INDIGENOUS RESEARCH ETHICS

ADVANCES IN RESEARCH ETHICS AND INTEGRITY

Series Editor: Dr Ron Iphofen, *FAcSS, Independent Consultant, France*

Recent Volumes:

Volume 1: Finding Common Ground: Consensus in Research Ethics Across the Social Sciences, *Edited by Ron Iphofen*
Volume 2: The Ethics of Online Research, *Edited by Kandy Woodfield*
Volume 3: Virtue Ethics in the Conduct and Governance of Social Science Research, *Edited by Nathan Emmerich*
Volume 4: Ethics and Integrity in Health and Life Sciences Research, *Edited by Zvonimir Koporc*
Volume 5: Ethics and Integrity in Visual Research Methods, *Edited by Savannah Dodd*

ADVANCES IN RESEARCH ETHICS AND INTEGRITY,
VOLUME 6

INDIGENOUS RESEARCH ETHICS: CLAIMING RESEARCH SOVEREIGNTY BEYOND DEFICIT AND THE COLONIAL LEGACY

EDITED BY

DR LILY GEORGE
DR JUAN TAURI
DR LINDSEY TE ATA O TU MACDONALD

emerald
PUBLISHING

United Kingdom – North America – Japan
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2020

Reprints and permissions service
Contact: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-78769-390-6 (Print)
ISBN: 978-1-78769-389-0 (Online)
ISBN: 978-1-78769-391-3 (Epub)

ISSN: 2398-6018 (Series)

CONTENTS

PART I
CHALLENGES OF MAINSTREAM INSTITUTIONS

PART II
INDIGENOUS RESEARCH

PART III
INDIGENOUS/NON-INDIGENOUS PARTNERSHIPS

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

FIGURES

TABLES

ABOUT THE EDITORS

Dr Lily George (Ngāpuhi tribe) is an Adjunct Research Fellow with Victoria University of Wellington. She serves as Chair of the New Zealand Ethics Committee. Her research interests include Māori youth development, incarceration of Māori, and Indigenous women, and she specialises in community-based health and well-being research.

Dr Juan Tauri (Ngāti Porou tribe) is a Senior Lecturer in the Sociology and Social Policy programme at the University of Waikato. His research projects focus on a diverse range of topics, including youth gangs, domestic violence, Indigenous experiences of prison, and the globalisation of restorative justice, and is Co-editor of *Decolonization of Criminology and Justice*.

Dr Lindsey Te Ata o Tu MacDonald (Ngāi Tahu tribe) is a Senior Lecturer in politics, and a Research Fellow with the Ngai Tahu Research Centre, at the University of Canterbury. He has served on University of Canterbury's ethics committee plus on the New Zealand Ethics Committee. His research projects include Indigenous politics, research ethics, and the use of Q methodology.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Professor Thalia Anthony is of Cypriot heritage, including from the colonised northern region, and works on Gadigal land. She is a Professor of Law at the University of Technology Sydney and researches systemic racism and colonial legacies in law enforcement. Her books include *Indigenous People, Crime and Punishment and Decolonising Criminology*. She collaborates with Aboriginal organisations in research and activism.

Dr Debbie Bargallie is a descendent of the Kamilaroi and Wonnarua peoples of New South Wales. She is a Postdoctoral Senior Research Fellow in the Griffith Institute for Educational Research, Griffith University and researches on race and racism. Her book *Unmasking the racial contract: Indigenous voices on racism in the Australian Public Service* was published in 2020 by AIATSIS Aboriginal Studies Press.

Maddie Boe's research interests include holistic well-being, including cultural, social, and emotional well-being, Indigenous self-determination, and intersectional feminism, including decolonisation. In 2016, as a graduate student, he received the Highest Academic Performance award (Upper Years) in Behavioural Science at the University of Notre Dame, Fremantle.

Dr Amohia Boulton (Ngāti Ranginui, Ngai te Rangi, Ngāti Mutunga) is the Director of Whakauae Research Services, the only tribally owned health research centre in Aotearoa New Zealand. A health services researcher, her recent publications have focussed on approaches to well-being, the relationship between care ethics and Māori values, and between colonisation and care.

Dr Julie Bull (PhD) is an award-winning Inuk Researcher and Educator from NunatuKavut, Labrador. She is currently based on Prince Edward Island and travels throughout Canada to work with communities, researchers, Research Ethics Boards (REBs), educators, and policymakers to implement emerging and promising practices in ethics and engagement with Indigenous peoples.

Professor Chris Cunneen is a Professor of Criminology at the Jumbunna Institute for Indigenous Education and Research, University of Technology Sydney, and an Adjunct Professor at James Cook University. Recent books include (with Brown et al.) *Justice Reinvestment: Winding Back Imprisonment*, Palgrave, and (with Tauri) *Indigenous Criminology*, Policy Press.

Associate Professor Antje Deckert is a Senior Lecturer (Criminology) at Auckland University of Technology. Her research examines academic and media crime discourses and their interactions with Indigenous peoples and epistemologies. She is Co-editor of both the *Palgrave Handbook of Australian and New Zealand Criminology, Crime and Justice* (2017) and the peer-reviewed journal *Decolonization of Criminology and Justice*.

Professor Jennifer Deger is a Visual Anthropologist and Research Leader who makes films, curates exhibitions, and writes on art, media, and relational aesthetics. She is Co-founder of Miyarrka Media, a community-based arts collective based in the Yolngu community of Gapuwiyak, northern Australia, with a recent publication about possibilities of a *yuṯa*, or new, anthropology, *Phone & Spear: A Yuṯa Anthropology* (Goldsmiths Press, 2019).

