4

ON TRICKY GROUND

Researching the Native in the Age of Uncertainty

Linda Tuhiwai Smith

▣ INTRODUCTION

In the spaces between research methodologies, ethical principles, institutional regulations, and human subjects as individuals and as socially organized actors and communities is tricky ground. The ground is tricky because it is complicated and changeable, and it is tricky also because it can play tricks on research and researchers. Qualitative researchers generally learn to recognize and negotiate this ground in a number of ways, such as through their graduate studies, their acquisition of deep theoretical and methodological understandings, apprenticeships, experiences and practices, conversations with colleagues, peer reviews, their teaching of others. The epistemological challenges to research—to its paradigms, practices, and impacts—play a significant role in making those spaces richly nuanced in terms of the diverse interests that occupy such spaces and at the same time much more dangerous for the unsuspecting qualitative traveler. For it is not just the noisy communities of difference "out there" in the margins of society who are moving into the research domain with new methodologies, epistemological approaches, and challenges to the way research is conducted. The neighbors are misbehaving as well. The pursuit of new scientific and technological knowledge, with biomedical research as a specific example, has presented new challenges to our understandings of what is scientifically possible and ethically acceptable. The turn back to the modernist and imperialist discourse of discovery, "hunting, racing, and gathering" across the globe to map the human genome or curing disease through the new science of genetic engineering,

has an impact on the work of qualitative social science researchers. The discourse of discovery speaks through globalization and the marketplace of knowledge. "Hunting, racing, and gathering" is without doubt about winning. But wait—there is more. Also lurking around the corners are countervailing conservative forces that seek to disrupt any agenda of social justice that may form on such tricky ground. These forces have little tolerance for public debate, have little patience for alternative views, and have no interest in qualitative richness or complexity. Rather, they are nostalgic for a return to a research paradigm that, like life in general, should be simple.

It is often at the level of specific communities in the margins of a society that these complex currents intersect and are experienced. Some indigenous communities are examples of groups that have been historically vulnerable to research and remain vulnerable in many ways, but also have been able to resist as a group and to attempt to reshape and engage in research around their own interests. This chapter applies indigenous perspectives to examine the intersecting challenges of methodologies, ethics, institutions, and communities. It is a chapter about arriving at and often departing from commonly accepted understandings about the relationships between methodology, ethics, institutional demands, and the communities in which we live and with whom we research. Rather than a story of how complex the world is and how powerless we are to change it, this chapter is framed within a sense of the possible, of what indigenous communities have struggled for, have tried to assert and have achieved.

▣ INDIGENOUS RESEARCH AND THE SPACES FROM WHICH IT SPEAKS

Indigenous peoples can be defined as the assembly of those who have witnessed, been excluded from, and have survived modernity and imperialism. They are peoples who have experienced the imperialism and colonialism of the modern historical period beginning with the Enlightenment. They remain culturally distinct, some with their native languages and belief systems still alive. They are minorities in territories and states over which they once held sovereignty. Some indigenous peoples do hold sovereignty, but of such small states that they wield little power over their own lives because they are subject to the whims and anxieties of large and powerful states. Some indigenous communities survive outside their traditional lands because they were forcibly removed from their lands and connections. They carry many names and labels, being referred to as natives, indigenous, autochthonous, tribal peoples, or ethnic minorities. Many indigenous peoples come together at regional and international levels to argue for rights and recognition. In some countries, such as China, there are many different indigenous groups and languages. In other places, such as New Zealand, there is one indigenous group, known as Māori, with one common language but multiple ways of defining themselves.

There are, of course, other definitions of indigenous or native peoples, stemming in part from international agreements and understandings, national laws and regulations, popular discourses, and the self-defining identities of the peoples who have been colonized and oppressed (Burger, 1987; Pritchard, 1998; Wilmer, 1993). The category of the native Other is one that Fanon (1961/1963) and Memmi (1957/1967) have argued is implicated in the same category as the settler and the colonizer. As opposing identities, they constitute each other as much as they constitute themselves. Rey Chow (1993) reminds us, however, that the native did exist before the "gaze" of the settler and before the image of "native" came to be constituted by imperialism, and that the native does have an existence outside and predating the settler/native identity. Chow refers to the "fascination" with the native as a "labor with endangered authenticities." The identity of "the native" is regarded as complicated, ambiguous, and therefore troubling even for those who live the realities and contradictions of being native and of being a member of a colonized and minority community that still remembers other ways of being, of knowing, and of relating to the world. What is troubling to the dominant cultural group about the definition of "native" is not what necessarily troubles the "native" community. The desire for "pure," uncontaminated, and simple definitions of the native by the settler is often a desire to continue to know and define the Other, whereas the desire by the native to be self-defining and self-naming can be read as a desire to be free, to escape definition, to be complicated, to develop and change, and to be regarded as fully human. In between such desires are multiple and shifting identities and hybridities with much more nuanced positions about what constitutes native identities, native communities, and native knowledge in anti/postcolonial times. There are also the not-insignificant matters of disproportionately high levels of poverty and underdevelopment, high levels of sickness and early death from preventable illnesses, disproportionate levels of incarceration, and other indices of social marginalization experienced by most indigenous communities.

There are some cautionary notes to these definitions, as native communities are not homogeneous, do not agree on the same issues, and do not live in splendid isolation from the world. There are internal relations of power, as in any society, that exclude, marginalize, and silence some while empowering others. Issues of gender, economic class, age, language, and religion are also struggled over in contemporary indigenous communities. There are native indigenous communities in the developed and in the developing world, and although material conditions even for those who live in rich countries are often horrendous, people in those countries are still better off than those in developing countries. There are, however, still many native and indigenous families and communities who possess the ancient memories of another way of knowing that informs many of their contemporary practices. When the foundations of those memories are disturbed, space sometimes is created for alternative imaginings to be voiced, to be sung, and to be heard (again).

The genealogy of indigenous approaches to research and the fact that they can be reviewed in this chapter is important because they have not simply appeared

overnight, nor do they exist—as with other critical research approaches—without a politics of support around them or a history of ideas. This chapter speaks from particular historical, political, and moral spaces, along with a set of relationships and connections between indigenous aspirations, political activism, scholarship, and other social justice movements and scholarly work. Indigenous communities and researchers from different parts of the globe have long and often voiced concern about the "problem of research" and represented themselves to be among the "most researched" peoples of the world. The critique of research came to be voiced in the public domain in the 1970s, when indigenous political activism was also reasserting itself (Eidheim, 1997; Humphery, 2000; Langton, 1981; L. T. Smith, 1999). The history of research from many indigenous perspectives is so deeply embedded in colonization that it has been regarded as a tool only of colonization and not as a potential tool for self-determination and development. For indigenous peoples, research has a significance that is embedded in our history as natives under the gaze of Western science and colonialism. It is framed by indigenous attempts to escape the penetration and surveillance of that gaze while simultaneously reordering, reconstituting, and redefining ourselves as peoples and communities in a state of ongoing crisis. Research is a site of contestation not simply at the level of epistemology or methodology but also in its broadest sense as an organized scholarly activity that is deeply connected to power. That resistance to research, however, is changing ever so slightly as more indigenous and minority scholars have engaged in research methodologies and debates about research with communities (Bishop, 1998; Cram, Keefe, Ormsby, & Ormsby, 1998; Humphery, 2000; Pidgeon & Hardy, 2002; Smith, 1985; Worby & Rigney, 2002). It is also changing as indigenous communities and nations have mobilized internationally and have engaged with issues related to globalization, education systems, sovereignty, and the development of new technologies.

Indigenous peoples are used to being studied by outsiders; indeed, many of the basic disciplines of knowledge are implicated in studying the Other and creating expert knowledge of the Other (Helu Thaman, 2003; Said, 1978; Minh-ha, 1989; Vidich & Lyman, 2000). More recently, however, indigenous researchers have been active in seeking ways to disrupt the "history of exploitation, suspicion, misunderstanding, and prejudice" of indigenous peoples in order to develop methodologies and approaches to research that privilege indigenous knowledges, voices, experiences, reflections, and analyses of their social, material, and spiritual conditions (Rigney, 1999, p. 117). This shift in position, from seeing ourselves as passive victims of all research to seeing ourselves as activists engaging in a counterhegemonic struggle over research, is significant. The story of that progression has been told elsewhere in more depth and is not unique to indigenous peoples; women, gay and lesbian communities, ethnic minorities, and other marginalized communities have made similar journeys of critical discovery of the role of research in their lives (Hill Collins, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 2000; Mies, 1983; Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1983; Sedgwick, 1991). There have been multiple

challenges to the epistemic basis of the dominant scientific paradigm of research, and these have led to the development of approaches that have offered a promise of counterhegemonic work. Some broad examples of these include oral history as stories of the working class, the range of feminist methodologies in both quantitative and qualitative research, the development of cultural and anti/postcolonial studies, critical race theory, and other critical approaches within disciplines (Beverley, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 2000; McLaren, 1993; Mohanty, 1984; Reinharz, 1992; Spivak, 1987; Stanley & Wise, 1983). Critical theorists have held out the hope that research could lead to emancipation and social justice for oppressed groups if research understood and addressed unequal relations of power. Feminism has challenged the deep patriarchy of Western knowledge and opened up new spaces for the examination of epistemological difference. Third World women, African American women, black women, Chicanas, and other minority group women have added immensely to our understandings of the intersections of gender, race, class, and imperialism and have attempted to describe what that means for themselves as researchers choosing to research in the margins (Aldama, 2001; Elabor-Idemudia, 2002; Hill Collins, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 2000; Mohanty, 1984; Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1983; Te Awekotuku, 1999). Indigenous women have played important roles in exploring the intersections of gender, race, class, and difference through the lens of native people and against the frame of colonization and oppression (K. Anderson, 2000; Maracle, 1996; Moreton-Robinson, 2000; L. T. Smith, 1992; Te Awekotuku, 1991; Trask, 1986).

