoples to the evolutionary narrative of Western existence. In this respect difference, as represented by Indigenous Peoples, is best viewed through the self-representation of Indigenous Peoples and not from the prewritten and imposed scripts. This self-representation, as a feature of self-determination, ensures that Indigenous Peoples will not languish in the discursive cages of Western scholarship.

For Indigenous Peoples, the living with and sharing of knowledge with the outside world has had predictable repercussions. Testimonies by many Indigenous Peoples regarding the conduct and standard of research recognize, as Weber-Pillwax (1999) states, “that much of what we have offered as beautiful and life giving to the incoming peoples was transformed into brutality and destruction for us"(p. 35). It is still an implicit practice in Western academia to extract Indigenous intellectual and cultural property under the guise of intellectual freedom only to reformulate the knowledge to meet Western values and regurgitate that knowledge in ways that reflect Eurocentric interests. Notions of an ethical order in research involving Indigenous Peoples will continue to be problematic and deceptive unless the embedded designs that motivate predacious activity are unmasked and issues of power and control are properly addressed. This perhaps would be closer to being achieved if higher learning institutions injected curricula into research programs that examine systemic bias against Indigenous Peoples. As Deloria (1991) stated, apart from protecting the quality and accuracy of work already done, there is “no useful purpose for any additional research or writing on [Indigenous Peoples]” (p. 461). In this regard it is also necessary to closely re-examine the paradigms that we use in our efforts to chart a unique path to true Indigenous Peoples’ development and a moral order of inquiry that crosses cultural borders.

5.7 Collective Ownership

The issue of ownership of collective knowledge and the data obtained from Indigenous communities is perhaps the most contentious of all the concerns regarding research involving Indigenous Peoples. The Indigenous relationship to knowledge is through a complex nexus of communal, natural, and spiritual orders. Knowledge is in many ways only obtainable through spiritual observances that are practiced communally and in the dynamic and evolving relationship between humans, the ecology, and the universe. In a United Nations resolution (Resolution 1993/44 of 26 August 1993), the Sub-Commission on Prevention of discrimination and Protection of Minorities endorsed recommendations relating to collective rights of Indigenous Peoples. This recommendation states: “Indigenous Peoples’ ownership and custody of their heritage must
continue to be collective, permanent and inalienable, as prescribed by the customs, rules and practices of each people” (p. 4). This heritage of knowledge is also encased in Indigenous languages, inscribed in family narratives, in sacred oral narratives, relationships with land, flora and fauna and in supernatural relationships.

To better understand collective ownership, clarity about “community” in the Indigenous context is helpful. The Indigenous community represents the synthesis of many peoples’ search for knowledge at the juncture of physical and metaphysical realities. The knowledge of many people developed through this process of experiencing totality, wholeness, and inwardness, effectively created a unified consciousness that transformed the collective into a participatory organism known as community. In doing so, the community, through its membership, became empowered as the ‘culture’ of accumulated knowledge. The people became the community, and the community became the worldview. The knowledge of the people was the glue that held the community together and molded the ethos that the people would live by. Notions of community traverse research issues of collective ownership as well as consent.

These are instances where it becomes problematic to define consent and personal scholarship and the attached personal claim to knowledge when dealing with Indigenous knowledge. The collective nature of community knowledge leads to the collective ownership of knowledge in Indigenous communities and we then see how “a community in North America may be placed at risk when members of that community participate in a research study designed to produce information about the community as a whole.” (Weijer, 1999, p.510). Further to that point, the Indigenous Research Protection Act suggested by the Indigenous Peoples Council on Biocolonialism (2000) confirms that “the tribe has the right of self-determination and in exercising that right must be recognized as the exclusive owner of Indigenous traditional knowledge” (p. 3). Apart from the individualism and the individualistic sense of personal scholarship, in some non-Indigenous societies, collective ownership meant “no ownership” (Peterson, 1982). Unfortunately, this has lead to the rational that since there is ‘no ownership’ of Indigenous Peoples cultural and intellectual property, that this opens the door to ‘state ownership’. In terms of knowledge production within the university world, this rationale has translated into the concept of ‘public domain’ or public ownership of all knowledge and hence the academic freedom. Hence, we see the line-up of Western academics at the doors of Indigenous Peoples’ cultural spaces with disregard for Indigenous Peoples’ claims to intellectual, cultural, and property rights and their indifference to the need for protection of these rights.

The importance of Indigenous peoples having ownership of information is evident in several articles where researchers describe various methods they have used to ensure meaningful involvement of community members in any research project. Review committees, whose responsibility it is to approve all aspects of the research process vary and include research teams comprised of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal researchers (Van Uchelen et al., 1997) to formal review committees that review and approve all aspects of the research including publication of findings (O’Neil, Reading, & Leader, 1998). One example from the Australian literature described the development of an Institutional Ethics Committee within an Aboriginal health service that was formed to be the arbiter of all ethical guidelines in a specific research project (Holmes, Stewart, Garrow, Anderson, & Thorpe, 2002).
5.8 Consent

Three years ago, I was granted both oral and written permission to study narratives, storytelling, and traditional ways of learning as they applied to a specific Native community in Alberta. The elders of the school involved in my research gave me oral approval; the director of the school gave me written consent. Even though the written authorization may be regarded as official, the acquisition of the elders’ permission constituted the first and most important step of my research. The oral approval may be defined as cultural approval…. (Piquemal, 2001, p.71)

Individual consent to research in and by itself is a problematic issue for Indigenous Peoples in light of the collective knowledge concept and Indigenous social mores (Beauvais, 1999). Obtaining consent from individuals in Indigenous communities can be problematic for a number of reasons. As Henderson (1996) has observed, “no single individual can ever be aware of all the cultural concerns that may exist in the community” (p. 83). These concerns may revolve around the issue of releasing information that is private and any disclosure of such information is a moral transgression against families and the community. Maddocks (1992) expresses a similar view and warns of ‘picking off’ gullible or uncomprehending individuals for opportunistic study. For Indigenous Peoples, the Western paradigm of individualism that recognizes the right of the individual to give knowledge through ‘informed consent’ is contradictory to the concept of collective ownership understood by Indigenous Peoples. Linda Smith (1999b) states:

Indigenous groups argue that legal definitions of ethics are framed in ways which contain the Western sense of the individual and of individualized property – for example, the right of an individual to give his or her own knowledge, or the right to give informed consent. The social ‘good’ against which ethical standards are determined is based on the same beliefs about the individual and individual property (p.118).

In making explicit the point about collective knowledge and the issue of individual consent, Brascoupe and Endemann (1999) explain that “Indigenous knowledge frequently has intangible and spiritual manifestations that relate to a community or nation rather than to an individual” (p. 2). Recent guidelines have gravitated towards group consent as the first stage basis for acquiring individual consent to participate in research. For example, The Mi’kmaq Research Principles and Protocols (2000) support the idea of collective consent - “knowledge is collectively owned, discovered, used, and taught and so must also be collectively guarded by appropriate delegated or appointed collective(s) (p. 2). In Australia, the development of guidelines for non-Indigenous people undertaking research among the Indigenous population of north-east Victoria, states, “all research proposals require written documentation of consent and support from the Koori organization or community in which the research is to be conducted” (p. 4). On a critical note, Deloria (1980) states that “ breaking the specialist stranglehold over racial minorities is a critical problem, and this aspect of social science alone makes the discussion of ‘informed consent’ irrelevant” (p. 270). Unless these contradictions inherent in cultural differences are resolved,
research conducted in Indigenous communities based on the Western sense of individualized property will continue to be regarded with great suspicion as opportunistic and exploitative.

The TCPS (1998) considers free and informed consent to be at the “heart of ethical research involving human subjects” (p 2.1). Free and informed consent in the academic setting rests on the presumption that competent adults generally have the capacity and right to decide whether or not to participate in a research study. Consent in this format rests on the condition of Western sensibilities of the legal individual and individuality. Signing a consent form reinforces the element of legal individuality and therefore represents a ‘contract’ or semi-binding agreement, voluntarily signed by the participant.

Importantly, the current privileging of the individual overlooks other cultures’ forms of social organization where individuality is less pronounced. Many Indigenous Peoples consider community consent to be as important as individual consent. Manderson, Kelaher, Williams, & Shannon, 1998), in describing their use of guidelines on ethical matters in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research (1991) reiterate, “community is prior to the individual with respect to negotiations for participation in research (p. 228). This concept of the collectivity is linked with distributive justice and reciprocity and includes the guidelines that researchers must acquire community permission for any research endeavour (Norton & Manson, 1996) and that they must understand the importance of the collective notion of consent and confidentiality (Norton & Manson, 1996)

Numerous authors (especially those supporting a participatory action research methodology) argue that informed consent is an on-going process and not merely an event or ‘hoop’ to pass through before heading into the field to conduct research. Piquemal suggests four broad ethical recommendations to ensure the circular nature to informed consent.

- Negotiating responsibilities prior to seeking free and informed consent
- Obtaining free and informed consent from the relevant authorities: the collective and the individual
- Confirming consent to ensure that consent is ongoing
- Completing the circle: providing the community with data

Importantly, Piquemal argues that consent is not a contract but rather it is an ongoing process. In this dialogue, consent is constantly negotiated and renegotiated. This process works toward closing the gulf between the researcher and the researched. The American Anthropological Association attempts to address this issue. As the AAA writes, “informed consent, for the purposes of this code, does not necessarily imply or require a particular written or signed form. It is the quality of the consent, not the format, that is relevant”. Bishop (1994) states that empowerment for Indigenous Peoples through research means “decision making from a position of shared strength and wealth, not from a position…of relinquishing one’s language and culture in order to participate in the mainstream” (p. 177). Others also comment on the need for researchers to genuinely include reciprocity as part of their research interests and processes (Darou, Hum, & Kurtness, 1993; Greely, 1996).
In this manner, the dialogue of ongoing consent allows for input into the research plan. Hopefully, this dialogue leads to a situation that Manderson, Kelaher, Williams & Shannon (1998) refer to as the ‘culture of consultation’ that often exists in research projects, particularly with a more recent focus on partnership development (Voyle & Simmons, 1999). While many researchers are becoming more cognizant of the importance of not imposing their agenda on communities, too often the consultative process does not reflect reciprocity. The concept of reciprocity is elaborated by Greely (1996) and Michell (1999) who articulate the ethic of reciprocity wherein knowledge is perceived as an entity that has a spirit to which certain behaviours and protocols are accorded.

One last point under consent relates to the issue of negotiating consent prior to having formal consent to negotiate with communities. Because consent is a process that may have elements that need to be negotiated with a community/participants prior to ‘formal’ consent being granted through a Research Ethics Board, researchers and communities find themselves in a dilemma. In order to negotiate the consent process, contact with the community/participants is required, however, this is prohibited by many REBs. In order to follow an ethical path with the Indigenous community in question, the researcher may be required to violate their institutional ethics. This is an extremely problematic situation that must be redressed immediately by REBs.

5.9 Benefits and Distributive Justice

It is the view of many writers that, at its lowest common denominator, research has not benefited Indigenous Peoples (Bishop, 1994; Fourmile, 1989; Trimble, 1977; King, 1989; L. Smith, 1999b; Kothari, 1997). Linda Smith (1999b) reveals “at the common sense level research was talked about both in terms of its absolute worthlessness to us…and its absolute usefulness to those who wielded it as an instrument” (p. 3). Indeed, how this has played out in research has been through the process of exploiting populations of Indigenous Peoples as ‘client populations’ rather than as contributors to research (La Fromboise, 1983; Deloria, 1980; Darou et. al., 1993). In this sense, any benefits accruing from research activities have gone to the researcher (Bishop, 1994), the non-Aboriginal (Fourmile, 1989), Europeans (Lewis & Bird Rose, 1985), intellectuals and students (King, 1989), bioprospectors (Kothari, 1997), Anthropologists (Cove, 1995), governments and scientists (Peterson, 1982), psychologists (Darou, Hum & Kurness, 1993), industries and universities (Usher, 1994). It is understandable why Indigenous Peoples would feel exploited and mistreated in this peculiar situation where benefits of research activities have accrued only to outsiders. This issue is manifested in multiple processes including advantages to institutions in terms of funding under the name of Indigenous research with little or no benefit to the communities in terms of programs or problem solving (Trimble & Medicine, 1976; La Fromboise, 1983). These are continuing issues that attest to the Western attitude concerning the intellectual property rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Several articles reflect on various processes that the authors used in studies involving Indigenous health issues. A recurrent theme relates to distributive justice (Freeman, 1993), which is closely tied to the benefits for Indigenous communities from various research projects. Several authors highlight the importance of research that is more proactive (Hurtado, Hill, Kaplan, & Lancaster, 2001) and that involves direct and tangible benefits to the community (Darou, Hum, & Kurtness, 1993; Norton & Manson, 1996). This could be the ‘gold standard’ that is applied to research projects; the ultimate aim of ethical guidelines must go beyond simply not harming to
engagement in more proactive behaviours on the part of researchers (Hurtado, Hill, Kaplan, & Lancaster, 2001). This concept goes beyond a simple description of research benefits to the community, but rather implies a more fundamental commitment to ensuring that the outcome of research studies provides real and tangible benefits to community members.

Any research involving Indigenous Peoples must ensure that benefits accrue to the people or community involved. The identification and nature of these benefits and gains should also be the prerogative of the participants or communities involved. Very often communities are looking for empowerment of Indigenous voice and skill (Mi’kmaq Research Principles and Protocols, 2000), and education. Research strategies like reclaiming, renaming, restoring, and reconstruction of Indigenous identities and cultural property become the codes words for the restructuring of knowledge through research (Smith, 1999b). Benefits may also include appropriate financial remuneration for research participants and through local employment, and all the associated costs of developing relationships for the success of collaborative and partnership models of research.

Ms Erica-Irene Daes, Chairperson-Rapporteur of the United Nations Working Group of Indigenous populations, remarked that:

Heritage can never be alienated, surrendered or sold, except for conditional use. Sharing therefore creates a relationship between the givers and receivers of knowledge. The givers retain the authority to ensure that knowledge is used properly and the receivers continue to recognize and repay the gift (1993, p.9).

These cost implications under benefits and distributive justice need to be accounted for in modern research proposals.

5.10 Confidentiality

Confidentiality, in Western academic research is paramount and must be incorporated into the design as well as guaranteed in writing by the researcher and participants alike. In matters of knowledge recognition and participant’s empowerment, this requirement ultimately continues to silence the Indigenous voice. The practice of confidentiality can have the effect of featuring the researcher’s voice in instances where acknowledging the views of participants and the knowledge system as the source of that information is appropriate. In this way knowledge translation and transfer have become the prerogatives of the researchers that lead to issues of appropriation and misrepresentation. From the Indigenous perspective, smuggling of knowledge happens through the confidentiality clause in ways that highlight the researcher and the researcher’s interpretation of knowledge, but hides the source of information. New models of partnerships and collaboration, through research agreements, warrant that the appropriate recognition of Indigenous knowledge and the empowerment of participants through co-authorship or similar acknowledgement. In this regard, Western academic confidentiality rules and regulations stand in direct contravention of knowledge sharing as tenet of Indigenous worldview.
Co-authorship with the community or participants may also be appropriate where Indigenous knowledge is shared. As an Indigenous researcher, one gathers the words, knowledge, and wisdom of others and has tremendous obligations to reflect both the owner of the knowledge and their meanings in a respectful and accurate way (Sinclair, 2003). Acquiring knowledge which is a part of nature, falls under the ethic of reciprocity whereby one must return something to nature (Michel, 1999) and exchange occurs, usually in the form of gifts. Researchers do not presume to own a part of nature. Researchers are “caretakers of knowledge carried by others” (Sinclair, 2003); taking credit alone for such work would be profane. Honouring the ethic of reciprocity occurs through traditional protocol regardless of the nature of the research – qualitative or quantitative (Greely, 1996). In the Indigenous context, knowledge is a gift and the researcher is indebted to give credit to the source which means that participants ought to be named if they consent to it and receive recognition in any reporting or publications.

Another aspect of confidentiality from the Indigenous perspective is not considered by the TCPS (1998). From this perspective, confidentiality refers to the expression of sacred knowledge obtained by researchers in Indigenous communities that does not belong in the public domain. The breach of confidentiality can occur if the researcher discloses or writes about knowledge without the community or individual consent to write or publish. The sacred knowledge of Indigenous Peoples is the subject to which access is restricted and can include names, knowledge, practices, objects and places. The breach of confidentiality often occurs during dialogue and/or negotiation for an agreement to interact. The three granting agencies should make this version of confidentiality explicit. The following quote is repeated for emphasis:

At the conference with medicine men, they specified that there were three types of information: Some should never be recorded, because they are so sacred that they should not be put on permanent record. Some may be recorded…it being understood that translation is a great barrier to protect information from those who should not have access. And, finally, some that may be translated. (Wax, 1991, p.442)

6.0 Trends

The trends here discussed comprise issues that have emerged in the most current literature about research with Indigenous people, and issues that are under hot debate in the Aboriginal research milieu. The trends here discussed include OCAP – Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession, Guidelines, Research Ethics Boards, Access to Information, and the Altered Research Process.

6.1 OCAP

There has evolved a significant and irreversible trend to the ownership, control, access, and possession (OCAP) of research activities and outcomes pertaining to Indigenous populations worldwide (Schnarch, 2004). The term “OCAP” has arisen simultaneously in several national and international contexts. OCAP is inextricably linked to the agenda of self-determination for Indigenous people because it serves to guide the re-appropriation of the research activities and outcomes in research pertaining to Indigenous people and it provides the context within which the
development of culturally relevant, Indigenous worldview based research paradigms are
developing. In effect, OCAP is providing the jurisdictional framework for the Indigenous research
agenda (Brant Castellano, 2004). “The protection of the cultural and intellectual property of
Indigenous peoples is fundamentally connected with the realization of their territorial rights and
right to self-determination” (Simpson & Jackson, 1998 P. 46). OCAP is serving to enhance
capacity building in Aboriginal research by bringing the concepts of ownership and control to the
attention of communities (Johnson & Ruttan, 1992). At the same time, the trend towards OCAP is
hastening the development of community based research guidelines and agreements, is influencing
how Research Ethics Boards are conducting ethical reviews of Indigenous related research, and is
also influencing how community based research information is accessed and how research is
conducted.