Fiona Duckworth is Senior Research Advisor Māori Research Laboratory: Te Rū Rangahau, University of Canterbury. She also works in central government contexts and has a focus on embedding culturally responsive approaches into policy and practice.

Professor Pat Dudgeon is from the Bardi people of the Kimberly area in Western Australia. Her areas of research include Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander social and emotional well-being and suicide prevention. She has many prominent publications including, *Working Together: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Mental Health and Wellbeing Principles and Practice*.

Professor Simon Easteal is the Director of the National Centre for Indigenous Genomics (NCIG) at the Australian National University's John Curtin School of Medical Research. For the past eight years, he has been working with a team of researchers to establish NCIG as a Centre that enables respectful inclusion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in genome research and in the resultant health benefits.

Dr Lorena Gibson specialises in the Anthropology of development, hope, and NGOs. Her current Marsden-funded research project, East Side Orchestras: Music and Social Change, explores the social impacts of NGOs operating orchestral music education programmes in areas of high socioeconomic deprivation in urban Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand.

Azure Hermes is from the Gimuy Walubara Yidinji people, traditional custodians of the Cairns area. She is the Indigenous Community Engagement Coordinator at the National Centre for Indigenous Genomics (NCIG) at the Australian National University. In this role, Azure communicates to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people the story of the NCIG historical collection.

Horomona Horo has fused the traditional instruments of the Maori, taonga puoro, within a diverse range of cultural and musical forms. Mentored by tohunga (experts) of taonga puoro, the late Dr Hirini Melbourne and Richard Nunns, he has become one of the leading international Maori faces of Taonga Puoro.

Associate Professor Maui Hudson (Whakatōhea) is an Interdisciplinary Researcher based in the Faculty of Māori and Indigenous Studies at the

University of Waikato. He is a Founding Member of Te Mana Raraunga Māori Data Sovereignty Network and the Global Indigenous Data Alliance.

Dr Sharon Huebner is a Research Fellow at the University of Melbourne's Indigenous Studies Unit and an honorary Research Fellow at the Monash Indigenous Studies Centre. She has worked with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families for the past two decades protecting and preserving intergenerational rights to cultural heritage, including the digital return of material culture from archives, libraries, and museums and to protocols for ethical engagement.

Dr Rebecca Kiddle's (Ngāti Porou, Ngā Puhi) research interests focus on Māori identity as it relates to towns and cities, the role of young people in decision-making processes to do with the built and natural environment, and decolonising cities.

Professor Tahu Kukutai (Ngāti Tiipa, Ngāti Kinohaku, Te Aupōuri) is Professor of Demography at the National Institute of Demographic and Economic Analysis. She co-edited *Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Toward an Agenda* and is a Founding Member of Te Mana Raraunga Māori Data Sovereignty Network and the Global Indigenous Data Alliance.

Rhea Lewthwaite is a Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in citizen and works for her self-governing First Nation on modern-treaty implementation issues. Her PhD research examines justice epistemologies, values, processes and practices within the social operation and function of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in before colonisation in the late 1890s and since post self-governance in the late 1990s.

Sebastian J. Lowe is a musical anthropologist from Aotearoa New Zealand with an interest in sound worlds, music, filmmaking, creative research methods, community anthropology and collaborative 'Mahi Tahi' ethics. He is also a co-curator of www.otismakers.com and a member of the New Zealand Ethics Committee - Te Roopu Rapu i te Tika.

Dr Angus Hikairo Macfarlane is Professor of Māori Research at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand. He has a prolific publication record and has also received many awards for his extensive academic achievements and contributions to Māori education. His research explores cultural concepts and strategies that influence professional practice.

Dr Sonja Macfarlane is an Associate Professor and Senior Research Fellow at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand. She has been the recipient of several prestigious awards that have acknowledged her academic contributions to Maori education. Her research focuses on culturally responsive evidence-based professional practice.

Professor Elena Marchetti is a Professor in the Griffith Law School, Griffith University. She is also the Deputy Chair of the Queensland Sentencing Advisory

Council. Her main research interests include Indigenous and feminist critiques of justice process and access to justice for minority groups. Her recent book *Indigenous Courts, Culture and Partner Violence* was published in 2019 by Palgrave Macmillan.

Carolyn Mascall, for over six years, has been engaged with the National Empowerment Project undertaking administration and research. She has studied health promotion, education, and public policy. She has worked to support the community to access appropriate health care and education and to improve cultural, social, and emotional well-being.

Dr Jeremy Mayall is a Composer, Performer, and Researcher who works in music, sound art, installation, and multimedia formats, with a focus on exploring his fascination in the interrelationships between sound, time, space, the senses, and the human experience. Much of his research is in the area of creative practice.

Miyarrka Media is an arts collective from east Arnhem Land in Australia's Northern Territory. They have exhibited internationally and produced several award-winning documentary films. *Phone & Spear: A Yu̲ta Anthropology* (Goldsmiths Press, 2019) is their first book, collaboratively authored by Paul Gurrumuruwuy, Jennifer Deger, Enid Guruŋulmiwuy, Warren Balpatji, Meredith Balanydjarrk, James Ganambarr, and Kayleen Djingadjingawuy.