The decolonization project in research engages in multiple layers of struggle across multiple sites. It involves the unmasking and deconstruction of imperialism, and its aspect of colonialism, in its old and new formations alongside a search for sovereignty; for reclamation of knowledge, language, and culture; and for the social transformation of the colonial relations between the native and the settler. It has been argued elsewhere that indigenous research needs an agenda that situates approaches and programs of research in the decolonization politics of the indigenous peoples movement (L. T. Smith, 1999). I would emphasize the importance of retaining the connections between the academy of researchers, the diverse indigenous communities, and the larger political struggle of decolonization because the disconnection of that relationship reinforces the colonial approach to education as divisive and destructive. This is not to suggest that such a relationship is, has been, or ever will be harmonious and idyllic; rather, it suggests that the connections, for all their turbulence, offer the best possibility for a transformative agenda that moves indigenous communities to someplace better than where they are now. Research is not just a highly moral and civilized search for knowledge; it is a set of very human activities that reproduce particular social relations of power. Decolonizing research, then, is not simply about challenging or making refinements to qualitative research. It is a much broader but still purposeful agenda for transforming the institution of research, the deep underlying structures and taken-for-granted ways of organizing, conducting, and disseminating research and knowledge. To borrow from

Edward Said (1978), research can also be described as "a corporate institution" that has made statements about indigenous peoples, "authorising views" of us, "describing [us], teaching about [us], settling [us] and ruling over [us]." It is the corporate institution of research, as well as the epistemological foundations from which it springs, that needs to be decolonized.

> *I name this research methodology as Indigenist.*

> —Lester Rigney (1999, p. 118)

Becoming an indigenous researcher is somewhat like Maxine Green's (2000) description of how artists from the margins come to re-imagine public spaces. "Through resistance in the course of their becoming—through naming what stood in their way, through coming together in efforts to overcome—people are likely to find out the kinds of selves they are creating" (p. 301). Indigenous researchers are "becoming" a research community. They have connected with each other across borders and have sought dialogue and conversations with each other. They write in ways that deeply resonate shared histories and struggles. They also write about what indigenous research ought to be. Australian Aborigine scholar Lester Rigney (1999), emphasizing Ward Churchill's (1993) earlier declarations of indigenist positioning, has argued for an indigenist approach to research that is formed around the three principles of

Table 4.1.   Corporate Layers of Research

- Foundations, genealogies, and disciplines of knowledge that define its methodologies and its systems of classification and representation
- Historical embeddedness in imperialism, the production of knowledge, and the development of science
- Cultures and subcultures of its institutions and infrastructures
- Communities of like-minded or trained scholars, disciplinary bodies, and research associations
- Ways in which research is regulated and inscribed through notions of ethics, ethical review boards, and codes of conduct
- Practices of reporting and publishing
- National and international funding agencies and their links to particular agendas
- Ways in which some forms of research legitimate dominant forms of knowledge and maintain hegemony or dominant myths
- Chain and distribution of benefits from research
- Intersection of research with policy and the design and implementation of interventions

resistance, *political integrity*, and *privileging* indigenous voices. He, like other indigenous researchers, connects research to liberation and to the history of oppression and racism. Rigney argues that research must serve and inform the political liberation struggle of indigenous peoples. It is also a struggle for development, for rebuilding leadership and governance structures, for strengthening social and cultural institutions, for protecting and restoring environments, and for revitalizing language and culture. Some indigenous writers would argue that indigenous research is research that is carried out by indigenous researchers with indigenous communities for indigenous communities (Cram, 2001; Rigney, 1999). Implicit in such a definition is that indigenous researchers are committed to a platform for changing the status quo and see the engagement by indigenous researchers as an important lever for transforming institutions, communities, and society. Other writers state that purpose more explicitly in that they define indigenous research as being a transformative project that is active in pursuit of social and institutional change, that makes space for indigenous knowledge, and that has a critical view of power relations and inequality (Bishop, 1998; Brady, 1999; Pihama, 2001; L. T. Smith, 1991). Others emphasize the critical role of research in enabling peoples and communities to reclaim and tell their stories in their own ways and to give *testimonio* to their collective herstories and struggles (Battiste, 2000; Beverley, 2000; The Latina Feminist Group, 2001). Embedded in these stories are the ways of knowing, deep metaphors, and motivational drivers that inspire the transformative praxis that many indigenous researchers identify as a powerful agent for resistance and change. These approaches connect and draw from indigenous knowledge and privilege indigenous pedagogies in their practices, relationships, and methodologies. Most indigenous researchers would claim that their research validates an ethical and culturally defined approach that enables indigenous communities to theorize their own lives and that connects their past histories with their future lives (Marker, 2003). Indigenous approaches are also mindful of and sensitive to the audiences of research and therefore of the accountabilities of researchers as storytellers, documenters of culture, and witnesses of the realities of indigenous lives, of their ceremonies, their aspirations, their incarcerations, their deaths. (Pihama, 1994; Steinhauer, 2003; Te Hennepe, 1993; Warrior, 1995).

In New Zealand, Māori scholars have coined their research approach as Kaupapa Māori or Māori research rather than employing the term "indigenist." There are strong reasons for such a naming, as the struggle has been seen as one over Māori language and the ability by Māori as Māori to name the world, to theorize the world, and to research back to power. The genealogy of indigenous research for Māori has one of its beginnings in the development of alternative Māori immersion-based schooling (Pihama, Cram, & Walker, 2002; G. H. Smith, 1990; L. T. Smith, 2000). Graham Smith (1990) has argued that the struggle to develop alternative schools known as Kura Kaupapa Māori helped produce a series of educational strategies that engaged with multiple levels of colonization and social inequality. These strategies included engagement with theory

and research in new ways. Kaupapa Māori research has developed its own life, and as an approach or theory of research methodology, it has been applied across different disciplinary fields, including the sciences. It can be argued that researchers who employ a Kaupapa Māori approach are employing quite consciously a set of arguments, principles, and frameworks that relate to the purpose, ethics, analyses, and outcomes of research (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Durie, 1992; Johnston, 2003; Pihama, 1993; L. T. Smith, 1991; Tomlins-Jahnke, 1997). It is a particular approach that sets out to make a positive difference for Māori, that incorporates a model of social change or transformation, that privileges Māori knowledge and ways of being, that sees the engagement in theory as well as empirical research as a significant task, and that sets out a framework for organizing, conducting, and evaluating Māori research (Jahnke & Taiapa, 1999; Pihama et al., 2002). It is also an approach that is active in building capacity and research infrastructure in order to sustain a sovereign research agenda that supports community aspirations and development (L. T. Smith, 1999). Those who work within this approach would argue that Kaupapa Māori research comes out of the practices, value systems, and social relations that are evident in the taken-for-granted ways that Māori people live their lives.

Indigenist research also includes a critique of the "rules of practice" regarding research, the way research projects are funded, and the development of strategies that address community concerns about the assumptions, ethics, purposes, procedures, and outcomes of research. These strategies often have led to innovative research questions, new methodologies, new research relationships, deep analyses of the researcher in context, and analyses, interpretations, and the making of meanings that have been enriched by indigenous concepts and language. To an extent, these strategies have encouraged nonindigenous researchers into a dialogue about research and, on occasion, to a reformulated and more constructive and collaborative research relationship with indigenous communities (Cram, 1997; Haig-Brown & Archibald, 1996; Simon & Smith, 2001; G. H. Smith, 1992). Critical and social justice approaches to qualitative research have provided academic space for much of the early work of indigenous research. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) describe a moment in the history of qualitative research (1970–1986) as the moment of "blurred genres" when local knowledge and lived realities became important, when a diversity of paradigms and methods developed, and when a theoretical and methodological blurring across boundaries occurred. Arguably, an indigenist research voice emerged in that blurred and liminal space as it paralleled the rise in indigenous political activism, especially in places like Australia, New Zealand, Norway, and North America. For indigenous activists, this moment was also one of recognition that decolonization needed a positive and more inclusive social vision and needed more tools for development and self-determination (as an alternative to violent campaigns of resistance). Research, like schooling, once the tool of colonization and oppression, is very gradually coming to be seen as a potential means to reclaim languages, histories, and knowledge, to find solutions to the negative impacts of colonialism and to give voice to an alternative way of knowing and of being.