6.2 Guidelines

Beginning in Australia in 1986, Indigenous Peoples have developed and set out guidelines
for the conduct of research in Indigenous communities largely in response to ongoing concerns
about institutional practices. They seek to suggest additional requirements to ensure the rights and
interests of the community as a whole are respected and guidelines suggest “Aboriginal
communities are distinct communities with common interests in need of protection.” (Weijer,
Goldsand, Emanuel, 1999). The emergence of guidelines and research agreements has had
significant implications for research with Aboriginal people. First, the appropriation of the right to
create and implement guidelines and agreements has mobilized communities to enact a high level
of control over research activities in their domain. Secondly, and this impact has yet to fully reveal
itself, the empowerment that comes with control over the research agenda has engendered, at the
Aboriginal community level, a sense of interest and responsibility in becoming more involved in
the processes of research and activities that support an autonomous research program including
capacity building and knowledge transfer. Nationally, the funding agencies in Canada have
responded by directing dollars to support new directions in research for Aboriginal peoples
through the ACADRE (Aboriginal Capacity and Developmental Research Environment) program
as well as by making adaptations through the implementation and ongoing revisions of the TCPS
(1998), for the respectful conduct of research. Thirdly, and perhaps most significantly, the value of
community guidelines is that they assert Indigenous Peoples’ jurisdiction over community cultural
resources. For example, the Kahnawake Schools Diabetes Prevention Project (KSDPP) of research
Ethics asserts “the sovereignty of the Kanien’keha:ka of Kahnawa:ke to make decisions about
research (1997). Thus, community based research guidelines may differ slightly from institutional
guidelines which may not, at this time, so readily recognize Indigenous rights and jurisdiction as
they pertain to research. Guidelines are an emerging trend in research with Aboriginal peoples and
are discussed as such in a later section. Here we not that despite the new institutional effort of
developing policies with guidelines initiated within many disciplines, concerns continued to be
expressed about ethics in research involving Indigenous Peoples (Brant Castellano, 2004;
Schnarch, 2004) and the effectiveness of institutional guidelines to address the issues.

Several reasons for the ineffectiveness of institutional-based ethical guidelines in research
have been offered. (a) Exemption of agencies and types of research. The creation of ethical
research guidelines did not have the desired impact largely because the guidelines did not go far
enough or that there were no enforcement mechanisms to complement the initiative (NAHO, 2002,
(b) Inadequate publicity and enforcement: Although the Councils will consider funding only to individuals and institutions which certify compliance with its policies, the TCPS (1989) “consists of guidelines only, existing without an enforcement to guarantee that researchers and corporations comply” (NAHO, 2002). (c) The problem of any central agency ensuring appropriate involvement at the community level.

Under the guidance of the TCPS (1998), universities and disciplines developed adherence policies. Many disciplines followed their institution’s guidelines as a response. However, these policy guidelines set up by the TCPS, and specifically disciplinary guidelines, were still self-serving in that they were largely framed in a way that supported only the professional interests and in the language of individualism. Many guidelines simply failed to account for research involving Indigenous Peoples. In order for guidelines to be substantial, the knowledge systems of Indigenous Peoples need national recognition, institutional protection, and developmental support within its own contexts and within its own terms. Institutional guidelines must assume that progress in research will only occur through equitable partnerships or collaboration with Indigenous Peoples. This assumption must take center stage in policy development.

Research in Northern Canada, including the Yukon Territory, Northwest Territories, Nunavut, and northern parts of the provinces, is considerably more advanced in terms of ethical principles relating to Indigenous Peoples. The Ethical Principles for the Conduct of Research in the North states that “a new spirit of partnership between northerners and researchers is emerging in northern research” (ACUNS, p.4). Another change is the increasing involvement of northerners in all aspects of the research process. The northern guidelines are intended to encourage partnership between northern peoples and researchers.

The creation of community-based research guidelines are an example of community initiatives attempting to create a level playing field in power-culture relations and are a direct response to the systemic and institutional status quo of research. The primary purpose of the research guidelines is to set standards of research so that Indigenous Peoples will be treated ethically in their participation in any research with the opportunity to benefit and gain from any research conducted among them. The guidelines often require Indigenous language usage in communication of reports. In this respect, community research guidelines emphasize that any research involving their people must have the effect of community empowerment, maximized benefits to the community and that the ownership of all date related to research remains with the community. Benefits may include co-authorship of any documentation arising from the research. Community guidelines also stipulate that any research proposal contemplating research with their people will bring with it education, capacity building, and new skills component for the benefit of the community people. Of significant importance is that First Nation community guidelines stress collaboration and partnerships in research involving their people.

6.3 Research Ethics Boards

Research Ethics Boards are in a precarious position as they relate to research involving Indigenous Peoples. Currently, although they “serve the research community” (TCPS, 1998), they must also, in some measure, speak and/or defend the community interests as far as they are able to.
Contemporary ethics practices at the institutional level have to this point silenced Indigenous jurisdictions and authorities and, by default assumption, place the ethics of research involving Indigenous Peoples squarely in the hands of non-Indigenous people. Further, in the pursuit of their responsibility, Research Ethics Boards and researchers are not required to take sensitivity training nor cross-cultural training that may inform decision making with respect to research proposals and research conduct relative to Indigenous Peoples. With the assertion of Indigenous voice in the research milieu, past forms may “no longer be workable in a trans-disciplinary, global, and postcolonial world.” (Denzin, 2003) The National Aboriginal Health Organization (2002) made numerous recommendations with respect to Research Ethics Boards. The issue is that REBs, specific to the protection of Indigenous Peoples interests, standards, and perspectives, should be created that would adjudicate research proposals for funding. Jurisdiction needs to be clarified because, ultimately, REBs developed under the auspices of Western conventions may not have authority to approve of any research that crosses into Indigenous jurisdictions. In light of this, appropriate mechanisms need to be established by the three granting agencies in concert with Indigenous authorities for the approval and review of research proposals in involving Indigenous Peoples, and that will appropriately meet the criteria of Indigenous jurisdiction, involvement, and worldview.

6.4 Access to information and access to Communities

A significant outcome of the reclamation of the research agenda by Indigenous people is that the previously open gateways to Aboriginal communities and community information are virtually sealed. This is a trend that is affecting Indigenous as well as non-Indigenous researchers (NAHO, 2004) and is one that is, at this time, restricting access to the plethora of community-based research that has been conducted in Aboriginal communities. Accessing grey literature from local and regional Aboriginal organizations for the completion of this review proved exceedingly difficult. Without processes and resources in place within organizations to oversee the responsible lending and borrowing of community based research material, information was not released and will not likely be released in the future until the organizations themselves create those processes.

The general suspicion held by Indigenous individuals, communities and organizations towards research activities is palpable and a heightened level of attention has to be given to processes at the front end of the research endeavour that include trust and relationship building. The Indigenous Peoples’ Health Research (IPHRC) created a new position called a “community research facilitator (CRF)”. The role of the CRF is to facilitate and negotiate research relationships between University researchers and Indigenous groups and communities. It is important to note that the CRFs, while not acting as gatekeepers, do not in every instance, facilitate research nor do they provide a “research superhighway” directly into Aboriginal communities. They are required by IPHRC mandate, to ensure that the research interests of the Indigenous community are honoured and protected, hence, projects that violate or transgress the ethical issues here discussed, are not supported. The CRF role does not totally alleviate the issue of access to information or communities, but as trust is developed in Aboriginal communities, the Research Facilitator may be able to facilitate research activities with greater ease. The IPHRC is witnessing several changes to the nature of the research process.
6.5 The Altered Research Process

Several emergent issues in the research process with Indigenous communities merit mentioning. These include how the research process is being altered to impact on project time parameters. Secondly, the process of consultation with Elders and community knowledge keepers in research involving Aboriginal people is altering research relationships and processes.

The time requirements and commitments in research with Aboriginal peoples has been altered as one consequence of the adverse history of research. As stated, the initial stages of the research project increasingly include a period, sometimes extensive, of trust and relationship building. The process of negotiating consent may require bringing together multiple stakeholders and negotiating multiple agendas and schedules. The nature of research, in the Aboriginal context, is undergoing a definitional shift as worldview and cultural constructs are applied to the research endeavor. Research is described by Indigenous authors as a knowledge seeking process guided by natural laws and ethical principles that comprises multiple relationships; with others, nature, and the cosmos (Sinclair, 2003; Martin, 2001; Smith, 1999a, 1999b; Bishop, 1998; Ermine, 1995; Deloria, 1991; Colorado, 1988). As such, the responsibility in research and for the researcher to honour relationships extends beyond research timelines and funding schedules. Conflicts arise for the researcher who may not be accounting for these lengthy negotiations in research applications and whose initial community consultations may take them beyond projected project deadlines.

An emerging practice for Aboriginal communities and independent Aboriginal researchers, in particular, is the concept of the Community Advisory Board. Presently, CABs are informal structures that are devised by the researcher, primarily as a process to ensure that traditional Indigenous values and ethics are maintained and adhered to in the research process (Straus, Sengupta, Quinn, Goeppinger, Spaulding, Kegeles, and Millett, 2001; Weaver cited in Sinclair, 2003). The composition of the CABs is often Elders or traditional knowledge keepers who have knowledge of traditional Indigenous protocol and ethics. The CAB process is not sanctioned by Research Ethics Boards and presents a problematic situation for Indigenous researchers, in particular, who may be required by the tenets of their worldview to confer with their community elders and knowledge keepers in their research activities (Sinclair, 2003). The issue of community-based advisory boards must be addressed in order to meet the ethical demands of research in Indigenous communities.

7.0 Analysis of Coverage and Gaps

Section 6 of the TCPS (1998) was created specifically to deal with research involving Indigenous Peoples. Guidance on the issues comes from the ethical principles, standards and procedures articulated in the document and from additional provisions developed in Canada and from other countries. This section analyses the coverage and gaps of this policy with respect to the ethics of research involving Indigenous Peoples.

The TCPS (1998) attempts to build ethical momentum in research policy based on three documents relevant to research involving Aboriginal peoples in Canada. Perhaps minor semantics, such as ‘research on Aboriginal peoples’ may be overlooked or that “the research may seek
information on the characteristic beliefs, values, social structures or other features” without the appropriate qualification in terms of first seeking community approvals for such initiatives.

Overall, the TCPS (1998) makes policy statements that articulate a desire to direct ethical conduct, but the distinction between being ethical and the ‘desire’ to be ethical is not unanimous. Comments such as “should consider” lack assertive value, and indeed, enforcement mechanisms for researchers and institutions to apply compliance for any of the suggested practices. The onus is on the TCPS to make succinct and assertive statements in the interests of guiding ethical thought and conduct that contemplates crossing cultural borders.

The merits of the TCPS (1998) are in the adopted ‘good practices’ that have been drawn from guideline documents developed in this country. These suggested practices have features that are evident in other ethical guidelines and converge with certain aspects of this report. Features in the TCPS such as the call for partnerships, involving the group in the design of the project, and providing information regarding the protective measures for the group’s cultural estate, are important principles in the interest of Indigenous Peoples.

The relevance of the Tri-Council Policy Statement to Indigenous Peoples is perhaps illustrated by what is omitted rather than what it contains. The following issues are gaps in the TCPS that need to be reflected and acted upon in the interest of promoting ethics in research involving Indigenous Peoples.

7.1 Jurisdiction

The most flagrant oversight of the TCPS (1998) in its policy statements with respect to research involving Indigenous Peoples is with the issue of jurisdiction. The updated TCPS (2003) states that any research to be performed outside the jurisdiction or country of the institution “shall undergo prospective ethics review both (a) by the REB of within the researcher’s institution; and (b) by the appropriate REB, where such exists, which has authority in the country or jurisdiction where the research is to be done” (p. A.4). Although this particular statement is in place, there is no clarity in terms of how the TCPS, Research Ethics Boards, researchers, and institutions interpret “jurisdiction” and whether they perceive Indigenous communities as jurisdictions in their own right under law or otherwise. The issue of jurisdiction is not covered in any of the documents reviewed, but the undercurrent message of their assertions has riveting connections to discussions about the rights and domains of peoples. Jurisdiction therefore refers to the rights of nations as to their heritage, cultural and intellectual property, languages, and religion amongst other items.

The jurisdiction of First Nations with respect to research activities is recognized through land claims agreements. First Nations can regulate research within their territories and as a result, for example, “any researcher who wants to work in an area on Yukon First Nation Settlement Land must first obtain that First Nations approval (Heritage Branch, 2000). The community/First Nation consultation includes details of contacts made and approvals received from communities, First Nations, and individuals who will be involved or affected by the research. A starting point when articulating research ethics with respect to Indigenous Peoples must be the law and customs of the Indigenous Peoples involved. The national Aboriginal Health Organization states that these laws and customs “define what constitutes property, identifies who has the right to share knowledge and
determines who is to benefit and be responsible for the sharing” (p. 7). In some Indigenous Peoples’ communities, research guidelines have been developed under these laws and customs because as Brascoupé and Endemann (1999) remind us, “it is important that Aboriginal communities develop strategies to protect traditional knowledge” (p. 4). The fundamental value of community guidelines is that they assert Indigenous Peoples’ jurisdiction over community cultural resources. For example, the Kahnawake Schools Diabetes Prevention Project (KSDPP) of research Ethics asserts “the sovereignty of the Kanien’kéha:ka of Kahnawake to make decisions about research.” The Indigenous Peoples Council on Biocolonialism’s Research Protection Act (2000) states that an Indigenous community has “the right, through its inherent sovereign authority…to exclude individuals from the reservation and to deny access for any research activities whatsoever (p.4). The Mi’kmaq Research Principles and Protocols Code established by the Mi’kmaq Ethics Committee state that the set of principles and protocols established protect the integrity and cultural knowledge of the Mi’kmaq people.

These community guidelines assert how research will be conducted within their jurisdictions and what kind of knowledge will be released from the communities to the outside world within the perimeters of benefiting Indigenous communities and the protection of cultural and intellectual property. Bourne from this jurisdiction is the approval and protective measures enacted by the communities such as the “research agreement” (Akwesasne: Protocol for Review of Environmental and Scientific Research Proposals, 1996), “obligations’ (Kahnawake Schools Diabetes Prevention Project Code of Research Ethics, 1997), and “community control” (Mi’kmaq Research Principles and Protocols, 2000). These research guidelines are enforceable at the local level. Similarly, the report of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Ethics Special Working Committee titled Giving Voice to the Spectrum (2004) states that, “research that crosses international and other jurisdictional boundaries requires further consideration with respect to jurisdiction, different cultural expectations, and other complexities that arise in intersocietal, intercultural research (p. 7). Furthermore, a research brief entitled Governance of Research Involving Indigenous Peoples by the National Aboriginal Health Organization (2002) indicates that Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982 extends constitutional protection and the rule of law to Aboriginal and treaty rights. The report states, “Aboriginal rights are derived from Indigenous knowledge and heritage” (p. 5). The dimensions of Aboriginal and Treaty rights are not acknowledged in the Tri-Council Policy Statement with respect to research and its impacts and implications.

In a sense, the most effective means of protecting traditional knowledge and having an equal voice at the research table may be to use Indigenous Peoples’ customs enforced by the community (Greaves, 1996). However, although the community research guidelines can be enforced through sanctions within the community and used as principles of research conduct, they are not enforceable in court (Brascoupé & Endemann, 1999). This process also does not provide clarity or account for the many Indigenous Peoples that reside in urban or other areas outside of Indigenous territory and jurisdiction. Therefore, on going efforts by scholars and political groups to formulate the parameters of national copy right laws and the protection of Indigenous Peoples’ intellectual and cultural property rights must take extreme urgency. Protection and recognition of Indigenous Peoples’ intellectual and cultural property rights must be part and partial of university research curricula within all disciplines and as an ethical requirement in all research that contemplates crossing cultural borders into Indigenous jurisdictions.
7.2 Research Agreements

Research agreements are discussed in various ethical guidelines in respect of rights and interests of Indigenous Peoples involved in partnership research. Formal research agreements are products of the ethical space where negotiation, dialogue, and discussions have taken place between cross-cultural entities. The aim of the negotiation process is to come to a clear understanding, which results in a formal agreement (preferably written), about research intentions, methods and potential results. The Guidelines for Ethical Research in Indigenous Studies (2000) state “the establishment of agreements and protocols between Indigenous Peoples and researchers is an important development in Indigenous Studies” (AIATSIS, 2000). They represent a negotiated agreement between equals to interact through a research process. The concept of research agreements stems from a call through guidelines to conduct research under certain standards and these stipulations become the substance of research agreements. As an example, many of the issues covered in this report can be ironed out through negotiation and documented under research agreements between institutions and communities involved. Issues like written documentation of consent from communities; status of ownership, control, access and possession of knowledge, data, information, and dissemination of findings through reports, and publication can be covered under these agreements.

Indigenous communities are asserting their rights to cultural and intellectual property and formulating the rules of ethical research conduct within their territories because it is Indigenous Peoples’ right and duty to develop their own cultures and knowledge systems. The United Nations’ Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of the Heritage of Indigenous Peoples support this approach. The document states that, “to protect their heritage Indigenous peoples must also exercise control over all research conducted within their territories, or which uses their people as subjects of study” (p. 5). Not only is the research to be controlled, but that the cultural contexts of knowledge are similarly to be respected. These goals are achieved through mutually negotiated research agreements, also referred to as Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) in many Aboriginal contexts. Research agreements are a current trend in Aboriginal research in Canada and constitute an assertion of governance over research activities. The Protocol For Review of Environmental and Scientific Research Proposals developed by the Akwasasne Task Force on the Environment Research Advisory Committee is one guideline document that stipulates the requirement for a research agreement. Guidelines, described as a move toward governance, will develop substance and longevity in research involving Indigenous Peoples (Brant Castellano, 2004). The process of developing guidelines will never be delineated into a “one size fits all” model, recognizing the diversity of Indigenous groups whose approach to research protocol and ethics may vary, understanding that each research project will engage a unique team and characteristics, and acknowledging that honouring the process of ethical research may require ongoing negotiation, change, and adaptation.
7.3 Dialogue and Negotiation Process

The respectful and ethical cross-over of research into different jurisdictions and cultures requires a protracted process of dialogue and negotiation between institutions, researchers, and Indigenous authorities. In essence, dialogue must become a central feature of a new relationship between Indigenous Peoples and the research enterprise and one that the TCPS should promote with conviction. The ethical space between cultures offers itself as the theatre for cross-cultural dialogue for the objective of creating different configurations of knowledge development and establishing a new research order that ethically engages different knowledge systems. According to Bohm (1996), dialogue enables inquiry into processes that can fragment and interfere with real communication between individuals, nations, and even different parts of the same organization. Dialogue is concerned with providing a space for exploring the field of thought and attention is given to understanding how thought functions in governing our cross-cultural behaviours. It is a way of observing, collectively, how hidden values and intentions can control our behaviour, and how unnoticed cultural differences can clash without our realizing what is occurring.

Dialogue is essentially a ‘conversation’ between equals and is therefore concerned with exploring the social constructs and inhibitions that affect communications. The act of dialogue is the act of resolving the confrontation and is itself an ethical act. This will entail the examination of structures and systems in attempts to remove all vestiges of colonial and imperial forms of knowledge production and to instill a respect and understanding of different and multiple readings of the world. It will be in the ethical space where all assumptions, biases, and misrepresentations about the ‘other’ are brought to bear in the interest of identifying ethical/moral principles in cross cultural interaction.

Dialogue is a subjective process that will be necessary in the successful creation of collaboration and partnerships within the ethical space. The successful creation of these endeavors will largely be determined by the participants’ interpersonal skills in the cross-cultural interaction. Researchers will not only be required to deal with people, but also be required to take sensitivity training, learn protocols and traditions, and establish a culturally relevant process in research. These requirements set out by community guidelines are new processes that will become a part of research and must be accounted for beyond the particulars of standard proposal writing and putting projects together.