Ocean Ripeka Mercier (Ngāti Porou) explores the connections between mātauranga Māori and science, particularly in educational contexts, cultural mapping, and her current research collaborations: pest wasps, ocean knowledge platforms, and groundwater. She is widely known for her science communication roles, for instance, as presenter of Māori Television's *Project Mātauranga* and TVNZ's *Coast*.

Dr Marama Muru-Lanning is the Director of the James Henare Māori Research Centre and an Associate Professor in Anthropology at the University of Auckland. Her research focuses on Māori perspectives of commodifying and privatising water, harbours, and other natural resources in Aotearoa New Zealand. Her book *Tūpuna Awa: People and Politics of the Waikato River* was published by Auckland University Press in 2016. She is from Tūrangawaewae Marae and is of Waikato and Ngāti Maniapoto descent.

Wiremu T. Puke is of Ngāti Wairere (the mana whenua of Hamilton City), Ngāti Porou, Ngāti Tūwharetoa, and Ngāpuhi descent. He is a trained ethnographic and empirical researcher and one of the few Māori carvers trained and accomplished in the use of traditional Māori stone tools.

Angela Ryder is a Wilman/Goreng Noongar from south-west WA who has worked relentlessly for over 30 years, with particular focus on empowering Aboriginal peoples and communities through the promotion of cultural, social, and emotional well-being. She is employed by Relationships Australia WA and serves on a number of boards.

Professor Juanita Sherwood is a Wiradjuri woman, Leader in ethical research practices with Aboriginal people, communities, and organisations in Australia. She is the Pro Vice Chancellor of Indigenous Engagement at Charles Sturt University. Her research approach is focused on building the capacity of non-Aboriginal researchers to ensure they undertake ethical research with Aboriginal peoples and their communities.

Dr Cherryl Waerea-i-te-rangi Smith (Ngā Wairiki/Ngati Apa, Te Aitanga a Hauiti, Ngai Tumapuhiarangi, Ngai Tahu) is a Senior Researcher at Te Atawhai o te Ao and lead researcher for her tribe Nga Wairiki/Ngati Apa. She has undertaken kaupapa Maori research for over 25 years in health, environment, education, and justice. She is grandmother of nine.

Dr Gretchen Stolte is a Nimi'ipuu (Nez Perce) American Indian and is the Berndt Foundation Research Fellow at the University of Western Australia. Her research on Australian First Nations identity construction and art will be published in a monograph to be available in late 2019.

Dr Catherine Trundle is a Pākehā Cultural Anthropologist and poet based in Wellington, New Zealand. She researches and writes about health, inequality, gender, family, ethics, and the politics of proof, and her work seeks to challenge the boundaries between academic writing and other creative modes of expression.

Tarapuhi Vaeau is a descendent of Ngāti Raukawa ki Te Tonga and Te Ati Haunui-a-Papārangi. She is a Cultural Anthropologist and Design Consultant. Her research interests lie in historical trauma, structural violence, Indigenous health, the politics of agency in vulnerable spaces, and Indigenous methodologies.

Kiri West (Ngāti Marutūahu) is a Doctoral Student at the University of Auckland, based in the Māori studies department. Her research is interested in Māori Data Sovereignty, with a particular focus on ethics and governance. She is a Founding Participant of the Global Indigenous Data Alliance.

Associate Professor Megan Williams is Wiradjuri through paternal family with over 20 years' experience on health programs and research in the justice context, including about workforce development and program evaluation using her Ngaa-bi-nya framework. She is an alumnus of the Lowitja Institute, chairs a research ethics committee and is a contributing editor of independent health media company Croakey.org.

Kaylynn Zaro is from Mauar of the Torres Strait central island group. She is the Director of Gerib Sik Torres Strait Islander Corporation and has received an ACT Women's Award in 2000 and 2010 and an Order of Australia Medal in 2010 for her work in promoting Torres Strait culture.

Noel Zaro is a Descendant of the Dowareb tribe of Murray Island in the Torres Strait. He is the Director of Gerib Sik Torres Strait Islanders Corporation and was awarded an Order of Australia Medal in 2010 for service to the promotion and teaching of Torres Strait Islander Culture.

This page intentionally left blank

ABOUT THE SERIES EDITOR

Dr Ron Iphofen, FAcSS, is Executive Editor of the Emerald book series *Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity* and edited volume 1 in the series, *Finding Common Ground: Consensus in Research Ethics Across the Social Sciences* (2017). He is an Independent Research Consultant, a Fellow of the UK Academy of Social Sciences, the Higher Education Academy and the Royal Society of Medicine. Since retiring as Director of Postgraduate Studies in the School of Healthcare Sciences, Bangor University, his major activity has been as an adviser to the European Commission (EC) and its agencies, the European Research Council (ERC) and the Research Executive Agency (REA) on both the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) and Horizon 2020. His consultancy work has covered a range of research agencies (in government and independent) across Europe. He was Vice Chair of the UK Social Research Association, updated their Ethics Guidelines and now convenes the SRA's Research Ethics Forum. He was scientific consultant on the EC RESPECT project – establishing pan-European standards in the social sciences and chaired the Ethics and Societal Impact Advisory Group for another EC-funded European Demonstration Project on mass transit security (SECUR-ED). He has advised the UK Research Integrity Office; the National Disability Authority (NDA) of the Irish Ministry of Justice; the UK Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology; the Scottish Executive; UK Government Social Research; National Centre for Social Research; the Audit Commission; the Food Standards Agency; the Ministry of Justice; the BIG Lottery; a UK Local Authorities' Consortium; Skills Development Scotland; Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR the French Research Funding agency), among many others. He was founding Executive Editor of the Emerald gerontology journal *Quality in Ageing and Older Adults*. He published *Ethical Decision Making in Social Research: A Practical Guide* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2009 and 2011) and coedited with Martin Tolich *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research Ethics* (Sage, 2018). He is currently leading a new €2.8M European Commission-funded project (PRO-RES) that aims at promoting ethics and integrity in all non-medical research (2018–2021).