Indigenous research focuses and situates the broader indigenous agenda in the research domain. This domain is dominated by a history, by institutional practices, and by particular paradigms and approaches to research held by academic communities and disciplines. The spaces within the research domain through which indigenous research can operate are small spaces on a shifting ground. Negotiating and transforming institutional practices and research frameworks is as significant as the carrying out of actual research programs. This makes indigenous research a highly political activity that can be perceived as threatening, destabilizing, and privileging of indigeneity over the interests and experiences of other diverse groups. Decolonization is political and disruptive even when the strategies employed are pacifist because anything that requires a major change of worldview, that forces a society to confront its past and address it at a structural and institutional level that challenges the systems of power, is indeed political. Indigenous research presents a challenge to the corporate institution of research to change its worldview, to confront its past and make changes.

Indigenous research approaches, like feminist methodologies, have not emerged into a neutral context, although their arrival has been predicted by those working with silenced and marginalized communities. As Lincoln (1993) forewarned, however, social sciences cannot simply develop grand narratives of the silenced without including the voices and understandings of marginalized and silenced communities. There continues to be vigorous critique of indigenous approaches and claims to knowledge, and, indeed, the indigenous presence in the academy. In some cases, this critique is framed by the discourses of anti–affirmative action, such as calls for "color- and race-free" policies. In other cases, the critique is a very focused attack on the possibility that indigenous people have a knowledge that can be differentiated from dogma and witchcraft or is a very focused and personal attack on an individual (Trask, 1993). In other examples, the critique does reflect attempts by nonindigenous scholars to engage seriously with indigenous scholarship and understand its implications for the practices of nonindigenous scholars and their disciplines. In a limited sense, there has been an attempt at dialogue between indigenous and nonindigenous scholars, usually occurring after indigenous scholars have provided a critique of the discipline—for example Vine Deloria's (1995) critique of anthropology and Ngugi wa Thiong'o's (1981/1987) critique of what counted as African literature. Kenyan writer Ngugi wa Thiong'o viewed the language of the settler/colonizer as being implicated in the "colonization of the mind" and came to the decision that he would not write in the language of the colonizer but instead would write in his own language of Gikuyu or Ki-Swahili. Ngugi's stance helped create further space for debate about "postcolonial" literature and the role of literature in colonial education systems (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1989). Vine Deloria's sustained political critique of the place of the American Indian in the American system has created space for the further development of American Indian Studies and a dialogue with other disciplines (Biolsi & Zimmerman, 1997). Unfortunately, dialogue is often the solution to fractures created through lack of dialogue between those with power and

marginalized groups. Similar debates have occurred and continue to occur in other fields, including literature (Cook-Lynn, 1996; Harjo & Bird, 1997; Womack, 1999), feminist studies (Maracle, 1996; Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1983; Moreton-Robinson, 2000), and multicultural and ethnic studies (Mihesuah, 1998). Some debates are very public media campaigns that invoke the prejudices and attitudes toward indigenous peoples held by the dominant social group.[1] In some of these campaigns, the ethnicity of the dominant group is masked behind such social categories as "the public," "the taxpayers," or "the rest of society." The fears and attitudes of the dominant social group, and of other minority social groups, are employed quite purposefully in public debates about indigenous knowledge as the arbiters of what indigenous people are permitted to do, of what they are allowed to know, and indeed of who they are.

An important task of indigenous research in "becoming" a community of researchers is about capacity building, developing and mentoring researchers, and creating the space and support for new approaches to research and new examinations of indigenous knowledge. That activity can now be seen in a range of strategies that are being applied by diverse communities across the world to build research capability. Conversations about indigenous methodologies—albeit in different historical, disciplinary, and institutional spaces—are being discussed and applied by a diverse range of indigenous scholars across the globe. These include Sami scholars in northern Norway, Finland, Sweden, and Russia (Keskitalo, 1997) and native scholars in the Pacific Islands (Helu Thaman, 2003; Kaomea, 2003). Sami literary scholar Harald Gaski (1997), for example, argues that "Ever since the world's various indigenous peoples began turning their efforts to co-operative endeavours in the 1970s, the Sami have participated actively in the struggle to make these peoples' and their own voice heard. Art and literature have always played an important role in this endeavour. Therefore, the time for Sami literature to join world literature is past due" (p. 6). Jan Henri Keskitalo (1997) points to a research agenda for Sami people that is "based on the freedom to define, initiate and organize research, and the possibility to prioritise what kind of research should be defined as Sami research, at least when using public funding" (p. 169). All these discussions represent cross-border conversations and activism, as the territorial boundaries of many indigenous communities have been intersected and overlaid by the formation of modern states. Some discussions occur through specific indigenous forums, or through feminist or environmentalist networks, and others occur through the diaspora of the Third World, the "developing world," and regional gatherings (Alexander & Mohanty, 1997; Saunders, 2002; Shiva, 1993; Spivak, 1987).

Researching the Native in the Knowledge Economy

Knowledge is a key commodity in the 21st century. We understand this at a commonsense level simply as an effect of living in the era of globalization, although it is also expressed as the consequences of life in the postindustrial age, the age of information and postmodernity. Knowledge as a commodity is a conception of knowledge (and curriculum) that is situated in the intersection of different visions of and alliances

Table 4.2.   Strategies for Building Indigenous Research Capability

- The training of indigenous people as researchers
- The employment of indigenous people as researchers
- Participation by indigenous people in a wide range of research projects employing different kinds of approaches and methodologies
- The generating of research questions by communities
- Developing indigenous research methodologies
- Developing research protocols for working with communities
- The support by various individuals and communities of research-based decision making
- The establishment of indigenous research organizations
- Presentation of their research by indigenous researchers to other indigenous researchers
- Engagements and dialogue between indigenous and nonindigenous researchers and communities

for globalization (Peters, 2003). Michael Apple (2001) refers to this alliance as one that brings together neoliberals, neoconservatives, authoritarian populists, and the new middle class. Apple defines neoliberals as those who are "deeply committed to markets and to freedom as 'individual choice,'" neoconservatives as ones who "want a return to discipline and traditional knowledge," authoritarian populists as ones who "want a return to (their) God in all of our institutions" (p. 11), and the new middle class as those who have created and stand to benefit most from this configuration of interests. The neoliberal economic vision of globalization is one in which the market shapes and determines most, if not all, human activities. Far from being simply an economic theory, neoliberal proponents have used their access to power to attempt to reform all aspects of society, including the relationships between the state and society. New Zealand is often used as a model, the "experiment" for how far this agenda can be pursued, because of the significant neoliberal reforms undertaken over the past 20 years (Kelsey, 1995). The reforms have included a "hollowing out" of the state; the reform and re-regulation of the welfare system—education, health, banking, and finance; and the removal of tariffs and other barriers to free trade (Moran, 1999). The reforms have been supported by a powerful ideological apparatus that has denied empirical evidence that groups were being marginalized further by policies and that the gaps between the rich and poor, the well and the sick, were widening under the reform regime. This ideological apparatus is most visible in its discursive strategies with rhetoric and slogans such as "user pays," privatization, increased competition, freedom of choice, and voucher education. It is also evident in the construction of

new, idealized neoliberal subjects who are supposed to be "self-regulating selective choosers, highly competitive and autonomous individuals liberated from their locations in history, the economy, culture and community in order to become consumers in a global market" (L. T. Smith et al., 2002, p. 170).

The significance of the neoliberal agenda for social science research is that the "social," the "science," and the "research" have also been re-envisioned and re-regulated according to the neoliberal ideologies. One site where this re-envisioning and re-regulation of the social, the science, and the research intersects is in the economy of knowledge. As with other strategies of power, it is often the marginalized and silenced communities of society who experience the brunt and the cruelty of both the slogans and the material changes in their lives. The "knowledge economy" is a term used by businesspeople such as Thomas Stewart (1997) to define the ways in which changes in technology such as the Internet, the removal of barriers to travel and trade, and the shift to a postindustrial economy have created conditions in which the knowledge content of all goods and services will underpin wealth creation and determine competitive advantage. As a commodity, knowledge is produced under capitalist labor market conditions: it can be bought and sold, and it is private rather than public property. Researchers are knowledge workers who produce new knowledge. In this environment, new and unique knowledge products become highly prized objects of capitalist desire. Mapping the human genome and searching for cures to various diseases that will require the manufacturing of special products are just two examples of the "race" now on for "knowledge," the new El Dorado. Now, where can one discover new knowledge that is not already under private ownership? The laboratories? The rain forests? The human body? The knowledge and practices of those who have maintained their unique ways of living? The answer to all the above is "Yes," and there is more. Indigenous knowledge once denied by science as irrational and dogmatic is one of those new frontiers of knowledge. The efforts by indigenous peoples to reclaim and protect their traditional knowledge now coincides and converges with scientific interests in discovering how that knowledge can offer new possibilities for discovery (Stewart-Harawira, 1999).