As Gibson and Gibson (1999) distinguish, collaboration “reflects a fundamental shift in control of the research agenda and a democratization of the process (p. 110).” With respect to the consultation and appropriate cross-cultural conduct, the requirements present new challenges where subjectivity comes to play over objectivity. Whereas the primary intent of scientific researchers is to be objective, community research guidelines are enforcing subjective processes in the configuration of research. Revolving thought around personal experiences and linking issues of knowledge around subjectivity will reveal complicity in unethical human conduct. This subjectivity represents an alternative awareness and assessment about ethics because this requirement grounds the actors to the basics of common courtesy, respect for human dignity, and universal human justice. To the Western researcher, this position represents a mirror to examine the partiality of their respective views not only towards Indigenous Peoples in general but also to see how institutional structures and processes contribute to breaches of ethics in cross-cultural
relationships. Ethics in research involving Indigenous Peoples calls for rethinking of professional ethics and scholarly responsibilities that include thinking and writing about other cultures in a respectful human manner. One way to achieve this through dialogue and collaboration is through the concept of the Ethical Space.

8.0 Convergence

8.1 The Ethical Space Development Project

The development of the ethical space will be a new enterprise in research. A language of possibility will drive this new enterprise. The ethical space can be a sacred space for human advancement, a refuge for the human potential, and a space of future possibility. The principle imperative of this new enterprise spurred on by believing in the ethical space is the realignment and shifting of the perspective, particularly from the Western knowledge perspective that dominates the current research order, to a new center defined by symmetrical relations in cross-cultural engagement. This shift in consciousness will not and cannot be manifested through the lenses of Western thought alone (Freire, 1970). The ethical space will take form as new, previously oppressed or silenced voices enter the discourse (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Therefore, it will require models of new knowledge and pedagogy from different worldviews. The new partnership model of the ethical space, in a cooperative spirit between Indigenous Peoples and Western institutions, will create new currents of thought that flow in different directions and overrun the old ways of thinking (Noel, 1994).

Kushner and Norris (1980) also worked with the idea of a space between research entities that requires recognition through a process of negotiation. In Interpretation, Negotiation, and Validity in Naturalistic Research, the authors highlight three special insights. These are: first, that research is necessarily political; second, that the ethics of research have been insufficiently explored; and third, there is a need to explore a research ethic that democratizes research. Kushner and Norris (1980) state, “negotiation, particularly in politically sensitive areas of study, can be thought of as taking place across ethical space…there is then an argument for using control procedures to equalize the power relations and to encourage unfettered interaction. (p. 31)."

One of the working ideas of this space is human emancipation from “relationships that enslave” (Benhabib, 1986). According to Freire (1970), emancipation requires a process of conscientization which refers to “the process in which [humans], not as recipients, but as knowing subjects, achieve a deepening awareness of both the socio-cultural reality that shapes their lives and of their capacity to transform that reality” (cited in Graveline, 1998, p.191). It is the intent of the ethical space to identify the points of agreement at the confluence of cultures where understandings can be worked on in pursuit of emancipation and the social realization of the human potential. It is a liberation of thought and to see how far the liberation of thought can make those transformations “urgent enough for people to want to carry them out and difficult enough to carry out for them to be profoundly rooted in reality” (Foucault, 1988, p.155).
8.2 Challenges

Configuring of ethical/moral principles of cross-cultural cooperation, at the common table of the ethical space, will be a challenging and arduous task. In its finest form, the notion of an agreement to interact must always be preceded by the affirmation of the ethical space and the dialogical process involved in its creation. The dimension of the dialogue might seem overwhelming because it will involve and encompass issues like language, distinct histories, knowledge traditions, values, interests, and social, economic and political realities and how these impact and influence an agreement to interact. Initially, it will require a protracted effort to create a level playing field where notions of hierarchy are replaced by concepts of equal relations. For many, this will involve a measure of vulnerability as individuals and groups encounter and gain new perspectives because as Giroux (1992) states, “a dialogical encounter between these discourses offers cultural workers the opportunity to re-examine the partiality of their respective views” (p. 21).

Knowledge translation and transfer will also be challenging but will require immediate attention at the ethical space. Particularly difficult terrains of the new dialogue will include how to resolve the issue of contexts, or how to reconcile disparate contexts in which the respective knowledge systems are embedded. This means work to reconcile a scientific based knowledge that defines much of the Western world with an epistemology based on participatory consciousness and personal experiences with human, natural, and supernatural relationships found in Indigenous learning traditions. It is important for Indigenous knowledge to be recognized as valid in its own right and not to be dismissed if it contradicts or is not explicable in Western academic terms. Concerted effort and fortitude will be required to place a particular focus of inquiry to the systems and institutions that promote and conduct research. It may mean that Western scholarship, as it relates to research involving Indigenous Peoples, will find difficulty in re-examining their truth claims and the possibility of undermining their power and privilege positions in knowledge production by resolving issues of knowledge like ownership, control, benefits and all the other contested issues endemic to the current research order.

Finally, Denzin and Lincoln (2000) speak of an emerging era of qualitative research they call the seventh moment. This emerging moment is the future of the research enterprise based on what the authors have observed as the continuum of mega, historical shifts of qualitative research, by breaks and ruptures, that have evolved since the early 1900s. Accordingly, the current era is the sixth moment and the trend for the future of qualitative research lies in the establishment of an inclusive and democratic research process. In the perspective of Denzin and Lincoln (2000), the compelling trend of the current moment, the sixth moment, is that there is a movement away from overarching grand or master narratives. With the growing realization in the knowledge and research world that there is no “God’s eye view that can be claimed by any knowledge tradition, and that there is a new center emerging from the contradictory tension-riddled enterprise of research, the future of research is yet to be determined. They state, “The center lies in the humanistic commitment of the qualitative researcher to study the world always from the perspective of the gendered, historically situated, interacting individual” (p. 1047). They define the sixth moment as a ‘messy’ moment, a new age where uncertain multi-voiced text, cultural criticism, and new experimental works appear. In the words of Naisbitt (1982), “those who are
willing to handle the ambiguity of this in between period and to anticipate the new era will be a quantum leap ahead of those who hold on to the past”.

9.0 Recommendations

While it is true that research has brought many benefits to human society, it has also been a negative experience for many of the world’s Indigenous Peoples. How research that involves Indigenous Peoples will take shape into the future will depend primarily on the degree of assertion Indigenous Peoples make about their knowledge systems and how accountable they hold the whole of the research enterprise to the practice of ethics. How Indigenous Peoples assert their knowledge and what kind of knowledge will be released from communities to the outside world needs to be understood within perimeters of benefiting Indigenous communities and the protection of cultural and intellectual property from needless exploitation. As Indigenous Peoples’ research advances, the more critical it will become and perhaps more recognized for its value in transforming knowledge. However, this tactic alone will not be the legacy that imprints Indigenous research into the ethical history books. Rather, it is how far Indigenous Peoples’ research can liberate thought and make the transformations urgent enough for people to want to carry them out and difficult enough to carry out for them to be profoundly rooted to reality that will make the difference. The current order of research established from archaic modes of thought requires more than a gentle nudge of a radical paradigm shift. This shift in consciousness will not and cannot be manifested through the lenses of Western thought alone. It will require models of new knowledge from different worldviews. For the West, not only must the discourses of intolerance be allowed to implode under the weight of the their own reasoning, but alternate venues of expression have to be offered in the place of their own deficiencies. Alternate paradigms that envision higher standards of human creativity are required. Apart from this quest, which the Western institutions must undertake in cooperation with Indigenous Peoples, there is no reason why Western research should continue to infringe on Indigenous Peoples’ spaces.

Recommendation #1: Indigenous Peoples’ Jurisdiction

The jurisdiction of Indigenous Peoples to their culture, heritage, knowledge, and political and intellectual domains must be explicitly recognized in the Tri-Council Policy Statement. Indigenous communities’ rights to cultural and intellectual property must be respected and considered in the formulation of the rules of ethical research conduct because it is Indigenous Peoples’ right and duty to develop their own cultures and knowledge systems. Appropriate mechanisms need to be established by the three granting agencies in concert with Indigenous authorities for the approval and review of research proposals in involving Indigenous Peoples. It would then be the responsibility of institutions and governments to adapt to this principle of jurisdiction in any research involving Indigenous Peoples.
Recommendation #2: Advancing the Ethical Space

Further conceptual development needs to take place in regards to an ethical space as the appropriate venue for the expression of an ethical research order that contemplates crossing cultural borders. A concrete conceptualization of the ethical space, as a meeting place of worldviews where excess baggage of interests and hidden agendas are left behind, will further enhance the visualization of an ethical research methodology. Ethical space is also has the potential for the creation of a ‘possibility theory’ in ongoing human research. The conceptual development of the ethical space will require guideline principles put into effect by the three granting agencies that cement practices of dialogue, negotiation, and research agreements with Indigenous authorities in any research involving Indigenous Peoples.

Recommendation #3: Research Agreements

In recognition of Indigenous jurisdiction, research agreements need to be negotiated and formalized with authorities of various Indigenous jurisdictions before any research is conducted with their people. The three granting agencies must enact this in policy and hinge any funding to researchers and institutions entertaining research involving Indigenous Peoples upon research agreements negotiated and approved by tribal authorities.

Recommendation #4: Empowerment and Benefits

Empowerment and benefits must become central features of any research entertained and conducted with respect to Indigenous Peoples. Empowerment not only refers to any benefits that may accrue from research, but also includes formulating research agendas in ways that advance community development, capacity building, knowledge transfer, and peoples’ cultural vitality. Research that is organized into appropriate methods such as renaming, reclaiming, and remembering community existence, must be one of the priorities in Indigenous Peoples’ research and one that research programs must make explicit. Governments, international organizations and private institutions should support the development of educational, research and training centers which are controlled by Indigenous communities, and strengthen these communities’ capacity to document, protect, teach and apply all aspects of their heritage.

Recommendation #5: Protection of Intellectual and Property Rights

Ongoing efforts by scholars and political groups to formulate the parameters of national copyright laws and the protection of Indigenous Peoples’ intellectual and cultural property rights must take extreme urgency. The appropriation of Indigenous Peoples’ intellectual and cultural property that entails a wide array of human, natural, and spiritual creations that are the exclusive property of groups such as the family, community, tribe, or nation is continuing at an astounding pace in new waves of neo-colonialism and imperialism. This property entails special relationships with the natural and spiritual world manifested as knowledge of plants, herbs, and other natural substances. The origin of such dangers as exploitation and appropriation of Indigenous knowledge often lies with university-sponsored research as enacted through funding agreements, scientific initiatives, and social and political developments brought on by economic globalization. Protection
and recognition of Indigenous Peoples’ intellectual and cultural property rights by researchers and institutions must be part and parcel of any funding received from the three granting agencies.

Recommendation # 6: Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession

To protect their heritage, Indigenous Peoples must also exercise control over all research conducted within their territories, or which uses their peoples as subjects of study. This includes the ownership, control, access, and possession of all data and information obtained from research involving Indigenous Peoples. Researchers and scholarly institutions should return all elements of Indigenous Peoples’ heritage to the traditional owners upon demand, or obtain formal agreements with the traditional owners for the shared custody, use and interpretation of their heritage. Additionally, researchers must not publish information obtained from Indigenous Peoples or the results of research conducted on flora, fauna, microbes or materials discovered through the assistance of Indigenous Peoples, without identifying the traditional owners and obtaining their consent to publication. The three granting agencies must stipulate this in policy and as conditions of any funding for researchers and institutions contemplating doing research involving Indigenous Peoples.

Recommendation # 7: Education

Understanding Indigenous social structures and systems, and the role of education in the process of knowledge and cultural transmission, is a vital necessity in coming to terms with research involving Indigenous Peoples. Confronting neo-colonial practices requires a broad and protracted process of conscientization about research ethics, cultural imperialism, and the protection of Indigenous knowledge through the curricula of universities and research institutions that receive funding from the three granting agencies. Education in these respects must be supported with appropriate funding and resources.

Recommendation # 8: Dissemination of Guideline Principles

Professional associations of scientists, engineers and scholars, in collaboration with Indigenous Peoples, should sponsor seminars and disseminate publications to promote ethical conduct in conformity with these guidelines and develop processes and structures to discipline members who act in contravention.

Recommendation # 9: Consent and Timeline conflicts

Steps must be taken to immediately implement policy that will ameliorate inherent conflicts between Research Ethics Board policies and Indigenous ethical requirements, the primary example being the process of negotiating consent with communities and participants prior to the receipt of formal consent that restricts participant contact. In order to negotiate the consent process, contact with the community/participants is required, however, contact prior to the granting of formal consent is prohibited by many Research Ethics Boards. In order to follow an ethical path with the Indigenous community in question, the researcher may be required to violate their institutional ethics. This extremely problematic situation must be addressed immediately by the three funding agencies. Further, the conflict between Indigenous constructions of the research relationships must
be examined vis a vis institutional timelines and funding schedules and how these processes undermine ethical conduct.

10.0 Conclusion – Synthesis

There is a persistent form of divergence, an alienating tension, at times bordering on animosity, that tarnishes and hangs like a dark cloud over the on-going association between Indigenous Peoples and the Western world. It is a time-lagged issue because the protracted matter of division had its genesis so long ago and the ensuing time span of relations has not alleviated the condition to any perceptible degree of comfort on either side. From the Indigenous perspective, the term mistrust is emphasized because the course of Western colonialism following contact, with its trail of misconceptions, deception, domination and even violence, has left distinct and sour imprints in the minds of many Indigenous Peoples about the possibility of forging any trustful relationships with the Western world. Similar disengagement exists in how the West seems unwilling to pursue an inclusive paradigm for advancing knowledge and the deeper level potential of humanity through appropriate dialogue and cooperation with alternate systems of knowledge. Therefore, the attendant scholarship that circumscribes the research enterprise is a readily apparent location for examining the historical nature of this encounter between the West and Indigenous Peoples for the purpose of identifying the tensions and subsequently remodeling the relationship. The purpose of this review is to provide ideas and concepts as substance to flesh out the “Good Practices” of the Tri-Council Policy Statement Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (1998). Like many recent scholarly examinations, this review highlighted to problematic history of research on Indigenous populations in order to explore issues that are affecting harmonious research activities and relationships. Taking advantage of our location at the centre of the Indigenous research milieu in Canada, the attempt to articulate that unique perspective utilizing both the literature and experience grounded in the Indigenous experience is here presented.

The purposeful highlighting of the schism between Indigenous Peoples and the Western world sets the conditions up for the reengagement of the two through an ethical process envisioned in the ethical space. Accordingly, the current era of the ethical space outlines the trend for the future of qualitative research that lies in the establishment of an inclusive and democratic research process. The compelling trend of the ethical space is that there is a movement away from overarching grand or master narratives and towards the development of “moral and pedagogical imperatives” to guide research in Indigenous contexts. With the growing realization in the knowledge and research world that there is no “God’s eye view that can be claimed by any knowledge tradition, and that there is a new center emerging from the contradictory tension-riddled enterprise of research, the future of research is yet to be determined in research involving Indigenous Peoples. It is certain, however, that the future will be one in which empowerment is not handed out by those in authority, rather an ethical order is facilitated through listening and participation “…in a process that facilitates the development of the people as a sense of themselves as agentic and of having an authoritative voice…” (Bishop, 1998 cited in Denzin, 2003).
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The ethical guidelines offered by the Aboriginal Healing Foundation emerged from the Legacy of Sexual and Physical Abuse in the Residential School System. As the process of healing developed, it brought together many Indigenous groups from across the nation, and from their work, this document emerged to address the ethical issues they faced. Their intention is that these guidelines will serve as model for other communities to use as may be needed. In Part I, the authors outline 18 points while Part II draws on stories that help others learn about ethics. Importantly, the Aboriginal Healing Foundation is a proponent of Aboriginal People across Canada developing their own ethical standards to meet their own community's issues.


Given the past problems of research for some Indian tribes in the USA and the inability of Institutional Research Boards to properly regulate research among American Indian tribes, this document attempts to identify special issues and provide Indian tribes with the materials necessary to develop their own approach to regulating research. Thus, the American Indian Law Center sees tribal and IRB processes as being complementary in legislating a code of research ethics. The model research code addresses the development process in which each tribe must: produce a policy statement; define the scope in terms of geography, persons, and subject matter; define the process of administration, review, application, and licenses and fees; and how will the legislation be enforced. The authors include a model research code and a checklist for Indian Health Boards support or approval of research proposals.


Health research and ethical considerations are a fairly new phenomenon in Aboriginal communities. In this chapter, Anderson discusses the importance of establishing constructive relationships between the researcher and the community to engage in community development necessary to improve health status and services to Aboriginals while promoting social change within the community. Following discussion on the promotion of social change, Anderson argues that this is achieved through the incorporation of immediate and direct benefits, a process of dissemination, and recognition of researcher and research study impact on the community throughout the research process.

Archibald discusses the focus of the Canadian Journal of Native Education Issue concerning issues of mutual respect central to First Nations research. She raises an important issue of incorporating Aboriginal values into First Nations research. Often times this means that researchers must go back and re-search motives, values, and methods in both research process and product. She gives a brief example concerning the integration of humor, stories and personal experiences in traditional learning and education before giving brief introductions to the following articles.


In Archibald’s editorial for the 1999 issue of the Canadian Journal of Native Education, she states the theme being reflection, acknowledgment, and revision of Aboriginal research and academic discourse. Prior to giving brief summaries on the main themes of the following articles in the issue, Archibald states that the articles selected illustrate important Aboriginal teachings and discourse, analytically examine current research issues, or present new discussion not previously discussed. They symbolize reaching back to hear important Aboriginal teachings.


The guidelines in this document are designed to address concerns over the documentation, representation, and utilization of traditional cultural knowledge. The Assembly of Native Educators (Alaska) hope these guidelines will facilitate the incorporation of Indigenous knowledge and practices in schools throughout Alaska. Importantly, Elders are a central element in this process. The Assembly addresses guidelines for the following groups: Native Elders; Authors and Illustrators; Curriculum Developers and Administrators; Educators; Editors and Publishers; Document Reviewers; Researchers; Native Language Specialists, Native Community Organizations, and the General Public. The Assembly then ends the document with 10 general recommendations to support the effective implementation of the guidelines.


The Association of Canadian Universities for Northern Studies outlines 20 principles to foster the development of co-operation and mutual respect between researchers and northern residents. The general guidelines include supporting community involvement in the various stages of research, receiving informed consent from participants, and generating trust by valuing the language, traditions, and standards of community.

In this article, Attneave examines the responsibilities of the researcher and the community in research while recognizing that both similarly faced with issues that exist outside their control. Although issues surrounding the responsibility of the researcher have been around a long time, there is a slow emergence towards the conception of the community as a living system, having rights and thus must be ethically treated. This is similar to the emergence of the ethical treatment of animals through their recognition of living creatures. Attneave also recognizes differences between the responsibilities of the researcher and the community such as the existence of a mutually agreed upon identity held by the researcher, whereas the community must define itself and its members while ensuring proper representation. The solution to issues of responsibility is argued to be clearly defined boundaries of the researcher and the community.


Using the philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre's definition of "traditions," the author argues that even though local Aboriginal culture in Central Australia has been through extensive change, that culture remains historically specific for the Aboriginal people involved. To illustrate that point, Austin-Broos draws on her observations at a funeral and other contemporary Lutheran traditions of Western Arrernte people in Central Australia. Importantly, as the Western Arrernte continually negotiate their declining socio-economic order with the Australian state, local traditions must be taken into account in discussions about 'contracts' or 'policies' concerning Aboriginal people today.