SERIES PREFACE

Ron Iphofen (Series Editor)

This book series, *Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity*, grew out of foundational work with a group of Fellows of the UK Academy of Social Sciences (AcSS) who were all concerned to ensure that lessons learned from previous work were built upon and improved in the interests of the production of robust research practices of high quality. Duplication or unnecessary repetitions of earlier research and ignorance of existing work were seen as hindrances to research progress. Individual researchers, research professions and society all suffer in having to pay the costs in time, energy and money of delayed progress and superfluous repetitions. There is little excuse for failure to build on existing knowledge and practice given modern search technologies unless selfish 'domain protectionism' leads researchers to ignore existing work and seek credit for innovations already accomplished. Our concern was to aid well-motivated researchers to quickly discover existing progress made in ethical research in terms of topic, method and/or discipline and to move on with their own work more productively and to discover the best, most effective means to disseminate their own findings so that other researchers could, in turn, contribute to research progress.

It is true that there is a plethora of ethics codes and guidelines with researchers left to themselves to judge those more appropriate to their proposed activity. The same questions are repeatedly asked on discussion forums about how to proceed when similar longstanding problems in the field are being confronted afresh by novice researchers. Researchers and members of ethics review boards alike are faced with selecting the most appropriate codes or guidelines for their current purpose, eliding differences and similarities in a labyrinth of uncertainty. It is no wonder that novice researchers can despair in their search for guidance and experienced researchers may be tempted by the 'checklist mentality' that appears to characterise a meeting of formalised ethics requirements and permit their conscience-free pursuit of a cherished programme of research.

If risks of harm to the public and to researchers are to be kept to a minimum and if professional standards in the conduct of scientific research are to be maintained, the more that fundamental understandings of ethical behaviour in research are shared the better. If progress is made in one sphere everyone gains from it being generally acknowledged and understood. If foundational work is conducted everyone gains from being able to build on and develop further that work.

Nor can it be assumed that formal ethics review committees are able to resolve the dilemmas or meet the challenges involved. Enough has been written about such review bodies to make their limitations clear. Crucially, they cannot follow researchers into the field to monitor their every action; they cannot anticipate all of the emergent ethical dilemmas nor, even, follow through to the publication of findings. There is no adequate penalty for neglect through incompetence, nor worse, for conscious omissions of evidence. We have to rely upon the virtues of the individual researcher alongside the skills of journal reviewers and funding agency evaluators. We need constantly to monitor scientific integrity at the corporate and at the individual level. These are issues of quality as well as morality.

Within the research ethics field new problems, issues and concerns and new ways of collecting data continue to emerge regularly. This should not be surprising as social, economic and technological change necessitate constant re-evaluation of research conduct. Standard approaches to research ethics such as valid informed consent, inclusion/exclusion criteria, vulnerable subjects and covert studies need to be reconsidered as developing social contexts and methodological innovation, interdisciplinary research and economic pressures pose new challenges to convention. Innovations in technology and method challenge our understanding of ‘the public’ and ‘the private’. Researchers need to think even more clearly about the balance of harm and benefit to their subjects, to themselves and to society. This series proposes to address such new and continuing challenges for both funders, research managers, research ethics committees and researchers in the field as they emerge. The concerns and interests are global and well recognised by researchers and commissioners alike around the world but with varying commitments at both the procedural and the practical levels. This series is designed to suggest realistic solutions to these challenges – this practical angle is the *unique selling proposition* (USP) for the series. Each volume will raise and address the key issues in the debates, but also strive to suggest ways forward that maintain the key ethical concerns of respect for human rights and dignity, while sustaining pragmatic guidance for future research developments. A series such as this aims to offer practical help and guidance in actual research engagements as well as meeting the often varied and challenging demands of research ethics review. The approach will not be one of abstract moral philosophy; instead it will seek to help researchers think through the potential harms and benefits of their work in the proposal stage and assist their reflection of the big ethical moments that they face in the field often when there may be no one to advise them in terms of their societal impact and acceptance.

While the research community can be highly imaginative both in the fields of study and methodological innovation, the structures of management and funding, and the pressure to publish to fulfil league table quotas can pressure researchers into errors of judgment that have personal and professional consequences. The series aims to adopt an approach that promotes good practice and sets principles, values and standards that serve as models to aid successful research outcomes. There is clear international appeal as commissioners and researchers alike share a vested interest in the global promotion of professional virtues that lead to the public acceptability of good research. In an increasingly global world in research terms, there is little point in applying too localised a morality, nor one that implies a solely Western hegemony of values. If standards ‘matter’, it seems evident that they should ‘matter’ to and for all. Only then can the growth of interdisciplinary and multi-national projects be accomplished effectively and with a shared concern for potential harms and benefits. While a diversity of experience and local interests is acknowledged, there are existing, proven models of good practice which can help research practitioners in emergent nations build their policies and processes to suit their own circumstances. We need to see that consensus positions effectively guide the work of scientists across the globe and secure minimal participant harm and maximum societal benefit – and, additionally, that instances of fraudulence, corruption and dishonesty in science decrease as a consequence.