One convergence of indigenous knowledge and science is in the field of ethnobotany, a field that has botanists and biologists working closely with indigenous communities in the collection and documentation of plants, medicinal remedies, and other practices. In doing science, ethnobotanists are also doing qualitative research, talking to community experts, observing practices, and developing word banks and other resources. The protocols that have been developed by the International Society of Ethnobotany will be discussed again later in this chapter. One use of the research that its members gather lies in the identification of medicinal properties that can be reproduced in the laboratory and developed for commercialization. The pharmaceutical industry has a keen hunger for such research, and there is real intensity in the hunt for new miracles to cure or alleviate both old and modern diseases. The search for new knowledge knows no borders. It is competitive and expensive, and only a few can

participate. In the biomedical field, the rapid advances in knowledge and technology—for example, in reproductive birth technologies and in genetic engineering—present new challenges to what society thinks is ethically acceptable. Issues raised in relation to cloning a human being, new genetic therapies, and other remedies and practices stretch our understandings of what life is about. Although the science can develop the new knowledge, it is the *social* science that has an understanding of the nature of social change. Scientists, however, can also be powerful advocates of their own discoveries and fields of research, such that institutions and industries "buy into" the promise of new technologies and expect society to "catch up" to the ethical implications of the new knowledge. For qualitative research, new technologies present new vistas in a sense, new attitudes to examine and new dilemmas to resolve. For indigenous and other marginalized communities, the new vistas present new threats and risks in terms of their ability to protect their traditional knowledge and the likelihood of the benefits of research being distributed equitably to the poor rather than to the rich.

As Apple (2001) reminds, us, however, the neoliberal agenda also converges with the countervailing neoconservative and authoritarian tendencies that seek to protect and strengthen certain "traditional" forms of privilege. The "traditional" values and forms of knowledge being reified by these interest groups are not the same traditional values and ways of knowing that indigenous peoples speak of but are in fact the very antithesis of any form of non-Western, nonheterosexual, nonfeminist knowledge. Graham Hingangaroa Smith (1994) argues that there are new types of colonization in the neoliberal version of globalization that enable dominant interests in society to be maintained. Smith further contends that in the global marketplace, where everything can be commodified, local communities, cultures, practices, and values are put at accelerated risk, with little room to maneuver or develop resistance. One analogy of how the global marketplace works to put local communities and knowledge at risk is the impact of the large multinational or national company that sets up its store or its mall in a town that has small and struggling businesses. There are powerful driving forces that shape the ways in which individual interests come to be either aligned with or marginalized from the new development. For example, some people may need employment and others may need access to cheaper products; some people need to retain their businesses or see their community as being defined by the "Main Street," not the Mall. Young people may see the Mall as presenting new social possibilities that would cater more to their tastes by providing access to more global brands. In the end, the community becomes divided by economic interests, although all may ultimately wish for a united community. In the end, the Mall wins: The small businesses either collapse or struggle on; Main Street looks even more depressing, driving more people to the Mall; and everyone in town begins wearing the global brands, just like the people on television and the people who live in the next community, the next state, the next country. Local products, if they are made, find their way to a boot sale or a market day, basically consigned to the margins of the economy and community consciousness. Some local or native products are selected

as marketable in the Mall, such as native medicine wheels and small hanging crystals. These products are not produced locally, because that would cost too much, so the *image* is reproduced at a cheaper price in countries with poor labor market conditions and then sold in every mall in the world. Imagine this as a global process having an impact in every little community of the world. It is a very seductive process, but something gets lost, in this process, for the community. For indigenous communities, the "something lost" has been defined as indigenous knowledge and culture. In biological terms, the "something lost" is our diversity; in sociolinguistics, it is the diversity of minority languages; culturally, it is our uniqueness of stories and experiences and how they are expressed. These are the "endangered authenticities" of which Rey Chow (1993) speaks, ones that are being erased through the homogenization of culture.

The knowledge economy, as one theme of globalization, constitutes the new identities of the self-regulating and selective chooser, the consumer of knowledge products, the knowledge worker and knowledge manager, and the clients of knowledge organizations. McLaren (1993, p. 215) calls these *market identities* that reflect the corporate model of market education and educational consumption. One might think that this makes for a very educated and knowledgeable society—not so. The knowledge economy is about creating and processing knowledge, trading and using knowledge for competitive advantage—it is not about knowing or knowledge for its own sake, it is not about the pursuit of knowledge but about "creating" knowledge by turning knowledge into a commodity or product. Research plays an important role in the creation of knowledge and, as argued by Steven Jordan (2003) in an article he entitled "Who stole my methodology?," even the most participatory research models are being subjected to the processes of commodification "for the purposes of supporting and reproducing the social relations of accumulation in their multifarious forms" (p. 195). Jordan further suggests that the methodology of participatory research is being appropriated and reconstituted by neoliberal discourses of participation "in ways that are antithetical to both its founding principles and traditions" (p. 195).

The neoliberal version of globalization is not, however, the only ideology at work across the globe. There are other interests at work, some repressive and others progressive. Trafficking in drugs and people, catering to pedophilia, and other organized criminal activities also have gone global. More recently, global terrorism (recognizing that some communities have been terrorized for hundreds of years by various forms of colonialism) has heightened the impulses and fears of neoconservatives and authoritarian populists and simultaneously has created threats to the free operations of the global marketplace. The powerful nostalgia of neoconservatives and authoritarian populists for a curriculum of the right (Apple, 2001), a curriculum of simple "facts," and a reification of what Denzin (1991) refers to as "ancient narratives" augurs dangers for education, for educational research, and for any social justice research. Neoconservative and authoritarian interest groups seek to disrupt any agenda for social justice and already have been effective in peeling back gains in social justice programs, although Roman

and Eyre (1997) caution us to see the dangers of "applying 'backlash' exclusively to Right-wing political reactions [that] fail to draw attention to reactionary and defensive politics within and across left-wing/progressive groups—whether feminist, critical multicultural/anti-racist, or anti-heterosexist" (p. 3). The neoliberal agenda crosses the left and right of the political spectrum, and to some extent the fellow travelers of neoliberalism manage to infiltrate a wide spectrum of politics.

Other, more progressive groups also have managed to go global and make use of knowledge in the pursuit of a social justice agenda. Nongovernmental organizations and communities of interest have managed to put up resistance to the powerful interests of wealthy nations and corporations. Some of these coalitions have brought together diverse interests and unusual bedfellows to contest free trade; others have organized important consciousness-raising activities to keep information about injustice in the public eye. Small communities still cling to their own schools and identities as they attempt to build democratic community consensus. One of the perspectives that indigenous research brings to an understanding of this moment in the history of globalization is that it is simply another historical moment (one of many that indigenous communities have survived) that reinscribes imperialism with new versions of old colonialisms. This is not as cynical as it may sound; rather, it comes from the wisdom of survival on the margins. This moment can be analyzed, understood, and disrupted by holding onto and rearticulating an alternative vision of life and society. It is also not the only defining moment: Other changes have occurred that make communities somewhat more prepared to act or resist. For example, more indigenous researchers are choosing to research alongside their own communities. There are more allies. There also are other imperatives that have driven an agenda of transformation; among them is language regeneration. Language regeneration programs have created a momentum, especially in New Zealand, that neoliberal reforms have not been able or willing to subvert, as these programs have a strong hold on the community's aspirations. Indigenous development is optimistic despite what often appear to be huge barriers.

The new subjectivities of the free market and the knowledge economy also include the re-envisioning and re-regulation of new native subjects, a reworked Other, still raced and gendered, idealized and demonized, but now in possession of "market potential." Some of these new subjectivities resonate with the global market, where evoking of "the image" is a powerful mechanism for distancing the material conditions of the people from the image itself. Other subjectivities are "turning the gaze" back onto the dominant settler society, reflecting the momentum of political, educational, and economic change that already has occurred in many indigenous communities. These identities are formed "in translation," in the constant negotiation for meaning in a changing context. New identities form and re-form in response to or as a consequence of other changes and other identities. New voices are expressed, new leaders emerge, new organizations form, and new narratives of identity get told.

One newly worked native identity is that of the native intellectual as scientist. This is a small, emerging group of native scientists with strong connections to their native

knowledge and practices. These scientists represent a new type of translator or inter-locutor, one who bridges different knowledge traditions in ways that Western scientists find difficult to dismiss and indigenous communities find acceptable (Little Bear, 2000; Thomas, 2001). The native scientist not only is the native healer, herbalist, or spiritual expert but also is someone who understands the philosophies, knowledge, and histories that underpin cultural practices and beliefs and who generates his or her science from these foundations. As Basso (1996) and Marker (2003) have suggested, these people are not in the academy to "play word and idea games" but intend to contribute to change for the benefit of communities, to ensure that science listens to, acknowledges, and benefits indigenous communities. The role of these indigenous professionals is similar to the role played by the first generation of indigenous teachers and nurses and by the first genera-tion of medical doctors and social workers in native communities, a difficult role of translating, mediating, and negotiating values, beliefs, and practices from different worldviews in difficult political contexts.