In this document, the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies draw on the principles of Indigenous self-determination and the right to control and maintain their culture and heritage to promote a practice of ethical research. The Institute offers 11 general guidelines and advice on about their implementation. The 11 points fall under these three broad categories: (1) consultation, negotiation, and mutual understanding; (2) respect, recognition, and involvement; and (3) benefits, outcomes, and agreement.


The Aurora Research Institute provides a practical document on conducting research in the Northwest Territories. The guide offers potential researchers a 'how-to' for such things as obtaining appropriate licences, consulting communities, where to find documents on ethical principles of research, getting northern residents involved in research projects, providing community contact lists, maps, and getting research support.

In this short article, Barden and Boyer argue that as more Indigenous scholars enter mainstream academic institutions, they bring new and fresh perspectives to the research. The problem is that the research being conducted by Indigenous scholars makes use of existing methodologies. Therefore, the authors argue that American Tribal Colleges are well situated to introduce 'new' research methodologies that better reflect Indigenous research interests drawn from existing Indigenous "ways of knowing."


In this article, Barnes explores a collaborative project between researchers at New Zealand's Alcohol & Public Health Research Unit and two Maori organizations (Te Whanau o Waipareira Trust and the Huakina Development Trust). The community-based initiatives (rather than an imposed initiative) aimed to prevent alcohol-related traffic accidents among Maori peoples. The community Trusts drew on both research-based knowledge and community knowledge to implement a complex and rich strategy to achieve a significant level of success. Barnes argues that the collaborative nature of the project resulted in considerable Maori participation and demonstrated that community knowledge can be merged with research knowledge to meet community concerns.


This guide was developed by the Women’s Research Centre for community groups involved in social change. It emphasizes participation and action research and begins with an overview of the thinking behind action research. It also illustrates a research process for “community” research. The appendices also provide detailed steps in the interviewing process and ethical considerations. This guide is geared specifically at AIDS groups, women’s groups, and others with the exception of Indigenous groups due to the neglect of mentioning any cultural significance in research and its process.


Indigenous peoples have had their language, culture, art, and knowledge including plant knowledge become susceptible to commercialization due to continued colonization. This commercialization has often occurred without proper consent, and without benefits to the community or the individuals within the community.

This book describes the current legal systems are why they are inadequate to protect Indigenous knowledge. This is followed by insights and ideas that can reform the current legal systems. This book also examines international issues and explores developments in various countries including Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand while examining the relevant United Nations national and international agreements to Indigenous knowledge. In the last section it
offers solutions of protection for Indigenous peoples, and provides guidance for those interested in exploring Indigenous knowledge further.


In this paper Beauvais discusses how there is an emerging issue involving the form and “nature” of obtaining informed consent in Native American communities. Attempts at obtaining written consent including permission for the participation of children in the community has been unsuccessful. Issues of obtaining consent and a number of other structural characteristics have become barriers to good research in North American communities. Beauvais argues that researchers can overcome these barriers by understanding and reacting to issues in these communities such as lack of available resources, uneasiness in association with research and its values, issues of sovereignty and overlapping jurisdictions. Thus, researchers must be aware of the social, political and historical events influencing the communities.


Historically, and in the last few years, patents for traditional Indigenous medicines and plants have been issued to university researchers and international corporations without recognition to Indigenous intellectual property. Indigenous activists are taking issues to international forums in the light of United States and Canadian claims that traditional knowledge is not intellectual property.


In this article, Bielawski draws on her experience working with Inuit elders and scientists working in the arctic and relates the problems she encounters in incorporating Inuit Indigenous knowledge and arctic science. Moreover, centuries of conflict have confronted the Inuit and the Europeans and permeate all relations between the two. Bielawski utilizes philosophical realism as a theoretical background when considering how the Inuit construct knowledge and producing an ethnography of arctic science. Thus, she argues that the case studies, when taken together, can contribute a better understanding of the Arctic.


This paper is concerned with Maori research that is empowering. Upon reflection of utilizing critical theory and action research, the author argues that in order to be empowering, and approach that is located in Maori cultural practices is required. This includes addressing and understanding not only Maori concerns about research as well as the role of the researcher in research prior to the actual start of conducting research.

Blanchard, M., McKnight, A., Lui-Chivizhe, L., Wray, D., French, K., Sherwood, J., et
al. (2000). *Creating an optimistic future for indigenous research in education: re-visioning both outcome and process*. Panel presentation report. In Australian Association for Research in Education Australia: Australian Association for Research in Education.

This report is presented by a panel of Indigenous people from the Koori Centre in Australia. This report presents many issues, challenges, opportunities and the emergence of an Indigenous research paradigm. Through the development of collaborative research initiatives emphasizing Indigenous Australians in the planning, management and processing of research information, progress concerning research ethics have been and continue to be an integral part of Indigenous Australian research.


This paper discusses the advantages of utilizing participatory action research with Aboriginal Canadians through illustrating how the study was constructed and determine what can be learned from this collaborative inquiry through a reflective analysis. In order to demonstrate the purpose of this paper, the authors discuss the qualitative study among the James Bay Cree that focuses on the meanings they gave to the rising incidence and prevalence of diabetes. In order to fully understand the meanings the researchers hired a number of co-researchers from the community. Both parties benefited as they contributed in the development of the Cree perspective on diabetes they also acquired knowledge and skills of qualitative research that can be useful to policy and practice in health care and other areas.


In this article, Boyer illustrates a positive research experience for both the researcher and the Indigenous community in which the research was conducted. He highlights the experience of a graduate student who took the time to better understand the culture, negotiated a mutually acceptable research topic, maintained that consent throughout, and returned to share her results after the project was finished. This article serves as an example for a respectful and thoughtful research project that will ultimately be beneficial to the community.


In Paul Boyer's interview with Dr. John Red Horse, they discuss the utility of scholarship and the issues that surround research in Indigenous communities. Issues they discuss include consent, cultural knowledge, Indigenous research agendas, and realizing Indigenous scholarship.


This paper discusses the problematising research method that attempts to get community dialogue on its issues not normally discussed in the area of adolescent crime and substance abuse in Yalata.
That author then argues that this method failed for a number of reasons including failure to recognize differing views by community members and their reactions to those problems identified.


This paper discusses the use of teachers and learners designing, implementing and evaluating educational programs that are not successful with just the utilization of traditional approaches in educating aboriginals in Canada and the Philippines. This model of education implied in the case studies is discussed as providing alternatives to traditional views of ethics, pedagogy and epistemologies.


This author discusses the cultural behaviors of Native children and their misinterpretation by clinicians in psychological assessments. She argues that failure to understand and associate these behaviors in a historical and cultural perspective can be destructive and cause more harm than be helpful.


This paper, the authors discuss current Canadian intellectual property legislation as it relates to Canada's First Nations people and offers some implications and limitations that this legislation has in protecting Indigenous traditional knowledge. Moreover, this paper is designed to be a guide for Indigenous communities to begin discussion relating to intellectual property and indigenous knowledge. Importantly, this paper outlines existing protective measures for traditional knowledge and Aboriginal intellectual property, alternative mechanisms Indigenous communities have at their disposal, information related to licensing intellectual property, and other sources of information regarding intellectual property rights.


Brown, in this article, addresses the current flaws in Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and the inability of those laws to protect individuals and corporations from appropriating and profiting from Indigenous cultural knowledge. Drawing on a policy-making perspective, Brown suggests that the legislative reforms offered by legal scholars, anthropologists, and native activists, incorrectly he argues, focus on expanding the notion of copyright. He argues that such a narrow focus ignores a broader crisis of intellectual property and the status of the public domain. Thus, Brown offers a "skeptical assessment" of legal schemes that promote the idea that Indigenous peoples can copyright ideas rather than tangible expressions (outcomes) of the ideas that exist in the public domain.

In this paper, that author argues that in the United States, the archaeology community and federal government are encouraging the participation and co-operation of American Indians in the preservation and protection of culture on federal reservations and other lands. This paper discusses the strategies for establishing a relationship between the government, American Indians, bands, tribes and the oil and gas industry.


Through the utilization of his own experiences, Cajete provides a foundational framework built on Native American educational practices that advocates a culturally specific educational process while also utilizing the most appropriate concepts and technologies of modern education. The foundational framework is built upon tradition and thought that becomes the “ecology of Indigenous education.”

In this book, Cajete begins with an interpretation of modern education from a tribal perspective as well as providing an overview of tribal Indigenous education. Next the author, describes integral sections of this tribal education foundation that includes spiritual ecology, environmental, mythical foundations, artistic and communal foundations. In his last section, Cajete explains in the role and importance of the individual in teaching and learning within Indigenous education.


Today, we live in a technologically driven society that has done considerable damage to the environment. In Native Science, Cajete conveys a way of understanding, experiencing and being in the natural word as seen in the foundations of Indigenous science. He also points to differences between Indigenous and Western paradigms of science, while conveying highlighting ecological and environmental studies.

In this book, the author begins by discussing philosophical foundations of Indigenous or native science. Later, he discusses ecology, plants, animals and the land as integral parts of understanding the foundations of Native science. While expressing the need for a Native science paradigm, Cajete also acknowledges the native contribution to a changing and new philosophy of science as well as ecological awareness.


This paper examines ethics in a bicultural context in New Zealand and identifies the Cartwright inquiry and the treaty of the Waitangi as influencing the current research ethics in New Zealand. It
resulted in the change of construction of ethics committees, and increased membership and participation of the Maori in the ethics of research and specifically the ethics of reproductive technologies.


In this paper, the author discusses the manner in which the construction of an Indigenous identity in Australia and the United States is influenced by Anthropologists. Anthropologists, it is argued, play an important role in practice and theory as the authors suggest the reburial of the ancestors is the Indigenous peoples’ attempts to regenerate the status quo. This article further discusses the ethical dilemmas of Anthropologist working towards the creation of a universal heritage instead of an emphasis of working with Indigenous communities due to the increasing need from management legislation and government regulations for the reproduction of Indigenous social order.


In this article, the author discusses aboriginal or Indigenous worldview as being foundational, a means in which culture grows that determines our realities and our own personal experiences. These influence our construction of research methodologies as we are different from western European worldviews and their research methodologies. Cardinal states that Indigenous research methods and methodologies are as old as our nations and ceremonies. They are always with us. Our culture has ways of gathering, discovering, and uncovering knowledge.


The main objective of this article is to discuss negative information and consider the limitations of dominant Western bioethical perspectives as they pertain specifically to the Navajo and the Navajo perspective. This is accomplished through the thirty four Navajo research participants from a Navajo reservation in Northeast Arizona who stated integrated cultural values of positive speaking into the manner in which patients and providers conduct health services. Therefore, the policies that comply with the Patient Self-determination Act in western biomedicine are ethically dangerous and conflict with Navajo values and thus warrant reevaluation.


Obtaining consent from research participants serves to protect their rights from the risks associated with research. In the United States, the standard ethical code set forth in the Belmont report and other guidelines may be inappropriate for use with people who have an ethnically different perspective. This paper presents an alternative to informed consent for participants of research in storyteller cultures.
Since the adoption of the Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS) in 1998, several shortcomings in the ethical guidelines and governance structures have been identified. In this paper, the author proposes a set of principles to assist in developing ethical codes for the conduct of research within the Aboriginal community or with external partners. It affirms that Aboriginal Peoples have a right to participate as principals or partners in research that generates knowledge affecting their culture, identity and well-being. To provide context and rationale for the principles presented, the paper outlines features of the current public dialogue on research ethics, how ethics are framed in Aboriginal cultures, and how Aboriginal perceptions of reality and right behaviour clash with norms prevailing in western research. Current initiatives of Aboriginal communities and nations, research granting councils and institutions to establish ethical guidelines for Aboriginal research are highlighted as evidence that the development of workable ethical regimes is already well begun.

The authors explore a participatory action research (PAR) project in the Yakama Indian Nation (Eastern Washington State, USA) designed for the early detection of cervical cancer through Pap smears. University researchers, practitioners, tribal members, and officials collaborated to increase the women's use of Pap smears and to facilitate the community's ability to manage future projects. From their interviews, the researchers discovered that for the Yakama women, family, community, and spirituality, rather than cancer were their primary interests. Importantly, the researchers developed broad programs to meet those needs and they attribute much of that success to the PAR methodology.

This article discusses the lack of attention made to the interaction between western biomedical ethics and the ethics and experiences of non western people. The author raises important questions pertaining to how these issues are to be addressed and to what extent should they influence research policies. He begins the discussion by presenting four problematic ethical models that he states are possible but due to particular circumstances are inadequate. The author argues that these models are inadequate because of the way in which ethics are perceived by each group. Each group has cultural differences and in terms of ethics, what needs to be recognized is that culture shapes the way in which we perceive, the form of, and the way in which ethics are handled. Thus, ethics must be viewed in a cross-cultural perspective as a form of ‘local knowledge’, and that differences must be negotiated as they will not disappear.
As Canada increasingly becomes a more ethnically, culturally, and racially plural society, Clarke argues that there is little valid and reliable research to assist nurses and other healthcare officials in understanding the cultural aspects of health and healing. Given the past record of culturally inappropriate research, the author calls for culturally suitable theory and research in nursing and healthcare delivery. Clarke proposes the suitability of critical ethnography as a research method among First Nations peoples which addresses the importance of partnerships, ethics, and ownership of the data collected.


In this article, Colorado argues that western science - the empirical positivist paradigm - cannot meet human nor ecological needs in light of environment destruction and personal alienation. To address her argument, Colorado promotes "traditional Indian science" as a solution to the ideological domination of a mono-cultural approach to research strategies and scholarly exchange. She argues that aboriginal epistemology is a holistic and spiritual process whereby information is gathered from the "mental, physical, social, and cultural / historical realms." For Colorado, the methodology of native science includes four tools: feelings, history, prayer, relations. She draws on the metaphor of the tree, the entity in which research, information, and knowledge, of nature is stored and exchanged. In aboriginal epistemology, this energy given by the tree centres or 'roots' each individual and provides the understanding of ones interconnection and interdependence with all things. In this way, native science is a personal journey and the quest for knowledge can provide the means to heal relationships destroyed by Western ideology and epistemology.


In this article, the author argues that community action research is useful in instilling a collaborative relationship between research and the practice of public health. This approach in New Zealand is based on respect for knowledge, skills and experience each partner brings to public health. The author discusses the APHRU/Wariki project that emphasized youth and drugs as an example of this.


The Council of Yukon First Nations observed that recently, interest in traditional knowledge has increasingly became a legitimate component in decision-making processes. This document emerged from a series of roundtable discussions meant to develop the protocols for ethical access and responsible use of traditional knowledge. These guidelines are based on the three cornerstones of "respect, protection, and connection." The guideline considers the following aspects: principles of traditional knowledge research, some reflections on traditional knowledge by Elders, access, collection, use, and storage of traditional knowledge, and ends with a series of different consent form samples and checklists. The CYFN also includes an appendix of a First Nations Contact list.

As American healthcare beliefs move toward a more "culturally competent" delivery system, existing ethical standards become increasingly complex. With the growing consciousness of the ethnically diverse population by the US healthcare system, several issues emerge among people with differing worldviews and ideas of informed consent and truth-telling. In this paper, the authors discuss the challenges nurses and their administrators have in interpreting healthcare policies as well as maintaining the American Nurses Association code of ethics when providing care for diverse populations. They argue that understanding the different approaches to truth-telling is critical to providing culturally sensitive care. The authors draw on three case studies to illustrate how different ethnic groups reacted to healthcare providers' actions and how concepts of truth-telling and informed consent shaped those responses.


Cruikshank takes us through her experiences working with Indigenous women in the Yukon since the mid-1970's. Her initial project was to explore how the Yukon gold rush (1896-98) shaped the lives of women born just prior to that date. From the very start, it was clear that the stories that Cruikshank wanted to acquire was very different from the stories the Yukon women wanted to tell. Given the nature of the Indigenous women's oral narratives, Cruikshank needed to understand how oral tradition is used rather than the factual information contained in the transcripts. Thus, for the rest of the introduction Cruikshank details how she allowed the Yukon women to shape and guide her research project in a collaborative fashion.


In this article, the author describes a framework that will contemplate research activities linked to Maori knowledge, while raising issues in Maori research. This framework is based on three principles which are identification of specific project locations that permit financial purchase and investment overtime, purchasers of research need to reflect on their operation and evaluation systems, and a skilled Maori research workforce is parallel to the goal of developing Maori specific research methods and methodologies. The article goes on to discuss the importance of Maori research, in particular Kaupapa Maori research, in science and technology to constantly develop and reinforce Maori knowledge.


This chapter portrays many of the research issues that researchers face when working in collaboration with Aboriginal communities. The author argues that community specific consultation processes are needed that also ensure the researchers role within the research project. The researcher due to the consultation process must, acknowledge group and individual
perspectives while negotiating and report to the community. This research process must also include the development at all education levels of a mathematics educational research agenda.


This chapter provides an introductory discussion necessary to begin meaningful discussions on ethics, health research, methods, and researcher responsibility for the purpose of providing initial exposure to ethical issues and initiate discussion for researchers. This chapter begins with a thorough illustration of the beginnings of health research and ethical considerations that followed. Daly and McDonald later present basic guidelines for research evaluation that include examining the potential impact on community health, appropriate research methods, intrusion and data collection, and appropriate dissemination of results.


Over the years, numerous psychological studies on the Crees of northern Quebec have left Cree members feeling exploited and mistreated. In response, the Cree have ejected five of the six researchers from their territory and stopped all further psychological studies. Although the authors of this paper point to the lack of respect for decisions made by local authorities as likely the main cause of the expulsion, an overall respect for the minority culture, authority, and expectations while conducting research was lacking. In this paper, the authors attempt to explain the problem and present a series of recommendations - such as respecting local authority; ensuring value to the community; showing caution, patience, and flexibility; avoiding cultural comparisons; using qualitative or participative methodologies; receiving feedback from local colleagues; and giving follow-up feedback sessions - to ensure appropriate research projects in diverse cultural situations.


In 1990, a process was initiated by the Australian Archaeology Association (AAA) to develop a code of ethics for archaeology research based on consultations with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. The process began with amendments to the code of ethics developed by the World Archaeology Congress (WAC). In this article, the author presents the evolution of a code of ethics in Australia through the presentation of the code of ethics by the WAC, the amendments that were recommended by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, and the resulting code of ethics for the AAA. Although, the newly created ethics are by no means mandatory to all research in Australia, they are however mandatory for members of the AAA, who will lose their membership in they do not adhere to the code of ethics.

In the context of higher education in the USA, American Indian people have extremely poor retention rates and find great difficulty in completing higher education degrees. In 1996, tribal and urban Institutions of higher education collaborated to evoke changes in order to benefit urban American Indian students. Given the numerous studies on student characteristics, the American Indian Urban Higher Education Initiative drew on a community-based research process to explore how the higher education institutions contributed to the problem. The authors of this article explore the process of developing new strategies from the initial symposium in which a guiding vision statement was developed and priorities were established, followed by a needs assessment process, which included a literature review, three community forum sessions and key informant surveys. Importantly, the American Indian Higher Education Initiative utilized the knowledge and resources of the urban American Indian communities of concern to "to provide self-directed, self-defined education to urban American Indian students" that was "culturally appropriate."