Perhaps some forms of truly independent formal ethics scrutiny can help maintain the integrity of research professions in an era of enhanced concerns over data security, privacy and human rights legislation. But it is essential to guard against rigid conformity to what can become administrative procedures. The consistency we seek to assist researchers in understanding what constitutes ‘proper behaviour’ does not imply uniformity. Having principles does not lead inexorably to an adherence to principlism. Indeed, sincerely held principles can be in conflict in differing contexts. No one practice is necessarily the best approach in all circumstances. But if researchers are aware of the range of possible ways in which their work can be accomplished ethically and with integrity, they can be free to apply the approach that works or is necessary in their setting. Guides to ‘good’ ways of doing things should not be taken as the ‘only’ way of proceeding. A rigidity in outlook does no favours to methodological innovation, nor to the research subjects or participants that they are supposed to protect. If there were to be any principles that should be rigidly adhered to they should include flexibility, open-mindedness, the recognition of the range of challenging situations to be met in the field – principles that in essence amount to a sense of proportionality. And these principles should apply equally to researchers and ethics reviewers alike. To accomplish that requires ethics reviewers to think afresh about each new research proposal, to detach from pre-formed opinions and prejudices, while still learning from and applying the lessons of the past. Principles such as these must also apply to funding and commissioning agencies, to research institutions and to professional associations and their learned societies. Our integrity as researchers demands that we recognise that the rights of our funders and research participants and/or subjects are to be valued alongside our cherished research goals and seek to embody such principles in the research process from the outset. This series will strive to seek just how that might be accomplished in the best interests of all.

FOREWORD

This book is timely and significant as the need for both an ethic about Indigenous research and an ethics of Indigenous research is as urgent now as it was two decades ago. The faster that knowledge and technology accelerates and is disseminated globally and virtually, the more important it is that our consciousness about conducting ethical research with, for and by Indigenous peoples and communities is paying attention. The more our world is threatened either by climate change or political repression, by biotechnology or human stupidity, the more we need to act ethically and in relation to humans and all other entities.

This book goes well beyond the 'How to fill out an ethics form' procedural approach to ethical requirements into the diverse ways in which we think about ethics within Indigenous research, how it is negotiated within non-Indigenous institutional contexts and then how it is mediated across different disciplinary and methodological attitudes to Indigenous peoples. This book is the textbook we need to support our postgraduate students to think deeply about ethics, and it is the text we need to sustain the intellectual conversation about research ethics in relation to Indigenous research as a part of exercising our epistemic sovereignty.

Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith

CHAPTER 1

AN INTRODUCTION TO INDIGENOUS RESEARCH ETHICS

Lily George, Lindsey Te Ata o Tu Macdonald
and Juan Tauri

ABSTRACT

This chapter provides an overview of the volume, beginning with anecdotes from the editors. These anecdotes demonstrate the range of issues facing Indigenous scholars and researchers who choose to work with Indigenous participants and/or communities. Reference is made to Indigenous research sovereignty, honouring the immense work undertaken by previous Indigenous scholars, enabling many today to work effectively with their own people as well as other Indigenous groups. This is considered a courageous act, given the vulnerability this opens Indigenous peoples up to in terms of the change that is engendered and the criticism from external non-Indigenous researchers that has often arisen. The organisation of the volume into three parts is discussed, and this chapter ends with synopses of the following 16 chapters.

Keywords: Indigenous research ethics; Indigenous research sovereignty; Indigenous knowledges; pre-ethics; Kaupapa Māori research; research collaboration

WALKING OUR TALK

Sitting in the misty and glooming light of dusk in the Ilyan province of Taiwan in November 2016, Lindsey MacDonald looked on as the Taiwanese Indigenous

---

Indigenous Research Ethics: Claiming Research Sovereignty Beyond Deficit and the Colonial Legacy
Advances in Research Ethics and Integrity, Volume 6, 1–15

ISSN: 2398-6018/doi:10.1108/S2398-601820200000006001

group started discussing his request to consider the statement cards in front of them. Turning to him, they pointed at the cards, gathered their seats around the tables in the courtyard and proceeded to completely change his university ethics approved research method. The elder of the group took control and informed Lindsey that they wanted to complete the research task as a group, not as individuals. Perhaps as a way of mollifying the 'outsider', they then offered him a very strong home-distilled alcohol and got on with answering the research question. In a matter of five minutes, they had taken over the research method – on their terms. The Indigenous participants gathered had protected their sense of the proper way to do things, their autonomy and self-determination.

At the end of 2009, Juan Tauri submitted his research ethics application for his doctoral research to the university research ethics committee as required. The committee rejected this initial application, on the grounds that he displayed potentially 'unsafe' research practice because for the Canadian component of his research he signalled that he would be using group-based informed consent protocols where consent could be given verbally. This approach violated the informed consent protocol of the committee, which gave preference to individual consent, evidenced through participants putting their names to a piece of paper. The protocols Juan included in his ethics application were constructed after extensive engagement with Indigenous participants, especially elders, as well as Indigenous academics and researchers. Had Juan followed the university research ethics board's preferred protocol, it is likely he would have violated the preferred protocols of the Indigenous participants. After further engagement with elders, Juan re-submitted his application, which included an extensive critique of the committee's initial decision, and a compromise, namely that he would offer participants a choice – their own protocols, or the university's – and that he would proceed engagement based upon that decision. While the compromise did not satisfy the committee, it signed off on his application, and Juan proceeded to complete the project. All of the participants involved in this research project rejected the committee's 'ethics' protocol and chose their own.