◙ ETHICS AND RESEARCH

One area of research being vigorously contested by indigenous communities is that of research ethics and the definitions and practices that exemplify ethical and respect-ful research. Indigenous researchers often situate discussions about ethics in the context of indigenous knowledge and values and in the context of imperialism, colonialism, and racism (Cram, 1993, 2001; Menzies, 2001; Rigney, 1999). Indigenous understandings of research ethics have often been informed by indigenous scholars' broad experience of research and other interactions with the media, health system, museums, schools, and government agencies. Increasingly, however, research ethics has come to be a focus of indigenous efforts to transform research and institutions (Worby & Rigney, 2002). Research ethics is often much more about institutional and professional regulations and codes of conduct than it is about the needs, aspirations, or worldviews of "marginalized and vulnerable" communities. Institutions are bound by ethical regulations designed to govern conduct within well-defined principles that have been embedded in international agreements and national laws. The Nuremberg Code (1949) was the first major interna-tional expression of principles that set out to protect the rights of people from research abuse, but there are other significant agreements, such as the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki Agreement of 1964 and the Belmont Report of 1979. National juris-dictions and professional societies have their own regulations that govern ethical conduct of research with human subjects. Increasingly, the challenges of new biotechnologies—for example, new birth technologies, genetic engineering, and issues related to cloning—also have given rise to ethical concerns, reviews, and revised guidelines.

For indigenous and other marginalized communities, research ethics is at a very basic level about establishing, maintaining, and nurturing reciprocal and respectful

relationships, not just among people as individuals but also with people as individuals, as collectives, and as members of communities, and with humans who live in and with other entities in the environment. The abilities to enter preexisting relationships; to build, maintain, and nurture relationships; and to strengthen connectivity are important research skills in the indigenous arena. They require critical sensitivity and reciprocity of spirit by a researcher. Bishop (1998) refers to an example of relationship building in the Māori context as *whakawhanaungatanga*, "the process of establishing family (*whânau*) relationships, literally by means of identifying, through culturally appropriate means, your bodily linkage, your engagement, your connectedness, and therefore, an unspoken but implicit commitment to other people" (p. 203). Worby and Rigney (2002) refer to the "Five Rs: Resources, Reputations, Relationships, Reconciliation and Research" (pp. 27–28) as informing the process of gaining ethical consent. They argue that "The dynamic relationship between givers and receivers of knowledge is a reminder that dealing with indigenous issues is one of the most sensitive and complex tasks facing teachers, learners and researchers at all levels . . ." (p. 27). Bishop and Glynn (1992) also make the point that relationships are not simply about making friends. They argue that researchers must be self-aware of their position within the relationship and aware of their need for engagement in power-sharing processes.

In *Decolonizing Methodologies* (L. T. Smith, 1999), I also gave some examples of the ways in which my communities may describe respect, respectful conduct, trustworthiness, and integrity at a day-to-day level of practice and community assessment. My concern was to show that community people, like everyone else, make assessments of character at every interaction. They assess people from the first time they see them, hear them, and engage with them. They assess them by the tone of a letter that is sent, as well as by the way they eat, dress, and speak. These are applied to strangers as well as insiders. We all do it. Different cultures, societies, and groups have ways of masking, revealing, and managing how much of the assessment is actually conveyed to the other person and, when it is communicated, in what form and for what purpose. A colleague, Fiona Cram (2001), has translated how the selected value statements in *Decolonizing Methodologies* could be applied by researchers to reflect on their own codes of conduct. This could be described as an exercise of "bottom-up" or "community-up" defining of ethical behaviors that create opportunities to discuss and negotiate what is meant by the term "respect." Other colleagues have elaborated on the values, adding more and reframing some to incorporate other cultural expressions. One point to make is that most ethical codes are top down, in the sense of "moral" philosophy framing the meanings of ethics and in the sense that the powerful still make decisions for the powerless. The discussions, dialogues, and conversations about what ethical research conduct looks like are conducted in the meeting rooms of the powerful.

No one would dispute the principle of *respect*; indeed, it is embedded in all the major ethical protocols for researching with human subjects. However, what is *respect*, and how do we know when researchers are behaving respectfully? What does *respect* entail at a

Table 4.3.   "Community-Up" Approach to Defining Researcher Conduct

Cultural Values (Smith, 1999)	Researcher Guideline (Cram, 2001)
Aroha ki te tangata	A respect for people—allow people to define their own space and meet on their own terms.
He kanohi kitea	It is important to meet people face to face, especially when introducing the idea of the research, "fronting up" to the community before sending out long, complicated letters and materials.
Titiro, whakarongo . . . kôrero	Looking and listening (and then maybe speaking). This value emphasizes the importance of looking/observing and listening in order to develop understandings and find a from which to speak.
Manaaki ki te tangata	Sharing, hosting, being generous. This is a value that underpins a collaborative approach to research, one that enables knowledge to flow both ways and that acknowledges the researcher as a learner and not just a data gatherer or observer. It also facilitates the process of "giving back," of sharing results, and of bringing closure if that is required for a project but not to a relationship.
Kia tupato	Be cautious. This suggests that researchers need to be politically astute, culturally safe, and reflective about their insider/outsider status. It is also a caution to insiders and outsiders that in community research, things can come undone without the researcher being aware or being told directly.
Kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata	Do not trample on the "mana" or dignity of a person. This is about informing people and guarding against being paternalistic or impatient because people do not know what the researcher may know. It is also about simple things like the way Westerners use wit, sarcasm, and irony as discursive strategies or where one sits down. For example, Māori people are offended when someone sits on a table designed and used for food.
Kaua e mahaki	Do not flaunt your knowledge. This is about finding ways to share knowledge, to be generous with knowledge without being a "show-off" or being arrogant. Sharing knowledge is about empowering a process, but the community has to empower itself.

day-to-day level of interaction? To be respectful, what else does a researcher need to understand? It is when we ask questions about the apparently universal value of respect that things come undone, because the basic premise of that value is quintessentially Euro-American. What at first appears a simple matter of *respect* can end up as a complicated matter of cultural protocols, languages of respect, rituals of respect, dress codes: in short, the "p's and q's" of etiquette specific to cultural, gender, and class groups and subgroups. *Respect*, like other social values, embraces quite complex social norms, behaviors, and meanings, as one of many competing and active values in any given social situation. As an ethical principle, *respect* is constructed as universal partly through the process of defining what it means in philosophical and moral terms, partly through a process of distancing the social value and practice of *respect* from the messiness of any particular set of social interactions, and partly through a process of wrapping up the principle in a legal and procedural framework. The practice of *respect* in research is interpreted and expressed in very different ways on the basis of methodology, theoretical paradigms, institutional preparation, and individual idiosyncrasies and "manners."

Similarly, the principle and practice of *informed consent* presents real-world problems for researchers and for the researched. Fine, Weis, Weseen, and Wong (2000) already have discussed the ways in which "the consent form sits at the contradictory base of the institutionalisation of research" (p. 113). The form itself can be, as they argue, a "crude tool—a conscience—to remind us of our accountability and position" (p. 113). They argue that a consent form makes the power relations between researchers and researched concrete, and this can present challenges to researchers and researched alike, with some participants *wanting* to share their stories while others may feel *compelled* to share. The form itself can be the basis of dialogue and mediation, but the individual person who is participating in the research still must sign it. The principle of *informed consent* is based on the right of individuals to give consent to participation once they have been informed about the project and believe that they understand the project. In some jurisdictions, this right does not necessarily apply to children, prisoners, or people who have a mental illness. Nevertheless, the right is an individual one. However, what if participating in a research project, unwittingly or wittingly, reveals collective information to researchers—for example, providing DNA, sharing the making of a medicine, or revealing secret women's or men's business as may occur in societies like Aboriginal Australian communities, where men's knowledge and women's knowledge is strictly differentiated? Researching with children already has opened up the possibility that family secrets, especially stories of abuse, require actions to be taken beyond the simple gathering of data. One concern of indigenous communities about the *informed consent* principle is about the bleeding of knowledge away from collective protection through individual participation in research, with knowledge moving to scientists and organizations in the world at large. This process weakens indigenous collectively shared knowledge and is especially risky in an era of knowledge hunting and gathering. Another concern is about the nature of

what it really means to be informed for people who may not be literate or well educated, who may not speak the language of the researcher, and who may not be able to differentiate the *invitation* to participate in research from the enforced compliance in signing official forms for welfare and social service agencies.