Here, Deloria calls for a change in the research environment with respect to Indigenous communities. Deloria points to popular writers, poorly trained scholars, and funding agencies outside the research realm that, historically, have tainted the quality of scholarship and damaged the image of native culture. The author argues that "new vehicles" of Indian / scholar communication need to be established to address current deficiencies. Deloria suggests that panels of "Master Scholars" could be set up, who in conjunction with Indigenous leaders could then consult funding agencies for appropriate research practices. Importantly, Deloria argues that funding agencies must clearly focus on research that is valuable to the communities and demand higher standards of behaviour and cooperation in the relationship between Indians and research scholars than currently exists.


These guidelines emerged from the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples and have become the standard of "best practice" for all RCAP funded research projects. Respect for Aboriginal cultures, languages, values and knowledge underpins their guidelines. Based on 7 principles, several issues are raised under the following ethical guidelines: Aboriginal knowledge, Consent, Collaborative Research, Access to Research Results, Community Benefit, and Implementation.


Donovon and Spark propose guidelines based on their experience with community-based health promotion program development and evaluation in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. Although these guidelines apply primarily to research conducted among mainland Aboriginal communities, they are also placed in a context to which Torres Strait Islanders and rural or urban community aborigines would also benefit through their application or use. These
guidelines were developed to assist non-Indigenous health and public policy professionals whose research methods involves the use of survey questionnaires or unstructured interviewing. The main objective for the creation of these guidelines is to assist in greater communication between Indigenous participants and researchers as well as to ensure that the interviewing process is accomplished with minimum discomfort to participants and maximum sensitivity to cultural differences.


The Bibbulung Gnarneep Project in Perth, Western Australia focused on Aboriginal maternal and child health began in 1994. While human rights and ethical principles provide a rationale for health research in Indigenous communities to be controlled by Indigenous people, there is still a need for non-Indigenous scientific knowledge and skills in Indigenous health research. The Bibbulung Gnarneep project team and the authors of this article describe the process of developing a protocol that falls in line with scientific ethical guidelines of informed consent and confidentiality as well as through consultation and negotiation between both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal involved in this project.


This book begins with a discussion on the current trend to incorporate Elders into Institution-based and health research. This book was developed as a guide to working with Elders for this type of research and as a result defines an Elder, describes their position in the community and what can be expected of them. Based on the perspectives of Elders in the Winnipeg areas, this book also discusses culturally appropriate ways of asking for information, and giving compensation for services. In the last section of this book, Ellerby discusses the diversity of Elders from different cultural groups and areas.


In relation to Indigenous medical knowledge in various parts of the world, the process begins with the research collection of information and/or materials and ends with the development or generation of a dissertation, scientific paper or drug. Medicinal plant research can have several motivations that range from understanding particular native plant systems to the development and discovery of new drugs. Although, these are significant contributions to the world economy, Indigenous groups tend not to benefit from the achievements of research. The author argues that due to sociopolitical, economic, and ethical disagreements from various levels including Indigenous communities and groups, research efforts are perceived as scientific imperialism unlike in the past. This results in government and Indigenous groups unwillingness to permit research. Unless these issues are discussed and further greater understanding, medicinal plant research is in danger of serving ethically questionable purposes.
In this article, Ferguson discusses the role and practice of Archaeology both historically and contemporary in relation to Native Americans. Currently, the social, political, legal and intellectual consequences of archaeology research processes are being reviewed due to concerns raised by Native Americans. The author argues however, that the issues raised by Native Americans about how and why archaeology research is conducted critiques the very foundation of archaeology. Now, archaeologists must work in partnership with Native Americans in studying the archaeological record in the Americas.


There are many different historical and contemporary perceptions of “Indians” within Canadian society. Francis examines a variety of different perceptions of Indians in the historical setting that developed out of white history. These types of Indians range from the vanishing Canadian, the performing Indian, the bureaucrat’s Indian as well as the marketing of these imaginary Indians. The author begins with an introduction that sets the stage for perceiving the imaginary Indian as a construction of white society that they passed onto their children. He later goes on to describe some types of Imaginary Indians as well as discussing how they were constructed and for what reasons.


In this article, Freeman considers the various aspects of conducting research in rural native communities. Freeman briefly explores three kinds of research related to healthcare in the first part of the article before moving on to an examination of the problems and solutions of research with First Nations communities, and followed by a short discussion of the relevance of these problems. The issues he discusses include, community control of research and publication, privacy and confidentiality, recruitment of research subjects, community investigators and staff, time allocation, the subpoena of data, distributive justice, research methods, and social realities. Importantly, Freeman argues, all research must be conducted with respect and with the communities involved to ensure viable and accurate solutions to primary healthcare needs.


In this article, the authors describe an agreement to commence genetic research with a particular Native American tribe in an attempt to reconcile confidentiality issues often identified with genetic research. This agreement was obtained through a culturally specific model particular to the Native American community. It entailed discussing project and other issues including informed consent with community members chosen in the community to making decisions concerning health. The
agreement that was reached not only addressed issues of ethics, informed consent, and confidentiality for the community members but also for the researchers.


In discussing the failure of a community relocation project in the Northwest Territories, Gamble highlights the inherent problems in applying Western scientific ideals in traditional northern societies. Gamble argues the unconscious values and beliefs that form the Western scientific tradition give rise to an intolerance that often "crushes" other world views, as in this case in the Northwest Territories. The inability (or unwillingness) of government officials to recognize and value the knowledge and wishes of the Indigenous community exemplifies the often cited negative examples of research and scientific applications. In the end, Gamble suggests that Western scientists can look to Indigenous forms of knowledge to restore a sense of humanity to their profession.


Indigenous people have often expressed concern about certain research models when it comes to research in their own communities. This resulted in the development of culturally appropriate social science research models. In this article, the author discusses personal experiences in negotiating a research agreement with the local Maori and the University of Otago to develop collaborative research. She discusses such methodological and conceptual issues such as the role of the researcher, level of participation by Maori in the research process, implementing a culturally appropriate methodology, and rights to “traditional” indigenous knowledge.


As health research in Canada moves toward the inclusion of socio-cultural factors influencing disease or healthcare delivery, the authors of this article attempt to identify the characteristics of specific organizational and individual partners and how they affect the participatory research process. In their view, the collaborative research process assumes a position whereby the community being studied is an equal partner to the other institutions involved in the study. All knowledge and expertise is considered complementary. Thus, the authors promote a research environment that takes into account all institutional partners and encourages an ongoing negotiation of such issues as the roles and responsibilities of each collaborator, the desired outcome of the research, measures of validity, ownership of data, control of funding, and modes of dissemination.

To create knowledge that is relevant to the communities specific needs and interests community-based approaches to research such as participatory research, participatory action research and/or action research are required. The key to a research process in community-based research involves the acknowledgment of personal, organizational, professional and research goals to community members in the beginning. This is important as it establishes greater success in obtained relevance to the particular community. This later becomes a framework for evaluation of the research project.


Gilchrist's article surveys the state of research with respect to Aboriginal people in terms of its relevance and ethics. Although volumes of research have been generated, little of that research has been determined by the Aboriginal peoples themselves. Gilchrist argues that significant issues such as Aboriginal worldview, access to technical knowledge and research resources, Aboriginal community participation and ownership of research, and interest representation (whose interests are being served by the research) are weak and missing in conventional research strategies defined by positivistic and quantitative approaches. Moreover, the value-free stance of the positivist paradigm is problematic for Aboriginal communities given that Aboriginal experience related in the conventional way is filtered through a Western value system. As a result, Gilchrist argues that it is virtually impossible for Western scholars to produce value-free or objective findings. To address this issue, the author argues that the hierarchies of power found in conventional research relations need to be inverted. She draws on the example of critical ethnography and a qualitative participatory research methodology to empower the researched while allowing researchers to access "more depth and detail" from their questions. She concludes by arguing that the myths of value neutrality must be overcome and that by embracing historical and cultural contexts will improve the quality and direction of research by and for aboriginal people.


This paper describes the development and use of formative assessment methods in a school-based obesity prevention project in six different Native American nations. The authors relate their experiences in developing appropriate protocols, data collection, and data analysis. Over the course of the study, the researchers found that individual interviewing, direct observation, and child-pairing interviews were more effective than focus group studies. The project was developed by a multi-disciplinary group including substantial input from Native American collaborators, drew on a wide range of participants including parents, children, teachers, administrators, and community leaders, and provided unique methods that could be applied across several Native American nations.

Informed consent based on the respect for individuals has been a principle universal in its adaptation as evident through its adoption by international ethic codes. In this article, Gostin describes how informed consent may be inconsistent with the beliefs and values of cultural and ethnic minorities. In order to illustrate this, Gostin states that national and cross-cultural literature is growing on the cultural relativeness of moral values and human rights. To demonstrate the inconsistency of universal informed consent and human rights, a case study of the American medical systems and consent physicians have to patients in the United States is presented.


For aboriginal people in Canada, our education systems have been dominated by Western educational models and Eurocentric thought. In this book, Graveline focuses on the development of an Aboriginal model, serving as resistance in an emancipation effort against Eurocentric thought and dominance in existing social and political structures as they are divided along race and culture. She is also interested in legitimizing Aboriginal holistic paradigms within frameworks available such as experiential learning, and feminist and anti-racist pedagogies. In the beginning portion of this book, Graveline focuses on decolonization, rewriting history, resisting schooling, reclaiming subjectivity, and culture as resistance in the face of Eurocentric and Western educational systems through demonstrating the need for a native perspective. In the second portion of this book, she examines the native perspective through an Aboriginal model in use illustrated in the medicine wheel.


Intellectual property rights has been discussed in very trivial terms from Hollywood movies, to high profile media coverage. In this source book, Greaves attempts to bring a collection of ideas, examples, and experiences that might help tribal peoples and other communities gain some benefit from their contributions to the world economy, whether it by new plants, foods, crafts, art or music. Indigenous peoples’ knowledge has been continually exploited by various researchers, corporations and a number of others in the hopes of obtaining valuable information and materials for the world economy. Often times, these people and/or their communities have not been properly compensated or recognized despite the enormous benefits obtained from their knowledge.


In this article, Thomas Greaves highlights the shortcomings of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) have with respect to protecting the "cultural knowledge" of Indigenous societies. Because Indigenous groups were sparsely represented at the initial drafting of IPR regulations, Greaves argues that the IPR is ill-equipped and far-too-narrowly defined. Greaves calls for Indigenous groups to become more active in the IPR process and for the widening of the definition of IPR. In the meantime, Greaves illustrates some of the alternative methods American Indigenous groups have used in overcoming the IPR limitations to protect their cultural knowledge.

Greely discusses the question of how can Indigenous rights be protected in the collection of human genes. In one section of the article, the author explores five different approaches: a ban on life-related patents, treatment that follows the Biodiversity Convention, gifts, individual property rights, and group rights. Ultimately the Greely supports the last option, the one of group rights. He argues that in this scenario, it is the group who decides whether or not to participate in genetic research projects, maintain control throughout the study, and accrue potential benefits.


The promotion of health in Canada currently encompasses participant control of health through defining needs, setting priorities of goals in health, controlling the application of health and evaluating health conditions, standards, and policies. Connected to participant control of health, participatory research has its advantages and used in conjunction with other methods it becomes more meaningful and acceptable to participants through community-based initiatives. This study begins by tracing the historical roots and contemporary contexts of participatory research.

Following the background information, theories and principles of participatory research in literature and the field contribute to the development of basic guidelines describing levels or forms of participatory research. These guidelines include a high degree of community participation and as such, the community not researchers identify the issue to be addressed, the research has the purpose of both collective learning and action to address issues, the methods of research are flexible and appropriate to the community, and the community will benefit from the research.


Drawing on an Indigenous parable of "the Coyote's new eyes," the authors – one a non-native supervisor and the other an Indigenous graduate student – explore the issues of power and respect and the need for fundamental changes within academia toward ethnography in Indigenous societies. The authors draw on a shared reading course and their own experiences conducting ethnographical research in Indigenous communities to illustrate the need to reorient existing ethnographic methods that are more inclusive of Indigenous epistemological philosophy and less hierarchical. The authors suggest that this article serves as a model or written research that "strives to transcend power differences." In the end, the metaphor of the Coyote's new eyes illustrates the incorporation of Indigenous knowledge into traditional academic writing and acknowledges the possibility that researchers and the cultures they study may be transformed by the process of research itself.
In Saskatchewan, First Nations groups are increasingly challenging the institutions in which archaeologists work. Hanna reports on two such examples, one at the Royal Saskatchewan Museum and the other with Saskatchewan Association of Profession Archaeologists. In the first instance, when museum curators began to develop the First Nations Gallery, they sought out the advice of some First Nations spiritual leaders. By the time this article was written, the project had been transformed to the point where the First Nation's Gallery in the non-Native institution was directed and staffed entirely by First Nations people. In the second example Hanna employs, the SAPA began holding workshops to hear from spiritual leaders on various issues. The First Nations consultations helped promote a climate of working together and offered some very important knowledge about 'sacredness' and protocols when working with burials. Importantly, the two examples illustrate the potential for more collaborative efforts built on trust and respect.


As the title suggests, Healey discusses the significance and application of Traditional Ecological Knowledge. He explores the relationship of TEK between researchers, traditional communities, and consumers, and its significance for conservation, community development, self-sufficiency, and for scientific knowledge. While Healey acknowledges the historical power relationship between the sponsors of research and the holders of traditional ecological knowledge has been extremely inequitable, he argues that research into TEK must go beyond the traditional limits but bearing in mind that the research must incorporate the interests of the communities as well as the research community and its funding agents / sponsors.


In this set of guidelines, New Zealand's Health Research Council informs researchers about the consultation process necessary when working with the Maori participants. The Maori Health Committee has provided this guideline to enhance partnerships between health researchers and the Maori communities, in ways that are beneficial to Maori health. This guideline considers why consultation is important, when to consult, and with whom to consult. Ultimately, the HRC wants to establish research practices that lead to improving Maori health and well-being.


Hedley explores the issue of control embedded in funding research projects. Hedley draws on the experiences encountered in a cooperative research program on resource management between the University of Windsor and the Walpole Island Indian Reserve. With that agreement in place, Hedley discusses the basic relationships through the initial funding agreement, potential threats to the relationships from securing funding through contractual agreements with governmental
departments, and the current resolution by the Band Council assist the research office with funding. Importantly, the developments have led to the community in possession of important levers of control and constitutes a movement toward self-determination.


In order to address inappropriate research practices of the past, the Department of Rural Health at the University of Melbourne has developed this framework for conducting research. They promote a partnership with Indigenous communities that incorporate the local cultural understandings and protocols. The Indigenous research framework includes the formation of a partnership committee to identify, initiate, advise, and oversee all research projects; the formation of a Koori research team that is accountable to the partnership committee and the Koori communities; the maintenance of the community consultation process, community involvement in the research, a local ethical review process, the supervision of inexperienced individuals working in Koori communities, and the storage and retention of data by the Koori research team; and the formation of a policy for the Department of Rural Health. In this article, the authors maintain that the framework has strengthened the relationship between the research unit and the Koori communities.


The author discusses in this article the use of community-based research as an empowerment tool for family practice research demonstrated by the Haida Gwaii Diabetes project example. A working relationship was developed through a participatory research paradigm between the members of the research team and the Haida community. The main goals of the project were to gain further understanding of Haida beliefs in relation to diabetes, develop culturally sensitive approaches to manage and prevent diabetes as well as apply this new understanding to a provincial wide model of preventative health for Native people.


In this guidebook, the Heritage Branch, Department of Tourism of the Government of the Yukon provides practical information for researchers and scientists planning to carry out research in the Yukon. In addition, the guide outlines the necessary permits, licences, or consent that must be obtained before research can begin and offers a variety of contact persons that may assist in the research process. The guide is divided into four parts dealing with general research in the Yukon, Yukon legislation, land claims agreements, and federal legislation.


http://www.sifc.edu/Indian%20Studies/IndigenousThought/fall99/tobacco.htm
This paper’s objective is to provide an understanding about tobacco offerings when approaching people for stories in Indigenous communities, it calls attention to the research process and issues of consent in Indigenous research methodologies and methods. Mitchell retells his own graduate experience of being unable to conduct his research due to different conceptions of appropriate research practices. In 1997, the Ethics Review Committee was not aware of the cultural importance of Tobacco and the culturally appropriate and respectful manner in which to conduct research in First Nations communities. In response to this, Mitchell provides one way of understanding the cultural and spiritual significance of tobacco in Cree and other Indigenous cultures.


The role of the anthropologist has been criticized and seen as exploitative as the anthropologist in research projects have been seen as the expert. This article deals with the reflection of anthropological research methodology in a dissertation based on a study of the development of a culturally relevant curriculum in a tribal society. This reflection deals with personal traditions of a Native American researcher, the traditions of the Ojibwa community, and academic research traditions. Research created by Native Americans often deals with Native American orientated ethic for research based on research for the sake of the community. As a result, reciprocity and mutual respect were integral in the research approach.


In recent years, the study, application, and recording of Indigenous knowledge has gained increased prominence in academic circles. Heyd explores the meaning of Indigenous knowledge, compares Indigenous knowledge to scientific knowledge, and finally considers the potential for emancipation and alienation in the current treatment of Indigenous knowledge. Heyd suggests that the differences of scientific and Indigenous knowledges are one of origin, rather than being fundamental. Importantly, Indigenous knowledge is embedded in distinctive cultural contexts and therefore careless extraction of that knowledge must be avoided.


The authors of this article explore the methodology of participatory action research (PAR) for promoting the use of Indigenous knowledge in the negotiation and litigation of comprehensive land claims and related issues. The problem that has arisen in land use claims has been the tendency of the government and the judicial courts to respect Indigenous knowledge that has been transmitted through oral traditions only when it has been verified by teams of accredited anthropologists, historians, and lawyers. However, this approaching is now being questioned for several reasons. In this article, the authors provide a comprehensive series of recommendations to guide Native communities, PAR
practitioners and jurists in designing, implementing and developing PAR projects required to reinforce and strengthen Indigenous forms of knowledge and cultural identity.


Arguing that culturally sensitive but standard, non-Aboriginal research methods remain unacceptable among Australia's Koori population, this article explores ethical, methodological, and cultural issues that emerged in a health and well-being study among young urban Koori people living in Melbourne. A community controlled organization, the Victorian Aboriginal Health Service initiated and conducted the research. The issues the authors encountered include: the creation of a local ethics committee, finding a representative sample, sustaining an on-going negotiation process, language, developing a user-centred identity code, and the need to recruit peer researchers. In relating their achievements and constraints, the authors argue that research conducted under Aboriginal control is both valuable and productive and it is with the hope that their experiences can assist future research efforts.


In this article, the author addresses the issues of the use and access to western culture and knowledge by Indigenous communities within the field of education. Hooley argues that Indigenous communities will have to accept being impacted by majority viewpoints and thus be required to change a least to some extent. This is the case as the author states that social institutions supported by the state will not be willing to adopt policies and practices that undermine its authority. For instance, the perspectives of Indigenous mathematics and science will most likely be influenced by contact with western perspectives. A case study concerning Nyerna Studies in the Bachelor of Education program is given as an example that is coming to grips with the contradiction through a respectful, democratic, and cultural two-way teaching and learning.