In 2015, near the beginning of what was to become a five-year series of projects on Māori youth development as a strategy for suicide prevention led by Lily George, at a whakawātea (feedback) meeting, the youth involved proceeded to let the research team know that their plan for the project was 'boring'. Although part of the project design had included 'consultation' with youth, their voices could not be clearly heard in the final design. From that point on, youth voices were an integral part of the research processes for three projects, from design to dissemination. Given a space of safety from which to speak and in which they knew they would be heard, the youth were enabled to *heal*, *connect* more strongly to culture and people and develop their *leadership* abilities – themes they identified at the end of the first project as important to their growth.

The purpose of the anecdotes related above is to demonstrate the range of issues facing Indigenous scholars and researchers, as they prepare to enter into research with Indigenous participants. Lindsey's, Juan's and Lily's experiences mirror a number of the core issues raised by authors in this collection, including that we as Indigenous researchers are beholden to the values, 'rules' and protocols that Indigenous communities have developed to govern the way their knowledge and experiences are gathered, by outsiders as well as community members themselves. For example, Lindsey's experience highlights both the localised and global nature of Indigenous research, and especially ethics protocols, which in turn highlights the need to engage with Indigenous research participants during the design phases of research – what Lowe, George and Deger call 'pre-ethics' in their chapter. Juan's experience demonstrates the resilience of Indigenous knowledge protocols, with the Indigenous participants rejecting the research ethics board's individualised consent process and demanding that their own processes form the basis of the research relationship. Lily's anecdote displays a factor common to many Indigenous groups – the importance of honouring our youth as rangatira mo apopo/leaders of the future – and the roles of adults and elders as guides for those journeys into leadership in the present. What all three anecdotes clearly demonstrate is the willingness of Indigenous communities to assert tino rangatiratanga, their right to sovereignty and self-determination in the research sphere by rejecting colonialist research practices and asserting their own, ethical protocols.

INDIGENOUS RESEARCH SOVEREIGNTY

As you shall see in this volume, making space for Indigenous sovereignty within research is now a global phenomenon. Such a global surge in Indigenous research – and research ethics – speaks to all the exciting and innovative possibilities that flow from research in which Indigenous peoples reclaim their past, present and future. As the volume also demonstrates, the diversity of ways of making space for that sovereignty is staggering. From the adoption of Kaupapa Māori Research principles in New Zealand (Hudson, Milne, Reynolds, Russell, & Smith, 2010; Smith, 1999), to the San people's recently issued Code of Research Ethics (San Institute, 2017), and Inuit in Nunavut (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, 2018), the variety of Indigenous research ethics mirrors the diversity of Indigenous peoples across the globe. Such a multiplicity is necessary because the ethics of Indigenous research are local, particular and do not aspire to become 'the' way of doing things. Instead, as all the contributors emphasise, meeting Indigenous research participants 'where they are' is one of the fundamental principles of Indigenous research ethics. For example, in Puke and Lowe's contribution, a conversation with an elder about Indigenous ways of knowing and research ethics takes place in an Indigenous community garden.

Nevertheless, while the research stories with Indigenous peoples are enormously diverse, they are also linked by, for example, a pursuit of self-determination, and their description of Indigenous communities who consider themselves sovereign and so seek to throw off the colonial fetters. Given the extreme variety of research issues and topics under investigation today, and the multi-million-dollar industry surrounding research, it becomes extremely important to ensure that research with Indigenous peoples is ethically as well as methodologically relevant, according to the needs and desires of Indigenous peoples themselves. As noted by Te Puni Kōkiri (1994),

> Ethics is about values, and ethical behaviour reflects values held by people at large. For Māori, ethics is about 'tikanga' [cultural concepts and rituals] – for tikanga reflects our values, our beliefs and the way we view the world. (Cited in Hudson et al., 2010)

In her seminal work, *Decolonizing methodologies* (1999), Linda Tuhiwai Smith wrote that:

> One of the challenges for Māori researchers has been to retrieve some space – first, to convince Māori people of the value of research for Māori; second, to convince the various, fragmented but powerful research communities of the need for greater Māori involvement in research; and third, to develop approaches and ways of carrying out research which take into account, without being limited by, the legacies of previous research, and the parameters of both previous and current approaches. What is now referred to as Kaupapa Māori approaches to research … is an attempt to retrieve that space and to achieve those general aims. (p. 183)

Smith (1999) could have been writing about many other Indigenous peoples and challenges related to claiming research space. Brant Castellano (2004) wrote that in a meeting involving Aboriginal people, some protested, 'We've been researched to death!' However, 'an Elder … spoke quietly from a corner of the room. 'If we have been researched to death', he said, 'maybe it's time we started researching ourselves back to life' (p. 98). There have been many advances in developing Indigenous research, and Indigenous 'methodologies vary according to the ways in which different Indigenous communities express their own unique knowledge systems' (Louis, 2007, p. 130). Nevertheless, challenges remain.