The claim to universal principles is one of the difficulties with ethical codes of conduct for research. It is not just that the concepts of respect, beneficence, and justice have been defined through Western eyes; there are other principles that inform ethical codes that can be problematic under certain conditions. In some indigenous contexts, the issue is framed more around the concept of *human rights* rather than principles or values. However, whether it is about principles, values, or rights, there is a common underpinning. Ethics codes are for the most part about protecting the individual, not the collective. Individuals can be "picked off" by researchers even when a community signals it does not approve of a project. Similarly, the claim to beneficence, the "save mankind" claim made even before research has been completed, is used to provide a moral imperative that certain forms of research must be supported at the expense of either individual or community consent. Research is often assumed to be beneficial simply because it is framed as research; its benefits are regarded as "self-evident" because the intentions of the researcher are "good." In a review of health research literature reporting on research involving indigenous Australians, I. Anderson, Griew, and McAullay (2003) suggest that very little attention is paid to the concept of benefit by researchers, and even less attention is paid to the assessment of research benefit. A consequence of the lack of guidelines in this area, they argue, is that "in the absence of any other guidelines the values that guide such a judgement will reflect those of the ethics committee as opposed to those of the Indigenous community in which research is proposed" (p. 26).

A more significant difficulty, already alluded to, can be expressed more in terms of "who" governs, regulates, interprets, sanctions, and monitors ethical codes of conduct." "Who" is responsible if things go terribly wrong? And "who" really governs and regulates the behaviors of scientists outside institutions and voluntary professional societies? For example, rogue scientists and quirky religious groups are already competing for the glory of cloning human beings with those whose research is at least held to an acceptable standard because of their employment in recognized institutions. From an indigenous perspective, the "who" on ethical review boards is representative of narrow class, religious, academic, and ethnic groups rather than reflecting the diversity of society. Because these boards are fundamentally supportive of research for advancing knowledge and other high-level aims, their main task is to advance research, not to limit it. In other words, their purpose is not neutral; it is to assist institutions to undertake research—within acceptable standards. These boards are not where larger questions about society's interests in research ought to be discussed; they generally are the place where already determined views about research are processed, primarily to protect institutions. Marginalized and vulnerable groups are not, by and large, represented on such

boards. If a marginalized group is represented, its voice is muted as one of many voices of equal weight but not of equal power. Hence, even if a representative of a marginalized group is included on a review board, the individual may not have the support, the knowledge, or the language to debate the issue among those who accept the dominant Western view of ethics and society. These are difficult concerns to resolve but need to be discussed in an ongoing way, as ethical challenges will always exist in societies.

King, Henderson, and Stein (1999) suggest that there are two paradigms of ethics, the one we know as principalist and a potentially new one in process that is about relationships. King, Henderson, and Stein argue that the ethics regulations that researchers currently work under are based on three factors:

- Balancing principles: autonomy, beneficence, justice, informed consent, and confidentiality
- Ethical universalism (not moral relativism): truth (not stories)
- Atomistic focus: small frame, centered on individuals.

In the case of the International Society of Ethnobiology (ISE), a society of scientists whose work involves indigenous communities, the Code of Ethics that was developed with indigenous participation identifies 15 principles upon which ethical conduct rests. These principles include such things as the principles of self-determination, inalienability, traditional guardianship, and active participation. The ISE Code of Ethics suggests that research needs to be built on meaningful partnerships and collaboration with indigenous communities. Similarly, the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies published the *Guidelines for Ethical Research in Indigenous Studies* (2000) after conducting workshops with indigenous studies researchers. The *Guidelines* connect the notion of ethical principles with human rights and seek to "embody the best standards of ethical research and human rights" (p. 4). The *Guidelines* propose three major principles, inside of which are fuller explanations of the principles and practical applications. The three main principles are

- Consultation, negotiation, and mutual understanding
- Respect, recognition, and involvement
- Benefits, outcomes, and agreement.

Within the principles of the *Guidelines* are further subprinciples, such as respect for indigenous knowledge systems and processes, recognition of the diversity and uniqueness of peoples and individuals, and respect for intellectual and cultural property rights and involvement of indigenous individuals and communities as research collaborators.

Principles are balancing factors that still rest upon the assumption that the principles are understood as meaning the same thing to all people under all circumstances.

As Denzin (2003) argues, this approach implies a singular approach to all forms of inquiry that oversimplifies and dehumanizes the human subject. Indigenous communities and other marginalized groups may not understand the history of the ethical code of conduct or its basis in Western moral philosophy, but they do understand breaches of respect and negative impacts from research such as the removal of their rights and lands. Qualitative researchers also know that emerging methodologies and emerging researchers have a difficult time making their way through the review process to gain approval. Kathleen M. Cumiskey (1998) narrates her experiences in dealing with her institutional review board as ones that came down to a reminder that graduate students would not be indemnified if she happened to be arrested or her work subpoenaed. The emphasis on procedural issues, including the balancing of risks and benefits, inhibits or limits the potential for institutions and society to examine ethics against a much broader social and epistemological framework.

What does an indigenous approach to research contribute to a discussion about ethical standards? Indigenous perspectives challenge researchers to reflect upon two significant contributions. In the first instance, indigenous communities share with other marginalized and vulnerable communities a collective and historically sustained experience of research as the Object. They also share the use of a "research as expert" representation of who they are. It is an experience indigenous communities associate with colonialism and racism, with inequality and injustice. More important, indigenous communities hold an alternative way of knowing about themselves and the environment that has managed to survive the assaults of colonization and its impacts. This alternative way of knowing may be different from what was known several hundred years ago by a community, but it is still a way of knowing that provides access to a different epistemology, an alternative vision of society, an alternative ethics for human conduct. It is not, therefore, a question of whether the knowledge is "pure" and authentic but whether it has been the means through which people have made sense of their lives and circumstances, that has sustained them and their cultural practices over time, that forms the basis for their understanding of human conduct, that enriches their creative spirit and fuels their determination to be free. The first contribution of an indigenous perspective to any discussion about research ethics is one that challenges those of us who teach about research ethics, who participate in approving and monitoring ethics proposals, to understand the historical development of research as a corporate, deeply colonial institution that is structurally embedded in society and its institutions. It is not just about training and then policing individual researchers, nor about ensuring that research with human subjects is an ethical activity. One thing we must have learned from the past is that when research subjects are not regarded as human to begin with, when they have been dehumanized, when they have been marginalized from "normal" human society, the human researcher does not see human subjects. To unravel the story of research ethics with human subjects, teachers and students must understand that research ethics is not just a body of historical "hiccups" and their legal solutions. It is a study of how societies, institutions, disciplines,

and individuals *authorize*, *describe*, *settle*, *and rule.* It is a study of historical imperi-alism, racism, and patriarchy and the new formations of these systems in contempo-rary relations of power. It is a study of how humans fail and succeed at treating each other with respect.

Just as important, the second contribution indigenous research offers is a rich, deep, and diverse resource of alternative ways of knowing and thinking about ethics, research relationships, personal conduct, and researcher integrity. There are other ways to think about ethics that are unique to each culture. There are other ways to guide researcher conduct and ensure the integrity of research and the pursuit of knowledge. In New Zealand, as one example, Māori are discussing ethics in rela-tion to *tikanga*, defined briefly by Mead (2003) as "A body of knowledge and custom-ary practices carried out characteristically by communities" (p. 15). Mead argues that Tikanga has three main aspects, of knowledge, practices, and actors, and that among other things, tikanga provides guidelines about moral and behavioral issues and informs ethical matters. He proposes five "tests" that can be applied to an ethi-cal dilemma from a *tikanga Māori* perspective. These "tests" draw on Māori values to provide a framework for arriving at a Māori position on a specific ethical issue. The "tests" include the following:

- Applying cultural understandings of knowledge (for example applying *mauri*, the view that every living thing has a *mauri or life force*)
- Genealogical stories (such as those that explain how living things were created)
- Precedents in history
- Relationships
- Cultural values (such as the value of looking after people).

Mead suggests that examining an ethical issue against each of the five "tests" provides a framework that enables the dilemma created by new technologies to be thought through in a way that meets cultural and ethical scrutiny while remaining open to new possibilities. It is also a way to build a cultural and community body of knowledge about new discoveries, technologies, and research ethics.

It may be that these and other explorations connect with King, Henderson, and Stein's (1999) conception of a relationships paradigm that includes the following elements:

Layering of relevant relationships—individuals and groups

Context based—what are the relevant contexts? Culture, gender, race/ethnicity, commu-nity, place, others

Crosscutting issues, wider frame of reference

Narrative focus

Continuity—issues arise before and continue after projects

Change—in relationships over time

It may also be a way that connects with Denzin's (2003) call for a more inclusive and flexible model that would apply to all forms of inquiry. Also, as suggested by I. Anderson, Griew, and McAullay (2003), there is a tension between the regulations of practice and the development of ethical relationships. They argue that there is a need to develop at least two layers of responsiveness, one involving institutional collaborations with communities and the other involving researcher relationships with communities that are also mediated by reformed research structures. Indigenous research offers access to a range of epistemic alternatives. I would not want to suggest that such ways are simply out there waiting to be discovered, but certainly there are people and communities willing to engage in a meaningful dialogue, and there is much to talk about.