The authors report on the development of a collaborative research project in southeastern Manitoba. Rising teenage suicide rates, addictions, and youth appearing in the courts raised concerns among the nine participating Ojibwa tribes and the Southeast Resource Development Council (SERDC). The research process was guided by four principles: elder input, use of traditional language in implementation, clear demonstration of benefit to community, and First Nations control. Importantly, the authors argue the need to design ways to involve communities at an earlier stage (front-end) and to create more time for evaluating and making recommendations in the final report (back-end).

In this article, Humphrey explores the transformations taken place over the past two decades with respect to Indigenous health research projects. She also examines the delicate balance in effecting changes in research practices without getting bogged down in research guidelines and protocols. In a broader context, she argues that research transformation must move beyond "the project" and develop models of research that are much more integrated while mainstream research needs to identify an understanding of what Indigenous research will look like 25 years down the road. That means that while recognizing important transformations have occurred over the past two decades, more work needs to be done to address a longterm research with Aboriginal healthcare organizations.


Drawing on the observations that most Indigenous groups in South America have not benefited from the scientific research carried out among their populations, the authors argue that future medical scientists have to be aware of the complex causes of poor health if they are to make any long-term advances. Thus in the first part of the paper, the authors discuss the complex medical issues related to indigenous populations. In the second part, the authors suggest six specific areas of field research that the American Anthropological Association needs explore with respect to current ethical guidelines. Their argument rests on going beyond the simple protocol of "not causing harm" to the Indigenous groups and ensuring that researchers follow through on ethical standards.


Following the call for a global meeting in December of 1999, The Earth Summit was held in June of 1992. It was there that a program for action and sustainability through agreements and the creation of the Rio Declaration and the requirements of Agenda 21. Important to the success of Agenda 21 is the recognition of the contribution of Indigenous people and their knowledge or TEK (traditional ecological knowledge) to a sustainable future.

The research papers in this volume represent a variety of positions and perspectives on the nature of TEK, reinforcing the position of Agenda 21 and the significance of Indigenous knowledge while supporting the position that Indigenous people have lived in harmony with the environment for hundreds of years. TEK knowledge can be used at the community level and by all areas that can contribute to the larger society.


Drawn from the 1988 Declaration of Belem, the International Society of Ethnobiology has provided a brief and concise guideline that works toward establishing genuine partnerships with indigenous peoples, traditional societies, and local communities with respect to ethnobiological
research. The 15 principles included, are: prior rights, self-determination, inalienability of indigenous rights, traditional guardianship, active participation, full disclosure of the nature of research, prior informed consent and veto, confidentiality of any information the indigenous communities deem, respect, active protection, precaution, compensation and equitable sharing, supporting Indigenous research, the dynamic interactive cycle, and restitution.


The authors of this article are critical of research that over-values individual-level risk factors which tends to obscure the content of social and environmental conditions. As a result of a broader call for a more comprehensive and integrative research approach that focuses on social, structural, and physical environmental inequities has been made. The authors promote a model of community-based research in public health that actively involves community members, organizational representatives, and researchers in all aspects of the research process. In turn, the knowledge acquired and potential solutions to the given phenomenon studied serve to benefit the community involved. In this paper, the authors synthesize key principles of community-based research, examine its place within the context of different scientific paradigms, discuss rationales for its use, and explore major challenges and facilitating factors and their implications for conducting effective community-based research aimed at improving the public's health.


In this article, the authors give practical advice for promoting reconciliation of the constant inequities between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians. Jackson and Ward argue that this process of reconciliation must acknowledge the past in influencing the present and be adopted within all of society for there to be an appreciable improvement in Aboriginal health.


In Janes' commentary on First Nations, the Executive Director of the Glenbow Museum in Calgary discusses his relationship with First Nations peoples from a personal, academic, and institutional perspective following a chronological trajectory from the early 1970s until the 1990s. Janes expresses an ongoing tension between museum collections and Indigenous claims on those holdings.


In 1994, the federal Attorney-General, Minister of Aboriginal and Torres Islander Affairs, and the Minister of Communication and Arts published “Stopping the Ripoffs: Intellectual Property Protection for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples.” This report discusses indigenous peoples’ concerns over the unauthorized exploitation of their cultural heritage through
unauthorized actions. It identified "indigenous cultural and intellectual property" to include issues such as uncompensated exploitation of traditional medicines, the repatriation of cultural items and human remains, and the protection of sacred sites. In response to this report, the Australian institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission created this report which discusses the inadequacies of current intellectual property laws in their ability to protect Indigenous arts and culture as well as providing some recommendations to overcome these issues through process of community consultation.

Part one discusses the nature of Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property and the aspects of it that Indigenous people feel should be protected, part two examines how far the existing Australian legal system protects these aspects of Indigenous Intellectual and Cultural Property and part three considers possible solutions under the headings.


This paper discusses some of the issues that can occur for the researcher in researching within Native American communities. The author argues that there are key differences between the research process and qualitative methods literature. These differences are concerned with establishing relationships and consent, the roles of the researcher and the informant as well as other culturally-specific issues. The author also discusses issues that are most important to American Indians and argues that this research takes longer and that researchers must be willing to accommodate the community that is researched.


In this article, the authors explore a pilot project with the Dene in the Northwest Territories to document Dene traditional environmental knowledge. The project was an attempt to develop a participatory action research methodology for documenting this and future studies of traditional environmental knowledge and to gain an understanding of how environmental knowledge still possessed by Dene peoples shapes the use of the land and its resources. Following a participatory model, the researchers gained community consent, created a steering committee, employed local and outside researchers, formed a technical advisory committee to review results and to help with the selection of informants, and promoted a community researcher training program. In the process, the authors discovered important types of environmental knowledge possessed by the elders and some of the practices and beliefs that are essential to the traditional system of management. Importantly, for the research of traditional environmental knowledge to be successful, the full participation of the community involved is essential.

This paper was written prior to development and establishment of the interim guidelines and thus argues for the creation of reliable guidelines designed in consultation with Aboriginal peoples. Although this paper discusses the importance of research ethics committee and Aboriginal involvement, its main focus is on the importance and reliability of guidelines influenced by the people who developed them and their underlying interests that they protect.


Here, Jones considers the issues of 'insider research.' Jones' perspective comes from doing ethnographic research as an 'outsider' in Thailand, and as an 'insider,' a black man working in one of Denver's poorest black neighbourhoods. Jones argues that insiders and outsiders face different problems in the course of their fieldwork. Importantly, since the anthropological discipline is founded in the Western epistemological tradition, 'inside' anthropologists trained in that tradition cannot offer new methodologies, only different points of view. Developing a 'native anthropology' on the other hand, entails the development of a set of theories based on non-Western values and assumptions. So long as 'native' anthropologists continue to work in the traditional anthropological framework, the discipline cannot move toward establishing alternative frameworks of study.


The KSDPP is partnership between three organizations: a Kahnawa:ke Mohawk community, two community-based research organizations, and two academic research organizations. This document recognizes a set of principles and procedures to guide the three partners in the KDSPP throughout the entire process while maintaining the integrity of the community at all times.


Due to the current changes in research relationship between researchers, individuals and Aboriginal communities, there has been a re-examination of ethical contracts. Guidelines once taken from non-Aboriginal researchers and institutions are now replaced with guidelines developed by First Nations and circumpolar indigenous peoples’ organizations. This paper discusses these guidelines as well as describing case studies that illustrate the political, methodological and ethical issues in conducting community-based health research.


In 1995, the International Workshop "Ethical Issues in Health Research among Circumpolar Indigenous Peoples" brought together researchers, representatives of aboriginal organizations and First Nations leaders to discuss problems in a process of reviewing research ethics. The ethical review process was designed to develop new frameworks which would increase community participation in the research process. This conference report summarizes some of the ethical and
political issues involved in developing such frameworks. It describes developments which have occurred since the Inuvik workshop reflecting the changing process of ethical review and new relationships between researchers, participants and aboriginal communities.


Drawing on a participatory research project among the Lakota, the authors relate their experiences in acquiring cultural competence in unfamiliar social, political, and economic circumstances. The project put nurses on the Lakota reserve for an extended time. The experience forced the nurses to examine their own social positions and value orientations while exploring emerging practices with the Lakota in collaborative relationships. Importantly, the authors argue that a measure of cultural competence with go a long way toward to establishing the connections people need for evoking real and significant social transformations.


In this article, Kew explores some of the contemporary issues confronting anthropologists, especially in British Columbia where anthropologists research, teach, and apply their knowledge among the very people they study. Some of the topics Kew explores include how ethnography and museum exhibitions represent First Nations, how specialized studies outside ethnography are drawing scholarly attention, how impact assessments, sustainable development, and the judicial courts (especially in land claims) affect Indigenous communities and the role anthropologists have in shaping those processes.

Kimberly Aboriginal Health Workers. (1992). The importance of Aboriginal research feedback. *Aboriginal and Islander Health Worker Journal* 16(2), 4-6.

This paper discusses the importance of Aboriginal people getting feedback after research was conducted. This is demonstrated through a case study where initial feedback was done in 1988 and 1989 at the community and individual levels, followed by questionnaires were given to 105 workers in Aboriginal health in 1991 and original research participants after a period of time.


In this article, the authors argue that appropriate health research strategies depend on active collaboration between communities and researchers. They found in inner-city Seattle communities that it was necessary to include community contribution, employ community members on the project, share power, and value respect and diversity.

In response to an invitation, the authors explored the beliefs and concerns about fetal alcohol syndrome (FAS) and fetal alcohol effects (FAE) in a northern Canadian community. Although a Dene organization initiated the research project, the invitation did not automatically mean entry into the community as many facets of the project had to be worked out at the community level before the research could be conducted. Gaining entry into this community in a culturally sensitive manner was, thus, a major part of the project. In this article, the authors share their experiences in negotiating the terms of research amenable to the members of the community. In doing so, they explore the theoretical components of cultural sensitivity, followed by a discussion of the stages of entry into a community. These guidelines provide essential information for those planning to study Native or ethnic communities.


The Kunming Action Plan, as drafted, calls for a unified strategy to defend the biological and cultural diversity on Earth. Part of the KAP, was the establishment for a "Global Coalition for the Defense of Biological and Cultural Diversity" where scientists, indigenous peoples, and environmentalists can engage in a long-term dialogue about protecting the Earths biodiversity. In turn, the authors offer 9 resolutions and a general strategy for the Global Coalition.


In this article, the authors explore the nature of Social Impact Research and the need to develop appropriate models that incorporates both the political and technical aspects of impact assessment. Without diminishing the technical aspects of impact assessment, the authors argue that given the political nature of all development schemes, it is important to integrate participatory and political components. The authors drawn on a controversial mining proposal in Australia's Northern Territory to illustrate how the Aboriginal communities successfully challenged mining and conservation interests. The combined approach of participatory / political and technical impact assessment provided a practical framework for development planning and now serves as a model for Australia's Resource Assessment Commission.


In this article, Larson shares a research experience when she attempted to study Saami-Norwegian bilingualism in northern Norway. Larson encountered culturally diverse entities among the Indigenous Saami. As Scandinavian society increasingly brings to bear pressure on the Indigenous lifestyles, some Saami have chosen to strongly assimilate Scandinavian cultural ways, some maintain a model of biculturalism, while a third group is militantly struggling to maintain the integrity of traditional Saami cultural values. Although the competing interests and social divisions in Saami society left her research project unfulfilled, she has turned the experience into a discussion on the relation between ethnopolitics, cultural boundaries, and research.

Lassiter suggests that while traditional ethnography has moved away from the authoritative monologues to include involved dialogue between the researcher and the informant, few ethnographers have taken the collaboration to the next step which allows the informant to read and offer interpretation of the ethnographic text. Thus, the author explores some of the political and ethical implications of collaborative and reciprocal ethnographic research; to truly "read alongside Natives" instead of "over their shoulders."


Research conducted in Native communities has often been cast in a negative light by the community and its members. Although there are difficulties in conducting research within Native communities, aboriginal research can be rewarding. In this article, Macauley discusses the importance of ethics in conducting research, the changing attitudes towards research, guidelines in research through the perspective of avocation for equal partnerships in research communities and research teams.


Participatory research requires ethical guidelines to incorporate the needs of the partners, i.e., the researchers and the community. This paper describes the background, development and implementation of an innovative Code of Research Ethics developed for a participatory research project with a Native community in Canada. The document ensures that responsibility and control will be shared by both researchers and community throughout the project including joint publication of the results. It defines community control of data, means of resolving dissension at time of publication, incorporation of new researchers and the differences between community-based and academic researchers.


In this article, the authors argue that participatory research allows to the community and researcher to collaborate on research process and the development of knowledge that is beneficial to the community. This is due in part to the three main principles of participatory research that include collaboration, mutual education, and acting on results from research questions. The results of this type of research are adaptable and thus applicable to other communities. Also addressed in the article, are the potential problems with participatory research including collaboration with a group in the community that does not represent collective interests, timeframe for project may
exceed researcher commitment, and researchers or community may be left with nothing if researcher or community change their mind. Although the authors recognize that participatory research may not always succeed, they do assert that it is rewarding to all parties involved and does promote respectful partnerships between researchers and the community.


This paper discusses the process of the development of a Code of Research Ethics, created during the Kahawake schools diabetes prevention project in the Mohawk community of Kahnawake in Canada. This code was written by the researchers and the community, represented by a Community Advisory Board, in the beginning of a three year project. This code embodies the principles of participatory research and ensures the community has equal decision making and participation in the entire research process.


In this chapter, the author discusses the importance of collaborative research between university researchers and the “community”. She argues in this case the community can consist or be represented by community-based physicians acting upon the entire membership within health research. She also discusses strengthens and problems with University researchers, the communities and their collaboration together within the community. As solutions, she recommends guidelines for research as well as recommendations for successful collaboration based on respect for both the community-based physician and outside researchers.


The National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) approved guidelines for research among Aborigines and Torres Strait islanders in 1991. These guidelines strict that those previously supported by NHMRC and as a result several groups have adopted similar guidelines. This paper discusses some of the issues that led to the creation and approval of such guidelines. The author argues that these guidelines based on participatory aspects that serve to give more participation and authority to Aboriginal communities raise concerns over the control of research and the role of consumer groups important to medicine.


The authors draw on their involvement in the Australian Longitudinal Study on Women's Health and elaborate on the strategies they employed in the consultation process with various immigrant and Indigenous communities. Given the historical conditions of colonization and the proliferation
of studies about and on Indigenous groups and the skepticism with which Indigenous communities receive further research, and the negligible impact of health research, the authors identify mechanisms for long-term community involvement in negotiating relevant research. Specifically, the relationship between researchers and the communities was shaped by politics of research, healthcare funding, the political identity of different communities, and the location of these communities. Overall, the authors maintain that continued community support and involvement are contingent on the women be able set the research agenda.


Manitoba First Nations Youth Council developed a First Nations Code of Ethics based on some of the universal traditional values. This code describes what knowledge and wisdom means in relationships between individuals, family and community life. There are twelve key ethics that embody values and morals that are relatively universal to First Nations people.


As Aboriginal peoples people gain greater access to and control of research within their communities, they are changing existing research paradigms by creating their own paradigms and programs of research. Drawing on a locally defined research framework of her people - the Quandamooka people of Minjeripah (in Queensland) - Martin discusses the emergence of an Indigenist research paradigm. As a decolonizing tool, Indigenist research reframes, reclaims, and renames western research practices in ways that "liberate and emancipate" Aboriginal voices that heretofore were suppressed. She argues that Indigenist research recognizes Indigenous worldviews and knowledge, emphasizes the social, political, and historical contexts that shape the Indigenous experience, honour Aboriginal social mores as essential processes, privilege Aboriginal voices, experiences, and lives of Aboriginal peoples, and identify and redress self-defined Aboriginal issues. In the second part of the essay, Martin turns to the various ways in which Indigenist research can be recognized in the western academy with particular emphasis placed on its procedures and processes. Thus, she explores the research question, design, conduct, analysis, interpretation, reporting, and dissemination in relation to Indigenist protocols. As she argues, an Indigenist research paradigm is essential for the process of decolonization to continue and the development of self-determination.


There are differences in participatory research. These differences are based in different perspectives about control and ownership. In the past, scientific research has been handled by the
researcher and the local people are involved through giving information or samples. In this article, the authors present discussions among the levels of participation from the perspective of aboriginal communities. The authors argue that most research relationships are based in collaborative and/or partly participatory relationships where aspects of the research study is shared or participants may be trained and study results shared with the community. Within the last part of the article, the authors describe the process of fully participatory research where the communities take a dominant role and is used to encourage communities to conduct research for themselves.


In a letter to the Editor of the Medical Journal of Australia, Mathews gives a response to Maddocks’ article “Ethics in Aboriginal research: A model for minorities or for all?” He states that Maddocks provides an excellent summary of the ethical issues existing in research involving Aboriginal people as well as implications in connection to consent and community involvement within Australian communities. He also discusses shortfalls of Maddocks’ arguments such as his lack of reflection on the non-formalization and thus support of research guidelines by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, as well as the lack of discussion on communities being given the opportunity for financial control over projects.


In this article, the author discusses ethical considerations in First Nations counseling and research. The author examines sections relevant to ethical guidelines of the Canadian Guidance and Counselling Association (CGCA) as well as the distinct ethical issues and considerations that Canadian counseling practitioners and researchers need to be aware of in working with First Nations people.


This article describes some of the strengths, weaknesses, and issues surrounding the application of approaches of health promotion and participatory research with First Nations populations and arthritis self-management. Populations like First Nations communities have not fully benefited from scientific innovations available through self-case and mutual aid. This demonstrates the challenges and opportunities for health promotion and participatory research with First Nations communities. This is demonstrated through the illustration of the First Nations Arthritis Self-Management study.


In 1976, the Royal Society of Canada held a symposium entitled “New Perspectives in Canadian Archaeology.” The contents of this book, are some of the written submissions at that symposium
that involve Canadian Archaeology and its place in Archaeology as a global discipline. Canadian Archaeology differs from other archaeology disciplines in that it has a different history.

In this book, there are six sessions ranging from professional problems and new motivations to Canadian Archaeology and its uses. It is however, the new motivations and attitudes that are most intriguing. In this session, various authors discuss the practices and ethics of Archaeology in relation to various native groups in Canada. What emerges is a snapshot of native peoples concerns about anthropology, archaeology research in the late 1970’s in Canada.


Meijer-Drees discusses the need for need for research involving Native communities and individuals and how this research must be accomplished. Currently, government and aboriginal organizations are revising research guidelines as this need increases and as such there are positive (specific to communities, individuals, and groups) and negative aspects (linked to funding, difficult to researcher subject to many guidelines) to the creation of multiple guidelines by different communities, organizations and governments. Meijer-Drees further utilizes presenting ethical guideline documents in order to illustrate significant research ethics problems and to stimulate further discussion in Native Studies research about how to deal with these issues. She also discusses the major issue of differentiating perspectives concerning how to conduct research, definitions of ethical and good research, as well as what is beneficial. Thus. research ethics should be carefully considered and the inability of standardized research ethics guidelines and funding structures to ensure ethical research practices acknowledged can solutions be gained.