Colonialism has created a formidable and ever-present set of structures and practices in societies that the contributors make clear are still far from overcome. So, we are perhaps not ready to declare the arena of Indigenous research ethics as 'post-colonial'; the assertion and demonstration of Indigenous sovereignties in research methods and ethics does not mean the colonial yoke of research has been fully shaken off by Indigenous communities (Tolich & Smith, 2014). Instead, the demonstration of sovereignty is that there are courageous Indigenous communities who know the value of their own knowledges and whose work demonstrates that research with Indigenous peoples can be a place of Indigenous sovereignty. Together with Indigenous researchers and non-Indigenous allies, Indigenous communities have reaffirmed ways of working that enable Indigenous agency in research to flourish. This is an incredibly vulnerable action since it opens the community up to change – and to criticism from external forces. Given the damage done by earlier research, such vulnerability is an incredibly brave act, therefore this volume can be seen by readers as both an honouring of the courage of these Indigenous communities and a call to courage for other researchers and communities.

VOLUME SECTIONS

Part One – Challenges of Mainstream Institutions

This volume is separated into three parts, which are nevertheless interconnected. Part One presents Indigenous research as strong and self-determined – with the ethics of our research, as with our methodologies and methods that we use as Indigenous people, arising from our unique cultural concepts. Yet there have been many challenges along the way, including the challenge of working within mainstream institutions that do not always see our methods and methodologies as legitimate 'science'.

Louis (2007) notes that 'research on Indigenous issues should be carried out in a manner which is respectful and ethically sound from an Indigenous perspective … [which] naturally challenges Western research paradigms' (p. 130). Indeed, as Ball and Janyst (2008) state, 'Enacting ethical principles and practices in research involving Indigenous peoples is among the most contested issues in the current research environment in Canada' (p. 33). Indigenous scholars such as Tauri (2014) question research ethics boards and the 'general lack of experience of [board] members in researching with Indigenous peoples', resulting in the privileging of a 'Eurocentric conceptualization of the autonomous research subject … [and] an over-reliance on formulaic main-streamed (white-streamed) assessment processes that sideline the importance of the social context' (p. 135).

A pervasive theme that binds our contributors is that Indigenous research ethics are necessary because the practices they produce are perhaps the safest and, therefore, most productive way to gather Indigenous knowledge. They create safety by ensuring researchers work with and for Indigenous peoples themselves. Moreover, by offering those communities agency and control over their voices and knowledge, we can allow a space in which the community can see itself represented with dignity, in the scholarly journals and books of our time. Without that safety for Indigenous communities, it is unlikely those communities will pass on their knowledge. And that knowledge is crucial because it increases the range of individual, community and global possibilities. Indigenous knowledges are vital because they expand the range of what is humanly possible; Indigenous research ethics thus makes possible the transmission of ideas from communities that were silenced by colonialism and yet have fundamental and valuable contributions to make to our understanding of all arenas of human existence.

Part Two – Indigenous Research

In Part Two, we examine notions of working 'with, for, and by' our people (see Smith, 1999). What does Indigenous research look like today, and what ethical issues arise when working with our own people? Again, research practice is grounded in cultural uniqueness, working in our distinctive and diverse ways. For instance, how do the various Indigenous organisations, institutions and communities organise and shape research? In addition, there is a new challenge in the twenty-first century for Indigenous people researching their own: many Indigenous organisations have fought for and won power – and money. What ethical challenges do tribal corporations and other forms of Indigenous power face when creating and contracting for research on their people and resources? (MacDonald, 2016).

As this volume demonstrates, Indigenous research ethics are almost always built upon local Indigenous, often autochthonous, community knowledges and traditions. The resilience of those knowledges and traditions is awe-inspiring. It is seldom noted that the knowledge and institutions upon which Indigenous ethics are built are older than the New Testament, older than Plato's works on ethics. In the case of Australian Aboriginal work, the research is building on and working ways of knowing that pre-date the dawn of large human settlements in Sumeria. Universities themselves, starting around the late first millennium, are new compared with the many of the traditions of Indigenous peoples that are discussed in the chapters below. Indigenous research ethics are incredibly important in allowing their own people as well as others to access these ancient knowledges that were silenced by colonialism.

Part Three – Indigenous/Non-Indigenous Partnerships

This section provides examples of Indigenous and non-Indigenous research *partnerships*, the associated ethical and other challenges they faced in working together, and how those challenges may be overcome. While there are many more Indigenous researchers today, as well as community-based non-academics who are research active, we still need to find effective ways to collaborate and work together, on our terms, as that opens more opportunities for Indigenous peoples.

Indigenous researchers are often embedded in the social and cultural life of those they research with. Working with our own people and focusing on issues that impact on our people and communities can mean that we are involved emotionally and spiritually with our research 'participants'. Recognising those places where we meet and converge, maintaining clarity in purpose and relationships, is therefore essential to 'ensuring that research sustains academic rigor as well as the knowledge and needs of those we research with' (George, 2018). Relationships are therefore often the foundation of Indigenous research projects, including those we have with each other, the land and environment, the gods who created them and with the historical contexts within which we are rooted. Tolich and Smith (2014) note that in applications to ethics review committees, the quality of engagement with Māori regarding research is 'generally low' (p. 165). Yet with Indigenous research, given that relationships are foundational, 'consultation' must go beyond more than a brief conversation at some point in the process. Relationships must be developed and maintained throughout the process.

A researcher should ask themselves 'Who am I? What right do I have to be doing this research?' (George, 2018). A researcher must recognise how their inclusion in particular socio-historical and cultural contexts influences the way they see, judge or interpret other people's worlds as well as their own. This becomes even more relevant if you are a non-Indigenous researcher wishing to research with Indigenous peoples. Previously, it was often unnecessary for non-Indigenous researchers to ponder their right to research with Indigenous people; today, Indigenous people often demand that of 'outsider' researchers. They are now impelled to consider their own history and socio-cultural positioning and how that influences their approach to the research and the people involved (George, 2018).