◫ QUALITATIVE TRAVELERS ON TRICKY GROUND

Qualitative research in an age of terrorism, in a time of uncertainty, and in an era when knowledge as power is reinscribed through its value as a commodity in the global market place presents tricky ground for researchers. It is often at the local level of marginalized communities that these complex currents intersect and are experienced as material conditions of poverty, injustice, and oppression. It is also at this level that responses to such currents are created on the ground, for seemingly pragmatic reasons. Sometimes this approach may indeed be a reasonable solution, but at other times it draws into question the taken-for-granted understandings that are being applied to decisions made under pressure. What maps should qualitative researchers study before venturing onto such terrain? This is not a trick question but rather one that suggests that we do have some maps. We can begin with all the maps of qualitative research we currently have, then draw some new maps that enrich and extend the boundaries of our understandings beyond the margins. We need to draw on all our maps of understanding. Even those tired and retired maps of qualitative research may hold important clues such as the origin stories or genealogical beginnings of certain trends and sticking points in qualitative research.

Qualitative researchers, however, must be more than either travelers or cultural tourists. Qualitative research is an important tool for indigenous communities because it is the tool that seems most able to *wage the battle of representation* (Fine et al., 2000); to weave and unravel competing *storylines* (Bishop, 1998); to situate, place, and contextualize; to create spaces for decolonizing (Aldama, 2001; Tierney, 2000); to provide frameworks for hearing silence and listening to the voices of the silenced (LeCompte, 1993; L. T. Smith, 2001); to create spaces for dialogue across difference; to analyze and make sense of complex and shifting experiences, identities, and realities; and to understand little and big changes that affect our lives. Qualitative research approaches have the potential to respond to epistemic challenges and crises, to unravel and weave, to fold in and unmask the layers of the social life and depth of human experience. This is not an argument for reducing qualitative research to social activism, nor is it an argument that

suggests that quantitative research cannot also do some of the same things, but rather an argument for the tools, strategies, insights, and expert knowledge that can come with having a focused mind trained on the qualitative experience of people.

Qualitative research has an expanding set of tools that enable finer-grained interpretations of social life. Expanding the understandings and tools of qualitative researchers is important in an era when the diversity of human experience in social groups and communities, with languages and epistemologies, is undergoing profound cultural and political shifts. Although it could be argued that this has always been the case because societies always are dynamic, there is an argument to be made about the rapid loss of languages and cultures, the homogenization of cultures through globalization, and the significance for many communities of the impact of human beings on the environment. Indigenous communities live with the urgency that these challenges present to the world and have sought, through international mobilization, to call attention to these concerns. It is considered a sign of success when the Western world, through one of its institutions, pauses even momentarily to consider an alternative possibility. Indigenous research actively seeks to extend that momentary pause into genuine engagement with indigenous communities and alternative ways of seeking to live with and in the world.

◙ NOTE

1. For example, in January, 2004, a series of speeches was made in New Zealand by a conservative political leader that attacked the role of the Treaty of Waitangi in legislation, that claimed Māori had extra holiday entitlements, that Māori with academic qualifications had lower standards because of affirmative action entry practices, and that purported to represent a "race free" vision for New Zealand. The speeches were quickly taken up as a populist message even though they were based on information later found to be incorrect and exaggerated and were clearly underpinned by an understanding of race and ethnicity that resonated with the racist messages of Australia's One Nation Leader Pauline Hanson.

◙ REFERENCES

Aldama, A. J. (2001). *Disrupting savagism: Intersecting Chicana/o, Mexican immigrant, and Native American struggles for self-representation.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Alexander, M. J., & Mohanty, C. T. (1997). *Feminist genealogies, colonial legacies, democratic futures.* New York: Routledge.

Anderson, I., Griew, R., & McAullay, D. (2003). Ethics guidelines, health research and indigenous Australians. *New Zealand Bioethics Journal, 4*(1), 20–29.

Anderson, K. (2000). *A recognition of being: Reconstructing native womanhood.* Toronto: Sumach Press.

Apple, M. (2001). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality.* New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1989). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures.* London: Routledge.

Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies. (2000). *Guidelines for ethical research in indigenous studies*. Canberra: Author.

Basso, K. H. (1996). *Wisdom sits in places: Landscape and language among the Western Apache.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Battiste, M. (Ed.). (2000). *Reclaiming indigenous voice and vision.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Beverley, J. (2000). Testimonio, subalternity, and narrative authority. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 555–566). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Biolsi, T., & Zimmerman, L. J. (Eds.). (1997). *Indians and anthropologists: Vine Deloria and the critique of anthropology.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Bishop, R. (1998). Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: A Māori approach to creating knowledge. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(2), 199–219.

Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1992). He kanohi kitea: Conducting and evaluating educational research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 27*(2), 125–135.

Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). Researching in Māori contexts: An interpretation of participatory consciousness. *Journal of Intercultural Studies,* 20(2), 167–182.

Brady, W. (1999). Observing the Other. *Eureka Street,* 9(1), 28–30.

Burger, J. (1987). *Report from the frontier: The state of the world's indigenous peoples.* London: Zed Books.

Chow, R. (1993). *Writing diaspora: Tactics of intervention in contemporary cultural studies.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Churchill, W. (1993). I am indigenist. In W. Churchill (Ed.), *Struggle for the land: Indigenous resistance to genocide, ecocide, and expropriation in contemporary North America* (pp. 403–451). Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.

Cook-Lynn, E. (1996). *Why I can't read Wallace Stegner and other essays: A tribal voice.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Cram, F. (1993). Ethics in Māori research. In L. Nikora (Ed.), *Cultural justice and ethics*. [Proceedings of the Cultural Justice and Ethics Symposium held as part of the New Zealand Psychological Society's annual conference]. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University.

Cram, F. (1997). Developing partnerships in research: Pâkehâ researchers and Māori research. *Sites, 35,* 44–63.

Cram, F. (2001). Rangahau Māori: Tona tika, tona pono—The validity and integrity of Māori research. In M. Tolich (Ed.), *Research ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 35–52). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education.

Cram, F., Keefe, V., Ormsby, C., & Ormsby, W. (1998). Memorywork and Māori health research: Discussion of a qualitative method. *He Pukenga Kôrero: A Journal of Māori Studies,* 37–45.

Cumiskey, K. M. (1998). (De)facing the Institutional Review Board: Wrangling the fear and fantasy of ethical dilemmas and research on "at-risk" youth. In J. Ayala et al. (Eds.), *Speed bumps: Reflections on the politics and methods of qualitative work* (pp. 28–31). New York: State University of New York, Graduate School of Education.

Deloria, V., Jr. (1995). *Red earth, white lies: Native Americans and the myth of scientific fact.* New York: Scribner.

Denzin, N. (1991). *Images of postmodern society: Social theory and contemporary cinema.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Durie, A. (1992). *Whaia te Ara Tika: Research methodologies and Māori.* Seminar on Māori research at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Eidheim, H. (1997). Ethno-political development among the Sami after World War II: The invention of self-hood. In H. Gaski (Ed.), *Sami culture in a new era: The Norwegian Sami experience* (pp. 29–61). Kárásjohka, Norway: Davvi Girji.

Elabor-Idemudia, P. (2002). Participatory research: A tool in the production of knowledge in development discourse. In K. Saunders (Ed.), *Feminist development and thought: Rethinking modernity, post-colonialism and representation* (pp. 227–242). London: Zed Books.

Fanon, F. (1963). *Wretched of the earth* (C. Farrington, Trans.). New York: Grove Press. (Original work published 1961)

Fine, M., Weis, L., Weseen, S., & Wong, L. (2000). For whom? Qualitative research, representations, and social responsibilities. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 107–132). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gaski, H. (Ed.). (1997). *In the shadow of the midnight sun: Contemporary Sami prose and literature.* Kárásjohka, Norway: Davvi Girji.

Green, M. (2000). Lived spaces, shared spaces, public spaces. In L. Weis & M. Fine (Eds.), *Construction sites: Excavating race, class, and gender among urban youth* (pp. 293–304). New York: Teachers College Press.

Haig-Brown, C., & Archibald, J. (1996). Transforming First Nations research with respect and power. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 9*(3), 245–267.

Harjo, J., & Bird, G. (1997). *Reinventing the enemy's language. Contemporary native women's writing of North America.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Helu Thaman, K. (2003). *Re-presenting and re-searching Oceania: A suggestion for synthesis.* Keynote address to the Pacific Health Research Fono, Health Research Council of New Zealand, Auckland.

Hill Colllins, P. (1991). Learning from the outsider within. In M. Fonow & J. A. Cook (Eds.), *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research* (pp. 35–57). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Humphery, K. (2000). *Indigenous health and "Western research"* (Discussion paper for VicHealth Koori Health Research and Community Development Unit). Melbourne: Centre for the Study of Health and Society, University of Melbourne.

Humphery, K. (2002). Dirty questions: Indigenous health and "Western research." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 25*(3), 197–202.