In this article Menzies reflects on the opposition and potential that Anthropology presents to Indigenous peoples. In his reflections he identifies three current roles that the Anthropologist can take in regards to Indigenous research, while elaborating on his research process expanded with a process of decolonization that he used to create and maintain respectful research relationships with First Nations in British Columbia. Menzies asserts that there is a place for not only social science researchers but their research in the creation of an Indigenous anthropology that exist within western research paradigms.


This article discusses the specific research approach adopted by the Nganampa to conduct health research, surveys and evaluations of local health issues in the region. The independent, Aboriginal-controlled health service of Nganampa Health Council provides primary health care services on the Anagu Pitjantjatjara Lands in northwestern portion of South Australia. This research approach can be applicable to other Aboriginal communities as well as national or
international research issues concerning the process of conducting health research in Aboriginal communities.


In this article, the author reflects on the Barrow Alcohol Study and Foulk’s article “Social Stratification and alcohol use in North Alaska.” The foundation of his response is based on the assumption that research can benefit Alaska Natives by guiding policy and practice through insights from health research in the community. In response to Foulk’s statement concerning the lack of credibility of research in the community and its link to being allowed to conduct research, Mohatt discusses a shift from the positivist paradigm towards a new paradigm that is based on a participatory model that incorporates the collaboration with the community. This approach empowers the community building its ability to discover and create solutions to questions in the research process.


This article begins with the recognition that Maori people often view research with suspicion as a process of colonization and as having unsatisfactory research methodologies. The author states that this led to the argument that there is no “Kaupapa Maori research”, making it difficult to define while reminding us that it remains a process of colonization. In this article, Moewaka Barnes defines Kaupapa Maori research as a distinctive research approach based in Maori worldviews and involving the concept of change as research associated with making a positive difference shows importance in its use, usefulness and ownership of research.


Moore explores the nature of sacred silences in Native American literature. Moore argues that silences and gaps in Indigenous narratives has been at once a tool to protect a culture by creating distance between the scholar the culture of the narrative and a tool with which to respect and explore a culture. Although geared toward a literary critic audience, the general applicability nevertheless, remains pertinent to scholars of various disciplines as Moore asks his audience in this article to consider how we can understand the gaps and silences of indigenous culture and then explores how the silences can be translated and made more understandable to Western audience while respecting the sacred parts of indigenous culture.


Postcolonial theory is a critical theory that deals specifically with literature surrounding colonized peoples. Although it has been linked with concepts of otherness and resistance, postcolonial theory has often been challenged on a variety of issues including its capabilities, its institutional location and other issues. In this book, Bart Gilbert-Moore examines the oppositions towards
postcolonial theory and discusses some of the issues surrounding both sides of the argument. In the beginning portion of this book, he gives a historical account of the development of postcolonial theory, particularly on the ways in which culture and colonialism were studied traditionally in the west as well as the emergence of other forms of postcolonial analysis. The second part of his book illustrates the postcolonial discussion of the works of Said, Spivak, and Bhabha. The third part of his book he considers the connection between different historical oppressions and postcolonial analysis while examining how it can be linked to the ongoing struggle for cultural decolonization.


We find at the heart of this chapter, a dichotomy between the spiritual value of a plant and its strictly economical value faces local communities and international organizations. The authors suggest current legal and ethical means are inadequate for rewarding the stewards of traditionally used plants and local knowledge. To combat the present legal limitations protecting traditional plant resources, the authors encourage extended discussions between farmers, scientists, and leaders within and beyond the Indigenous communities to ensure that ethical practices go beyond the letter of the law and embody "the spirit of ethical exchange." Thus they emphasize culturally appropriate rewards over market driven approaches. In this chapter, Nabhan et al. explore the methods used by one grassroots conservation organization in the desert Southwest to reward and acknowledge conservators and users of biological diversity.


In this research brief, the National Aboriginal Health Organization addresses the lack enforcement mechanisms in the current Tri-Council Policy Statement. Moreover, several Indigenous organizations have come to form rigorous ethics guidelines, yet like the Tri-Council, adherence to them is not required. Thus the brief makes a series of recommendations with respect to Aboriginal Ethics Boards and Aboriginal Research Ethics Standards.


Emerging from an 1987 national conference, ethics related to Aboriginal health research has received considerable attention in Australia. More recently, Institutional Ethics Committees (IEC) have been established within Aboriginal organizations to decide on research proposals. Thus, a series of guidelines approved by the National Health and Medical Research Council (Australia) in this brief document fall under the following headings: Consultation, Community Involvement, and Ownership and Publication of Data.

This concise document by the National Science Foundation provides researchers with 13 recommendations with which to carry out research that promotes mutual respect and communication between scientists and northern residents. These guidelines are shaped by the expectation of cooperation between the researcher and the participants throughout the research process.


From 16th century onward, colonial imperialism, disease, dislocations, and divergent cultural values have resulted in the loss of control over tradition homelands and the cultural and natural resources contained within them. The intense controversy over the issue of who controls Native American cultural properties in the USA remains a potent reminder of that past. In this chapter, the authors explore the conflicting interests over the looting and development of sacred burial sites in three Native American societies - the Navajo, the Zuni, and Abenaki - and their efforts to gain greater control over their cultural resources. Importantly, the authors call for a broad change in attitudes respect Native Americans and follow an Indigenous ethical standard in which one respects the power and authority of the remains found in burial sites and resists claiming "ownership" of sites that fall outside current Indian territories.


Intolerance is the theory; it is a way of knowing in this sense, a way of looking at the world in relation to others through simplification as well as the domination and oppression that are practiced by the dominators. Lise Noel, a Montreal historian, shows how oppression is related to the six parameters of race, class, gender, sexual preference, age, and mental and physical health. She explains how the theory of intolerance is used to justify the domination and oppression practices, and illustrates common patterns from one parameter to the other and one country to another. She also challenges the validity of using concepts such as difference to defend the rights of the oppressed.

In the first part of this book, Noel examines the universal discourse including language of objectivity and religion of the dominator. In part two, she examines the dominated and how they are dominated followed by the stages of emancipation.


Noley's article explores the relationship between the Indigenous community and the research institutions, especially publicly funded state universities. He calls for Tribal organizations to transform the nature of research that takes place in state universities and to ensure Indigenous voices become part of each university's commitment to the "public at large." The author sees an
important role for Tribal Colleges in setting Indigenous research agendas and seeing that the research carried out serves the specific needs of the involved communities.


This document emerged out of the North American Primary Care Research Group's (NAPCRG) 1996 workshop on conducting respectful research with communities. This document, then, forms the basis of the NAPCRG's organizational policy toward primary care research in community setting and promotes a collaborative research methodology as a means of addressing the ethical concerns of research. Such concerns that get negotiated between the collaborators include common goals, desired outcomes, ownership of data, and strategies for managing potentially sensitive results. Importantly, the authors argue that a participatory research project can only be considered successful if all involved are satisfied with the research process and the results.


In 1994, the National Institutes of Health guidelines required the recruitment of women and ethnic minorities into clinical research. The authors consider several key issues with respect to the legislative changes. They explore problems with defining the population of American Indians and Alaska Natives participating in the study, participation of the tribes in research and approval by the Institutional Review Board, issues of confidentiality, identifying potential benefits for the communities involved, and evaluating the scientific merit of proposed studies. The authors argue that an increased awareness of these issues will help to produce meaningful research that avoids the recurrence of past abuses and help facilitate future research projects.


In this article, the authors explore their research methods in a sustainable agriculture and conservation project on the Zuni Indian Reservation in New Mexico. After years of environmental disruption and damage to natural resources by external agencies, this project sought to incorporate local knowledge and experience with outside science in the project design. Thus, the researchers worked in conjunction with farmers in the Zuni Sustainable Conservation Project looking at traditional "runoff" agriculture to find solutions to ever-increasing desertification.


The scientific research licensing guidelines and appendices are created to provide information to assist researchers in applying for research licenses. These guidelines and appendices include discussions on deadlines, the submission of annual summary report, the consent and ethical review
process, the killing and protection from polar bears as well as the cost of search and rescue. These licensing guidelines are considered applicable to the entire Nunavut population and are therefore not specific in culturally appropriateness or research process.


Drawing on their involvement in a collaborative research project with a regional First Nations political organization and a university-based research group, the authors explore the development of a National Longitudinal Aboriginal Health Survey whereby First Nations' concerns were made central to the process. Importantly, the authors challenge the legitimacy of traditional epidemiological discourse and describe the development of a new research model. Thus, the authors comment on such emerging issues as the politics of research, culture-based approaches to research ethics, capacity building among First Nations, and traditional accountability structures in a university-based research environment.


Currently, the field of research ethics is changing with the development of the major Canadian granting agencies (the Tri-Council) inclusion of "collectivities" in determining the ethical nature of research. This paper argues that the involvement of collectivities is essential for ethical research relationships, but it ought not to limit the sorts of questions we study or the publication of the answers we find. In exploring by two examples in which aboriginal communities asserted their collective rights against researchers, the author suggests they lead to the debate between those who believe community work is "all politics," and those who try to underpin it with ethical principles. Finally, the author argues that ethical practice requires a knowledge base created by valid research. O'Neill argues that researchers should support an improved relationship with host communities, but not let the political agendas of contending community groups constrain the questions we can ask about social problems or our assessment of measures designed to solve them.


In this article, the author revisits the report of the national Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from their Families in terms of two other writings. The authors argue that the report moves in a category of subject relations whereby the sensitive ethical terms of listening and responding occurs with the release of memories of Aboriginal people. The problem still remains on how to restore the voice of Aboriginal people.


The politics of Aboriginal identity has special challenges as Aboriginal people are included in sovereign states not of their making. This article addresses some of these challenges including the
cognitions of “place” between Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginals; the appropriateness and insufficiency of Western liberal rights philosophy, multiculturalism, and respecting Aboriginality. These are discussed through a case study focusing on the Mohawks of Kahnawake to illustrate the argument.


This article describes specific projects that support the Pareek’s formulation and current emphasis on the role of political culture in development as well as implications for social scientists in contributing to political culture. The development process has the potential of describing the strengths of individuals and communities in that it is encouraged through the presence of certain values inherent to specific groups or cultures. Each culture has characteristics that are either functional or dysfunctional in the development process. The task of action research is to define the functional and dysfunction aspects, build and strengthen the functional and reduce the dysfunctional.


This package came out of a workshop and consists of background papers and guidelines that encompass current ethical issues on a national, international and global scale. The goal of this workshop was to come to a consensus to general principles of ethical research while remembering the goal was not to eliminate all research but to encourage a collaboration between the researcher and Indigenous community.

In part one, a series of background papers are presented that describe a number of ethical issues from a variety of perspectives including Indigenous, non-Indigenous, various organizations and institutional perspectives. Part two, contains a variety of guidelines from a various funding bodies, professional organizations and Indigenous groups. These guidelines are separated into international, Canada, United States, Greenland and Australia sections.


Alan Pence, with the University of Victoria and Marie McCallum, with the Meadow Lake Tribal Council discuss the development of a cross-cultural model for post-secondary in the area of early childhood services. Despite the cultural and institutional differences and challenges in early childhood services, this cross-cultural model resulted in the development of an innovative, cross-cultural, curriculum model as well as establishing a caring and respectful relationship. It is also argued that such approaches may contain implications.

In this article, Peterson draws on his experiences in Greenland to consider some of the ethical considerations in an asymmetrical ethnic situation. Peterson argues for the continued neutrality of the scientist and need not concern himself with political debate in which the research is conducted, in this case the Inuit of Greenland and the government of Denmark and a particularly contentious dispute over mining development in a traditional hunting ground. In light of the lack of intermediaries between the Indigenous communities and the Danish government, the author finds himself considering such issues as political interference, ethnicity, private versus collective rights, and the need for research. In addressing these issues, Peterson argues that it is important not to make a choice between opposite interests but to seek a balance between the two.


Research with Aboriginal Peoples has largely been based on western ideologies and this intolerance of Aboriginal perspectives, culture and values. She states that recently with Indigenous scholars there is beginning to be the creation of space for Indigenous knowledge and research. The main question that Pidgeon and Hardy Cox contend with is how is Aboriginal research conducted that is ethical not oppressive, intrusive or disrespectful of Aboriginal students in higher education. She elaborates that this is possible through culturally sensitive research and research processes that model the Aboriginal values to influence policy, practices and programs for Aboriginal students in higher education.


The term Kaupapa Maori captures Maori desires to affirm Maori cultural philosophies and practices. In short Kaupapa Maori is about being "fully" Maori. These desires have only rarely been recognized by the mainstream education system that has at various times sought to "civilize," "assimilate," and "integrate" Maori. The struggle by Maori for control over how Maori children and young people are educated has led to the establishment of Kaupapa Maori education initiatives across all educational levels. These initiatives are exemplary in that they reflect Maori aspirations and continue to produce bicultural, bilingual, confident, and well-educated Maori. This article outlines the key elements underpinning these initiatives largely through an exploration of the writings that have emerged from Maori education staff and students at the University of Auckland. A self-determination, anti-colonial education agenda emerges that is firmly based in Maori language and cultural ways of being.

As the ethics of ethnographical research increasingly come under scrutiny and criticism, Piquemal explores the changing roles researchers have in Indigenous communities. In drawing on personal experiences to illustrate the issue, the author argues that existing protocols are not flexible enough to properly ensure "free and informed consent" by research subjects since only the ethics of the researcher are governed; not of those being 'researched.' As a remedy for this situation, Piquemal writes that consent cannot be viewed as one-time contract prior to arriving in the desired community. Free and informed consent is an ongoing, circular process that must constantly renegotiated between the researcher, the community, and the individual authorities.


As indigenous knowledge becomes increasingly important, scientists find themselves conducting research among Indigenous peoples more frequently while indigenous peoples have become more politicized in its use, misappropriation, and commercialization of their knowledge and biogenetic resources. The ethical and practical issues of scientists who collect plants, animals, folktales and photos in Indigenous communities debate over control over the collection of data. This paper deals with some of the ethical and practical issues that frame the debate over the collection of data from indigenous peoples.


There are three major elements of participatory research that include research, education, and community action. The authors of this article discuss the Nuclear Risk Management for Native Communities Project an example of collaborative, academic, and community-based tribal project that conducts beneficial participatory research in a time when the environmental health field is based in purely quantitative research that does not consult with community needs and concerns. This project developed a new model of participatory research that resulted in building an environmental health infrastructure that was community-based, constructing community abilities through informational sessions and materials, conducting a combination of technical and community research, as well as facilitating community-based hazards management planning. These resulted in a variety of positive outcomes including equitable relationships between participants and researchers, improvement in scientific research through the integration and use of participatory research, and the creation of sustainable program intervention for community long-term needs.


Drawn from the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, these guidelines are intended to assist in involving local and indigenous peoples in the sustainable use of managed wetlands. The convention favours a collaborative approach known as participatory management with the following requirements: to provide long-term incentives and benefits for all stakeholders, to
develop trust among the stakeholders, maintain flexibility, exchange knowledge and build capacity within the project, and to establish a continuity of resources and effort. In the latter part of the guidelines, the document includes checklists to measure local involvement in wetland management projects.


This article discusses the role of the researcher in alcohol/mental health research in communities. Richards identifies a number of problems in researching within small communities including the lack of consensus and existence of different perspectives and approaches to research in the community. His solution is the adoption of an unfamiliar role for researchers that encompasses resolving conflicts to collaborate in the construction and development of health research. Apart from adopting a different role as the researcher, Richards also argues that the analytical approach to identifying and resolving conflicts within the community requires a systematic viewpoint and analysis. This systematic analysis will identify the problems, project researchers and the theoretical hypothesis while recognizing the worldviews of the community.


Rosaldo argues that the conjunction of decolonization and an intensification of American imperialism in the 1960s produced a re-evaluation of social analysis. In the first chapter to his book, *Culture & Truth*, Rosaldo briefly explores the crisis and erosion of classical norms in anthropology that emerged during the 1960s and 1970s. He argues anthropologists can no longer separate the translation of cultures and social criticism and that ethnographies must become a form of social analysis. Importantly, however, Rosaldo argues that it is no longer fashionable to see different cultures as discrete and homogeneous wholes disconnected from the world around them, but rather to view cultures as "open" where boundaries are crisscrossed "over a field at once fluid and saturated with power."


This article looks at the development of an aboriginal ethics sub-committee which is considered one step closer to ensuring true aboriginal research control. This paper discusses issues surrounding community consultations, proposals, consent procedure, cultural aspects, and information ownership.


Given the importance that aboriginal property concepts play in political theory and land claims disputes, the author argues that no quantified, empirical studies exist. Thus, Rudmin's study is the first comparative, psycholinguistic study of aboriginal and European conceptions of ownership and property. In this article, Rudmin outlines his research methodology in a Cree community in the James Bay region of Northern Ontario to argue that the Cree do have a concept of ownership.
(albeit significant differences exist with English-Canadian conceptions), rebuking a long held view that they lacked these concepts.


In this article, community psychologists propose a research model and framework that discuss these issues: a) definition of an ethnic cultural community, b) cross-cultural theories, c) environmental stability. The model proposed that ethnic cultural research can be viewed as a three dimensional structure.


The principles of ownership, control, access and possession (OCAP) encompass themes long advocated by First Nations in Canada. With an emphasis on self-determination in research, key notions outlined in this paper relate to the collective ownership; First Nations control over research and information; and First Nations' management of and access to research data. Following a critical review of colonial research practices and recent institutional efforts to improve Aboriginal research ethics, this paper highlights policies and strategies adopted by First Nations organizations-approaches as well as discussing the development and benefits of OCAP. These include the rebuilding of trust, improved research quality and relevance, decreased bias, meaningful capacity development and community empowerment to create social change.


This article examines, the development of ethical and principle guidelines for working with Indigenous people. The report contains the contents and format of current ethical guidelines, some which have been adopted by various researchers, institutions, and organizations.


The National Bioethic Advisory Commission extended its protection of individuals to include protection of social groups and thus reports and recommends that researchers and ethic review boards, a) work with community representatives, b) discuss implications of the group, and c) consider harm with participants in reporting research. The author goes on to explain that difficulties arise out of the Commissions approach and as such proposes a research agenda to
develop the best practices to working with local communities in epidemiologic and environmental health research.


Sillitoe addresses the new opportunities for anthropologists in development and other applied anthropology applications. Given the recent trends of collaborative research projects involving communities, individuals, and increased integration of traditional knowledge in both the natural and social sciences, the author argues that anthropologists are well situated to engage and contribute solutions encountered in cross-cultural settings, intellectual property rights debates, and facilitate increased interdisciplinary cooperation.


The authors argue that as Indigenous groups increasingly turn to Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) to protect their knowledge and culture, the mechanisms and institutions of current IPR laws pose a real and significant threat to their territorial and resources rights as well as their cultural integrity. Importantly, the current IPR laws fail to acknowledge the very existence of Indigenous cultural and intellectual property rights which serves to perpetuate the marginalization of Indigenous Peoples. In examining both the challenges confronting Indigenous Peoples and some of measures assisting them, the authors argue that only a sui generis approach to protecting Indigenous cultural and intellectual property rights. The authors call for the formal recognition of non-Indigenous legal systems and institutions, which are recognized by the Indigenous Peoples, and imbued with the ability to implement and enforce Indigenous laws and customs.