CHAPTER SYNOPSES

Part One – Challenges of Mainstream Institutions

Part One begins with *Ethical conduct in Indigenous research: It's just good manners* (Chapter Two), where Juanita Sherwood and Thalia Anthony elucidate some 'limitations of well-intentioned guidelines for the decolonisation of research in Australia'. Although these guidelines may respond to ethical concerns about harmful processes in research, Sherwood and Anthony argue that they may instead serve to 'entrench colonial relations and structures'. For example, the continuing conjecture of Indigenous vulnerability and deficit in the guidelines generates emphasis on minimising risk, rather than focusing instead on creation of strengths-based approaches recognising inherent strength and capacity within Indigenous communities – 'This means that communities must be partners in research who can demand reciprocation for their participation and sharing of their knowledge, time and experiences'. The authors provide examples of self-determining Indigenous research models within health and criminology.

Chapter 3, 'Developing Ethical Standards in Criminology and Criminal Justice Research: A Focus on Indigenous Australian Peoples', examines three core questions about the ethics of criminology and criminal justice research in Australia that involves Indigenous peoples: What does 'free, prior and informed consent' to participate in research mean and how should it be obtained and operationalised in criminology and criminal justice research involving Indigenous peoples and communities? What does the requirement that research be 'for the benefit of Indigenous peoples' mean in the context of criminal justice research? Further, how can ethical guidelines ensure that Indigenous-focused criminological and criminal justice research and evaluation enhance and support Indigenous peoples' empowerment and self-determination? Debbie Bargallie, Chris Cunneen, Elena Marchetti, Juan Tauri and Megan Williams suggest that these questions need to be posed and answered because the current guidance of the National Health and Medical Research Council's (NHMRC) *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research* (updated 2018) and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) *Guidelines for Ethical Research in Australian Indigenous Studies* (2012) does not specifically focus on research or evaluations in the criminology and criminal justice space, resulting in discipline-specific gaps.

In Chapter 4, 'Vision Mātauranga, Eclectic Anthropology, and the Fading Empire', Marama Muru-Lanning discusses the ways in which the government policy in New Zealand on research with Māori (Vision Mātauranga) is used in multiple ways as a mechanism to advance and create relationships between scientists and Māori communities in the co-production of new knowledge. She explores how her scholarly views, via training in anthropology, narrowed the lens through which she explored the relations within research between Māori and non-Maori. Now as the Director of the James Henare Research Centre, the manner of engagements with Māori and non-Māori groups has transformed, given that the Vision Mātauranga process impels a set of questions that were less relevant during her training and practice as an anthropologist. Muru-Lanning notes that

'The probing and critical perspectives I had developed by privileging anthropological ideas and theory overshadowed other ways of interacting and understanding people and place'. The positive outcome of these transformed engagements is an increased incidence of cross-discipline as well as cross-cultural collaborations that can be rich and meaningful.

Following Marama Muru-Lanning's more personal accounting of ethics through a New Zealand research policy, we move to an outline of how Indigenous peoples might choose to react to the questions raised by 'Big Data'. Kiri West, Maui Hudson and Tahu Kukutai suggest in Chapter Five, 'Data Ethics and Data Governance from a Māori World View', that Indigenous Data Sovereignty is critical in an age when data are the most valuable commodity. They suggest that Indigenous Data Sovereignty has emerged as a key consideration in discussions and debates relating to the ethical, and particularly the secondary, use of data –

> Beginning with the presumption of indigenous rights to tribal/nation sovereignty, Indigenous Data Sovereignty weaves together indigenous research ethics, cultural and intellectual property rights and indigenous governance discourse, with the view to offer solutions to the challenges being presented in an open data environment.

They provide an overview and contribution to Indigenous Data Sovereignty's distinctive approach to data, bringing together the discourse of cultural and intellectual property rights, Indigenous research ethics and Indigenous governance to address the evolving challenges of a global data environment that is increasingly open and integrated. Using their work in Aotearoa New Zealand as an example, they suggest that focusing on data sovereignty has led to a greater focus on how Māori kawa (customs) and tikanga (protocols) might inform approaches to data ethics and data governance.

In Chapter 6, 'Autoethnography and Ethics: Sovereignty, Self-determination and Strategies', by drawing on her Canadian experience Julie Bull argues that paradigms are changing with regard to research concerning Indigenous peoples: 'research *with* Indigenous peoples instead of research *on* them'. The diversity and multiplicity of world views must be acknowledged and treated as 'sacred space'. The tensions within this space – an ethical space – must be negotiated sensitively and effectively by researchers and Research Ethics Boards (REBs) through effective collaborations with Indigenous peoples 'to find mutually agreeable solutions to research ethics tensions'. Julie utilises a 2018 study which traversed ethical engagement by practising Etuaptmumk (two-eyed seeing – the Mi'kmaq concept of learning to see from and integrate multiple perspectives to find remedies to issues/challenges/questions that benefit everyone). The chapter seeks to address the policy-to-practice gaps which still exist in application of Canada's research ethics policy, second Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS2). Developing programmes in Canada and other nations, and within academic and Indigenous communities, provide opportunity to develop more effective policies on research ethics for research with Indigenous peoples in terms of 'doing research differently' through strong Indigenous leadership. Julie provides reflections of a study 'acknowledging self-in-science or examining self-as-science' through creative research 'methods and mediums to explore and examine the self without separation from the research'.