Jahnke, H., & Taiapa, J. (1999). Māori research. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social science research in New Zealand: Many paths to understanding* (pp. 39–50). Auckland, New Zealand: Longman Pearson Education.

Johnston, P. M. (2003). Research in a bicultural context: The case in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In J. Swann & J. Pratt (Eds.), *Educational research practice: Making sense of methodology* (pp. 98–110). London: Continuum.

Jordan, S. (2003). Who stole my methodology? Co- opting PAR. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 1*(2), 185–200.

Kaomea, J. (2003). Reading erasures and making the familiar strange: Defamiliarizing methods for research in formerly colonized and historically oppressed communities. *Educational Researcher, 32*(2), 14–25.

Kelsey, J. (1995). *The New Zealand experiment.* Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.

Keskitalo, J. H. (1997). Sami post-secondary education—Ideals and realities. In H. Gaski (Ed.), *Sami culture in a new era: The Norwegian Sami experience* (pp. 155–171). Kárásjohka, Norway: Davvi Girji.

King, N., Henderson, G. E., & Stein, J. E. (1999). *Beyond regulations. Ethics in human subjects research*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 257–278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Langton, M. (1981). Anthropologists must change. *Identity, 4*(4), 11.

The Latina Feminist Group. (2001). *Telling to live: Latina feminist testimonios.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

LeCompte, M. (1993). A framework for hearing silence: What does telling stories mean when we are supposed to be doing science? In D. McLaughlin & W. G. Tierney (Eds.), *Naming silenced lives* (pp. 9–28). New York: Routledge.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1993). I and thou: Method, voice, and roles in research with the silenced. In D. McLaughlin & W. G. Tierney (Eds.), *Naming silenced lives* (pp. 29–50). New York: Routledge.

Little Bear, L. (2000). Jagged worldviews colliding. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 77–85). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Maracle, L. (1996). *I am woman: A native perspective on sociology and feminism.* Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers.

Marker, M. (2003). Indigenous voice, community, and epistemic violence: The ethnographer's "interests" and what "interests" the ethnographer. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(3), 361–375.

McLaren, P. (1993). Border disputes: Multicultural narrative, identity formation, and critical pedagogy in postmodern America. In D. McLaughlin & W. G. Tierney (Eds.), *Naming silenced lives* (pp. 201–236). New York: Routledge.

Mead, H. M. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values.* Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publications and Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi Press.

Memmi, A. (1967). *The colonizer and the colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press. (Original work published 1957)

Menzies, C. (2001). Researching with, for and among indigenous peoples. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 25*(1), 19–36.

Mies, M. (1983). Towards a methodology for feminist research. In G. Bowles & R. D. Klein (Eds.), *Theories of women's studies* (pp. 117–139). New York: Routledge.

Minh-ha, T. T. (1989). *Woman, native, other: Writing, postcoloniality and feminism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mohanty, C. (1984). Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Boundary, 12*(3) and *13*(1), 338–358.

Moraga, C., & Anzaldúa, G. (Eds.). (1983). *This bridge called my back.* New York: Kitchen Table Press.

Moran, W. (1999). Democracy and geography in the reregulation of New Zealand. In D. B. Knight & A. E. Joseph (Eds.), *Restructuring societies: Insights from the social sciences* (pp. 33–58). Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2000). *Talkin' up to the white woman: Indigenous women and feminism.* St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Ngugi Wa Thiong'o. (1997). *Writers in politics: A re-engagement with issues of literature and society.* Oxford, UK: James Currey. (Original work published 1981)

Peters, M. A. (2003). Classical political economy and the role of universities in the new knowledge economy. *Globalization, Societies and Education, 1*(2), 153–168.

Pidgeon, M., & Hardy, C. (2002). Researching with Aboriginal peoples: Practices and principles. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 26*(2), 96–106.

Pihama, L. (1993). *Tungia te ururua kia tupu whakarirorito te tupu o te harakeke.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Auckland.

Pihama, L. (1994). Are films dangerous?: A Māori woman's perspective on *The Piano. Hecate, 20*(2), 239–242.

Pihama, L. (2001). *Tihei Mauriora: Honouring our voices—mana wahine as a kaupapa Māori theoretical framework.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Auckland.

Pihama, L., Cram, F., & Walker, S. (2002). Creating methodological space: A literature review of Kaupapa Māori research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 26*(1), 30–43.

Pritchard, S. (Ed.). (1998). *Indigenous peoples, the United Nations and human rights.* London: Zed Books.

Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Rigney, L. (1999). Internationalization of an indigenous anticolonial cultural critique of research methodologies. A guide to indigenist research methodology and its principles. *Wicazo SA Journal of Native American Studies Review, 14*(2), 109–121.

Roman, L. G., & Eyre, L. (1997). *Dangerous territories: Struggles for difference and equality in education.* New York: Routledge.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism.* London: Vintage Books.

Saunders, K. (Ed.). (2002). *Feminist development and thought: Rethinking modernity, postcolonialism and representation.* London. Zed Books.

Sedgwick, E. K. (1991). *Epistemology of the closet.* New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Shiva, V. (1993). *Monocultures of the mind.* London: Zed Books.

Simon, J., & Smith, L. T. (Eds.). (2001). *A civilising mission? Perceptions and representations of the New Zealand Native Schools system.* Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.

Smith, G. H. (1990). The politics of reforming Māori education: The transforming potential of kura kaupapa Māori. In H. Lauder & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Towards successful schooling* (pp. 73–89). Basingstoke: Falmer.

Smith, G. H. (1992). *Research issues related to Māori education.* Auckland, New Zealand: Research Unit for Māori Education, The University of Auckland.

Smith, G. H. (1994). For sale: Indigenous language, knowledge and culture. *Polemic: A Journal of the University of Sydney Law School, 4*(3).

Smith, L. T. (1991). Te rapunga i te ao marama (the search for the world of light): Māori perspectives on research in education. In T. Linzey & J. Morss (Eds.), *Growing up: The politics of human learning* (pp. 46–55). Auckland, New Zealand: Longman Paul.

Smith, L. T. (1992). Māori women: Discourses, projects and mana wahine. In S. Middleton & A. Jones (Eds.), *Women and education in Aotearoa 2* (pp. 33–51). Wellington, New Zealand Bridget Williams Books.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples.* London: Zed Books.

Smith, L. T. (2000). Kaupapa Māori research. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 225–247). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Smith, L. T. (2001). Troubling spaces. *Journal of Critical Psychology, 4,* 175–182.

Smith, L. T., Smith, G. H., Boler, M., Kempton, M., Ormond, A., Chueh, H. C., et al. (2002). "Do you guys hate Aucklanders too?" Youth: Voicing difference from the rural heartland. *Journal of Rural Studies, 18,* 169–178.

Spivak, G. (1987). *In other worlds: Essays in cultural politics.* New York: Methuen.

Stanley, L., & Wise, S. (1983). *Breaking out: Feminist consciousness and feminist research.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Steinhauer, E. (2003). Thoughts on an indigenous research methodology. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 26*(2), 69–81.

Stewart, T. A. (1997). *Intellectual capital: The new wealth of organizations.* New York. Doubleday/Currency.

Stewart-Harawira, M. (1999, October). Neo-imperialism and the (mis)appropriation of indigenousness. *Pacific World, 54,* pp. 10–15.

Te Awekotuku, N. (1991). *Mana wahine Māori.* Auckland, New Zealand: New Women's Press.

Te Awekotuku, N. (1999). Māori women and research: Researching ourselves. In *Māori psychology: Research and practice* (pp. 57–63) [Proceedings of a symposium sponsored by the Māori and Psychology Research Unit, University of Waikato]. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.

Te Hennepe, S. (1993). Issues of respect: Reflections of First Nations students' experiences in post- secondary anthropology classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 20,* 193–260.

Thomas, G. (2001). The value of scientific engineering training for Indian communities. In K. James (Ed.), *Science and Native American communities* (pp. 149–154). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Thompson, P. (1978). *The voices of the past.* London: Oxford University Press.

Tierney, W. G. (2000). Undaunted courage: Life history and the postmodern challenge. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 537–554). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tomlins-Jahnke, H. (1997). Towards a theory of mana wahine. *He Pukenga Kôrero: A Journal of Māori Studies, 3*(1), 27–36.

Trask, H.-K. (1986). *Eros and power: The promise of feminist theory.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Trask, H.-K. (1993). *From a native daughter: Colonialism and sovereignty in Hawai'i.* Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.

Vidich, A. J., & Lyman, S. M. (2000). Qualitative methods: Their history in sociology and anthropology. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 37–84). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Warrior, R. A. (1995). *Tribal secrets: Recovering American Indian intellectual traditions.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wilmer, F. (1993). *The indigenous voice in world politics.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Womack, C. S. (1999). *Red on red: Native American literary separatism.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Worby, G., & Rigney, D. (2002). Approaching ethical issues: Institutional management of indigenous research. *Australian Universities Review, 45*(1), 24–33.