The purpose of this article is to explain the process adopted in completing a land use study in Long Lake First Nation Anishinaabe community in northern Ontario. The authors elaborate on their collaborative approach to land use research and describe the benefits undertaking collaborative research in Indigenous communities in Canada. They argue that this is not only applicable to on a national but that it has the possibility of also holding validity on an international scale for Indigenous peoples as well.


Over the past two decades, Indigenous scholars have become more numerous and assertive, providing a catalyst for changes in the traditional research environment. The result has led to increased Indigenous input and control over research projects that traditionally never existed. However, the inclusion of Indigenous knowledge in traditional academia has been blocked by incommensurate Western and Indigenous epistemological traditions and the "colonizing propensities" perpetuated in academic institutions. In this article, Sinclair draws on a research
project about how Indigenous researchers integrate their "worldview beliefs, practices, and protocols" with Western research methodologies. She explores her experiences in which Indigenous methodologies and knowledge can and should be included as a legitimate research methodology in Western academic institutions. Importantly, she argues that Indigenous epistemology readily provides ethically sound and productive research theory because Indigenous methods direct the researcher to the proper means for initiating, understanding the purpose, and conducting research.


There is currently a growing interest and respect for Indigenous knowledge, particularly in postcolonial societies. As Indigenous Australians are reclaiming their cultural heritage, ethics surrounding ownership and control become predominant. In a time when knowledge is linked to power and culturally rigorous research is being conducted, ethics and the value of research becomes tools of survival and empowerment for Indigenous peoples. In this paper, the author addresses 1) Indigenous research similarities and differences with non-Indigenous research, 2) what is ethical Indigenous research, and 3) what is an appropriate research process and protocol for Indigenous research.


In this book Linda Smith re-examines the nature of Western research and scholarship from an Indigenous Peoples perspective. As a member of Australia's Maori, Smith points out, that on a global scale, research devastated and perpetuated the subjugation, oppression, and colonization particularly of Indigenous populations. Since research is an extension of knowledge, Smith argues the assumptions, methodologies, and epistemological premises of conventional research must be challenged in order to assert Indigenous ways of knowing. Importantly, research must be valuable, accountable and empowering to Indigenous people involved and must fit with aboriginal worldview.

In the first part of the book, Smith critically examines the philosophical traditions of Western academic research and explores ways in which scientific research has been linked to some of the worst excesses of colonial imperialism. In the second part of the book, Smith turns to an outline of a new agenda for "indigenous research methodologies" to restore respect and the spirituality of Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing. Drawn on Indigenous social movements from the 1960s, the author offers a broad and ambitious Indigenous research agenda (including 25 current projects) formed from the constructs of decolonization, healing, transformation, and mobilization. It is in the setting a new agenda for Indigenous research that Smith shows how the Kaupapa Maori are reclaiming control over Indigenous epistemological traditions.

The authors argue that improved health outcomes in Canadian Aboriginal communities can be achieved with culturally appropriate and community controlled and collaborative research projects. The authors draw on an analysis of their planning meetings during a community-based Aboriginal health research project in an effort to expose other researchers to some of the challenges they faced in the course of conducting their research. They look at four issues: the constrasting frameworks of western science and Indigenous knowledge systems; the impact of colonial research practices in Aboriginal communities; generating and transferring cultural relevant frameworks of knowledge; and promoting Indigenous leadership, governance, and participation. In the end, the authors maintain these issues need not be seen as obstacles but rather viewed as opportunities for providing relevant and appropriate healthcare services.


Community-based participatory research (CBPR), a methodology that gives respect for the individual and commitment to social change emerges as a way to empower communities. This article discusses the origin and emergence of CBPR and how it is empowering to First Nations communities. CBPR is considered demanding, time consuming and has difficulty in achieving community participation, yet has enormous potential.


This text was made up of an edited version of the Conference on Canada and Polar Science, held in Yellowknife in May of 1994. Northern science or polar science is a microcosm of science, with important distinctions such as it being pursued in a geographical place namely northern Canada but it affects the globe due to environmental conditions. The environmental agenda of this workshop is thus an international issue not just a Canadian one. In the last thirty years, many needs and research questions have begun to be directed at the knowledge of aboriginal societies and thus aboriginal people have become interested in the decision making process. This affects the ethics of polar research as licensing or permitting virtually transfers permission for the conduction of research to communities affected. This conference conveyed new conditions in polar research, its relationship to Indigenous knowledge and science and to express perspectives on Canada’s record, obligations and opportunities.


In this article the author compiles the works of Indigenous scholars in a literature review, who have discussed Indigenous research methodologies. She further describes the development of Indigenous Research Methodology as including the position of the researcher to the research, the methodologies main features, who should develop the methodology and what constitutes Indigenous knowledge. This is research methodology is developed, as Steinhauer argues, in order to tell our stories through our perspectives and to empower our communities and individuals through a positive research process experience and research product outcome. She also discusses
cellular theory, reflects on Indigenous worldviews and defines Indigenous methods. She concludes her article by explaining that it addresses the complexities of Indigenous research methodologies.


Research within First Nations communities has not always been a positive experience for the community. This thesis examines ethical and moral research pertaining to collaborative inquiries with First Nations communities, with particular emphasis on the National Tri-Council Policy Statement. The context of this thesis is presented through the personal experiences of Stevenson and includes discussions on specific methods and methodologies as well as intellectual property rights and support for “sui generis system of knowledge” protection. Stevenson feels that for ethical and moral research to occur FN and tribal organizations must move towards self determination by the creation, development, and institutionalizing of codes of research conduct and ethics. He also states that collaboration with First Nations communities requires an understanding of Indigenous philosophies. This is described through discussion of the Seven Sacred teachings of the Anishinaabe.


Ethical research involving human subjects mandates that individual consent be obtained from research participants or from surrogates when participants are not able to consent for themselves. The existing requirements for informed consent assume that all study participants have personal autonomy; fully comprehend the purpose, risks, and benefits of the research; and volunteer for projects that disclose all relevant information. Yet contemporary examples of lapses in the individual informed consent process have been reported. The authors propose the use of community advisory boards, which can facilitate research by providing advice about the informed consent process and the design and implementation of research protocols. These activities could help reduce the number of individual informed consent lapses, benefiting study participants and the scientific integrity of the research in question.


This article contains the evaluation of family oriented substance abuse prevention in three native communities. In general, the study stated problems existed due to the perceived level of intrusion, the use of non-native staff, concerns over research benefits, value of Indian opinions and questions of assimilation into larger society. These problems were reasons behind the lack of commitment of participants in the study. The article also focuses on some of the research methodologies that were successful but adds that researchers must understand the time it takes to research Native Americans.

The Working Group on Indigenous populations were authorized in 1982 to review developments pertaining to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms of Indigenous populations. In 1993, they submitted a draft declaration on the rights of Indigenous peoples. This document contains the replies received as of June 1994.

In this document, Ecuador’s reply is given where they state that: Ecuador is a multicultural society that does not accept some provisions of the draft declaration. A declaration is not binding and Ecuadorian law contains some of these provisions. The government of Ecuador considers that the wording should protect the rights of indigenous peoples, but not at the price of destabilizing society.

Panama’s reply is also given suggesting concerns over the representations of Indigenous populations from Panama. That it should state that consultations with Indigenous groups that are representatives and duly recognized by governments and Indigenous assemblies.


These guidelines fall under Section 66 of the University of Alberta's standards for human research and adhere to the principles set forth by Canada's funding agencies (Tri-Council). This comprehensive document covers 18 aspects of research ethics. It outlines the general ethical principles for researchers, research that requires an ethics review, the authority and mandate of Research Ethics Boards (REB), the assessment, decision-making and procedures of a REB and appeals of REB decisions. In addition, the document explores the various requirements for acquiring informed consent, privacy and confidentiality, conflict of interest, inclusion in research, clinical trials, human genetic research, research with human gametes, embryos, or foetuses, human tissue, the responsibilities of researchers, and the education and dissemination of information.


This report emerges from a graduate student conference held at UBC in March 2001. The conference brought together 85 First Nations and non-First Nations students from across Canada. The conference was divided into three parts. First, a panel discussion of researchers highlighted their personal experiences working in Indigenous villages and the necessary ethical protocols. The second part of the conference consisted of student roundtable discussions and paper presentations from a variety of disciplines and topics. The final part of the conference focused on a First Nations Agenda where the students were asked to consider a series of research methodologies that addressed First Nations issues and the relationship Indigenous communities and research institutions should have.

This ethics guideline produced by the University of Victoria consists of a 4-part scheme: (I) Rationale; (II) Indigenous Peoples - Implications for Research; (III) Protocols and Principles for Conducting Research in an Indigenous Context; and (IV) References. This is a comprehensive document that applies to all researchers from the Faculty of Human and Social Development and is designed to protect not only researchers, but Indigenous groups being researched.


The author in this article discusses the benefits of cooperative research and how it can provide valuable information to both the researcher and Aboriginal communities. In order to accomplish this there needs to be an adequate and ongoing consultation which must also include the return of the results to the communities involved. In her discussion of two separate language groups of the Darling River in Australia, she illustrated these groups interest in genetic differences.


The limitations of a needs orientation for aboriginal mental health planning are evaluated in terms of the discrepancy between First Nations and western medical paradigms of health. The authors propose an alternative approach that focuses on how aboriginal people conceptualize wellness and describe their strengths. This provides a focus for initiatives that promote well-being by enhancing strengths rather than concentrating solely on deficits. The authors illustrate this approach by highlighting the indigenous knowledge of urban First Nations people in Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside neighbourhood. They conclude that supporting existing strengths promotes wellness in holistic, culturally appropriate, and empowering ways.


This report is from the second community workshop in 2000, entitled “Research – Understanding Ethics.” The goal of the workshop was to provide an opportunity to discuss ethics and the control of Koori health research. The Koori participants spoke about their experiences of research, ethical issues they encountered as well as provided feedback to the case study presentation of the Gammin research proposal. The experiences of Koori participants were facilitated through case studies and group discussions, enabling all voices to and ideas to be heard with equal value. Four areas of concern were raised at the discussion and included confidentiality issues, issues around informed consent, issues around consultation and strengthening community participation as well as issues around the publication and ownership of data accumulated from Koori health research.

VicHealth Koori Health Research and Community Development Unit. (2000). *We don't
This is a report from a community workshop held in Shepparton, Victoria in 1999 entitled, “We don’t like research... but in Koori hands it could make a difference. In this workshop Koori researchers presented and discussed personal experiences in Koori health research, and young community members and elders spoke of their experiences and opinions about Koori research. The goals of the workshop were to look at concerns about research, identify the barriers to and solutions for community control in health research as well as ascertaining strategies for strengthening community participation in health research. The goals of the workshop were accomplished through small groups discussions on negative and positive contributions to the control of community health research and how to build Koori community ownership of research through the identification of barriers and viable solutions as well as providing examples of Koori community-initiated projects.


This paper describes the formative and process evaluation of a community development partnership for health promotion between a health group and an urban Maori community in New Zealand. The authors encountered a historical distrust among the Maori of the motives of healthcare research paradigms. Ultimately, the partnership achieved what it set out to do when the Maori partners took over the running of their own health groups and health programme. Building upon a detailed literature review and data from the evaluation, the paper offers a list of recommended procedures for the development of partnerships, applicable to health and other domains. Recommendations encompass preparatory steps, the formation of a partnership committee, programme planning and development, and the appointment of a community-based liaison worker. A conclusion of the research and premise underpinning the recommendations is that devolution of power is a key aspect of organizational process underlying successful partnerships involving professional groups and indigenous people.


Here, Waldram draws on his experiences working with Indigenous prisoners in Western Canadian to illustrate the complexities of research ethics with respect to dealing with marginalized social sectors. In this particular study, Waldram relates the delicate balance between empowering inmates by securing individual consent and ensuring a measure of accountability to the participants and operating within the framework of the corrections institution. The author maintains that research done ethically, can navigate between the interests of the two groups, and can also serve as a model for other populations considered marginal.

Currently, the research policy nexus is dominated by non-Native practitioners and bureaucrats who place an emphasis on inappropriate methodologies. This paper discusses the involvement of Native people in research design and applied anthropology in connection to Native self-determination. Anthropologists can strengthen interdisciplinary research by applying research techniques which native people view as culturally appropriate.


This article examines the conflicts it imposed on government archaeologists including questioning their professional duties, ethical and reporting responsibilities and obligations. This is demonstrated with the “Kennewick Man” case study.


There is an occurrence of developments in working with Aboriginal Australian communities to reach common goals despite the Australian policy of Self-determination for Aboriginals. In this article, the authors discuss utilizing a case study approach, how a particular Australian Aboriginal community combined Aboriginal local knowledge with non-Aboriginal knowledge in the construction and development of an alternative mathematics curriculum. This alternative curriculum will promote community development and authentic self-determination.


Wax, in this article, explores the "space" between the demands of university institutions and rural indigenous research subjects. Wax's article draws attention to the ethics of research in rural Indigenous villages and the divergent interests of the parties involved – researchers, tribal officials, and research subjects – in the research process. Wax surveyed six "organized Indian groups" to determine the ethical qualities of previous research projects in their communities. From these surveys, Wax suggests the wide gulf that traditionally separated the researchers from their subjects is steadily narrowing. Importantly, he urges that we move away from the biomedical model of research to a more integrative model negotiated between Indigenous communities and the researcher.


This paper discusses the challenges social workers can face in gaining access to establishing research in Native American on and off reserve communities. The manners in which to address these issues including how to conduct competent research in these communities is also discussed through the utilization of case studies. These illustrations also demonstrate specific principles and techniques for requesting and maintaining the participation of Native American rural reservation and urban communities in research projects.

Weber-Pillwax discusses through her personal stories the need for an Indigenous research context that would be incorporated into Indigenous research. While Indigenous research methodologies allow for Indigenous researchers to be who they are while participating in research. Weber-Pillwax discusses the notion of traditional education for Indigenous researchers as a motivation in Indigenous research. This is demonstrated through her discussion concerning knowledge gained by the Indigenous researcher will enable them to learn about themselves as a person and there place in the world.


In this article, the authors discuss a strategy for the development of protections for communities in biomedical research instead of applying existing guidelines. In the creation of this strategy they discuss community characteristics relevant to medical research, and a synthesis to appropriate protections. They argue that through an analysis of the different types of communities in research, their characteristics and protections for each a focused discussion on community consent and consultation will result. This is argued as a more effective approach then the tri council policy statement and its research guidelines that were considered applicable to other communities but in reality created problems as specific provisions could not always be applied to these communities.


Under a TEK working group influenced by a symposium by the Commission of Ecology of International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), a workshop was held in April of 1988 that resulted in the publication of these papers. The editors decided to present papers that expressed the nature, diversity, and contemporary value of TEK and show some of its universal features. The majority of the papers are taken from a multidisciplinary approach to TEK issues, some refer to the role of TEK in partnerships for sustainable development while issues in ethics are implied in many of the papers. The first part of the book examines specific definitions of TEK, the second addresses specifically methods and approaches associated with TEK and the third illustrates case studies.


The focus of this article is to understand the relationship between Indigenous epistemology and Indigenous methodology. He argues that there needs to be a move from an Indigenous perspective to an Indigenous paradigm because for Wilson the definition of a paradigm in based in beliefs that determine actions. Wilson then describes and elaborated on the western system research paradigms in comparison to an Indigenous paradigm which is based on definitions of knowledge, relationships with others, the cosmos, the earth everything. For Wilson, an Indigenous
methodology means answering to all your relations and fulfilling the relationships around you and only after you develop the beliefs that serve as a foundation to an Indigenous research paradigm can you begin to define the specific methods that would fit with the methodology.


Wilson in his article discusses the role of the individual or self in Indigenous research from an Indigenous perspective. For Indigenous people the self is rooted and connected to the land and thus the self has a relationship to the land and everything involved with it. This means that as an Indigenous researcher, the self is accountable to the land and all its relations. This concept of self differs significantly from the European concept of self as it is often associated with the independence of the individual.


This summary emerged out of the International Workshop on Indigenous Knowledge and Community-Based Resource Management with an overall objective to develop a plan to improve the ways in which Indigenous knowledge is utilized in decision-making processes. The stated objectives are to exchange information and experiences regarding TEK and community resource management, to establish networks among interested parties, to identify issues relating to the incorporation of traditional knowledge in decision-making processes, and to define areas of priority for future research. Drawing on two themes - the holistic nature of TEK and the lack of understanding in western society of TEK's strength and importance - the summary offers a series of recommendations that consider the following points: ethical guidelines; education and training; research and technology; communications; information management; institutional, legal and economic aspects; and partnerships. The summary concludes with the understanding that the principle of sustainable development can only be acquired by inclusion of both types of knowledge, in which there exists equality among peoples, cultures and knowledge systems.


Up until three decades ago, Anthropologists rarely took a stand for the people they studied due to the dominant thought prevailing Anthropology at the time. At that time it was considered “unscientific” as Anthropology and other social science disciplines valued unbiased, value free, objective research. In this paper, Wright traces the development and growth of Anthropology as a discipline and its eventual alliance based on current Anthropological perspectives and Native peoples struggles. Wright feels that there is a need to recognize and expose historical perspectives and thoughts that have contributed to the distortion of images of Native people. To avoid this happening again Anthropology as a discipline must affirm its humanistic concerns.

Wyatt, K. (1991). Aboriginal health research: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander

Aboriginal people in Australia have always addressed concerns over researchers invading privacy and conducting research for their own academic, political or professional needs within their communities. The author argues that the most important factor when conducting research in Australian Aboriginal communities should be their participation and collaborative relationship within the research project. The level of involvement and control should include such factors as the community determining research priorities, designing the research project, jointly administering the project, participating in research process including methodology and methods of research, as well as retaining the right to withdraw from the research.


There are many groups involved in social movements that focus primarily on the equal allocation of material goods, resources, income, wealth, and jobs. Young argues that this is problematic as she argues that instead of focusing on distribution, the concept of justice should begin with inquiries into domination and oppression which would bring out issues in decision making, division of labor, and culture that all too often have been ignored in philosophical discussions. Throughout her book she critically examines concepts of impartiality, formal equality, and moral subjectivity. She also argues for groups representation in politics and group – differentiated policies, based in a vision urban life as including more than one separate, distinct cultural network.

The beginning portion of this book examines the focus on oppression and domination as starting points in social justice and defines the concepts in chapter 2. The next portion of her book discusses social movements, the welfare capitalist state, ideas of impartiality, and some of the implications of political identities and political bodies. The last portion of her book discusses social movements in connection to politics of difference, affirmative action and urban life and difference.


This book is written from the perspective of an academic researcher who has felt the need to take a critical and comprehensive look at literature pertaining to the state of health of Native Americans including, why certain diseases are common, and how best to prevent and control them. The case study approach provides many examples where unique genetic, environmental and cultural issues impacted health status and the effectiveness of interventions through the methodological application of both anthropology and epidemiology or “biocultural epidemiology.” In this book, the author begins through an introduction to and overview of Native Americans. She then proceeds to discuss infectious and chronic diseases as well as injuries and social pathologies.