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1 Thank you very much in Ojibwe
2Thank you very much in the Mohawk language
3 Agreement between the Haudenosaunee Confederacy and Anishnaabeg Nations of this territory.
The dish represents the land and the spoon represents peace and co-sharing for present and future generations.
4 A research primer provides basic guidelines and insight to researchers engaging in various topics.
SECTION 2: INTRODUCTION

The McMaster Indigenous Research Primer is a three-part series informed by the Triangulation of Meaning in the chapter Indigenous and Authentic: Hawaiian Epistemology and the Triangulation of Meaning, written by Manulani Aluli Meyer. Meyer’s work offers a model of understanding informed by their own localized Hawaiian Indigenous knowledge, which links Indigenous navigational systems as an example of an “epistemology specific to place and people” (p. 218). Meyer suggests a three-pillared approach to knowledge informed by the integration of three sites of human understanding: the body, mind, and spirit (p. 134). As such, our work to produce this document, and future engagements with Indigenous research will endeavour to represent these distinct sites of knowledge.

This physical document represents the “body” within Meyer’s Triangulation of Meaning. The body is expressed through sensation via objective measurement and evaluation. The body is the centre of most research processes (p. 226). “Knowing” within this context means that this physical document will provide the basics of what Indigenous research methodologies were, are, and could be in the future.

Different scholars develop different methodologies informed by their own territories and experiences and make it their own. The use of the Triangulation of Meaning, which comes from Hawaii, is a demonstration of connecting Indigenous scholarly work from around the world to strengthen our collective understanding of Indigenous methodologies from a holistic perspective. Body, Mind and Spirit is relational to us all as human beings and demonstrates how we can incorporate key principles of Indigenous thought into our research at every level.

As creators of knowledge, locating one’s positionality is the essential starting point to understanding oneself, and entering into research-centred relations with Indigenous scholars, research and community. One must first locate themselves in time, space and society to understand how best to navigate toward your intended research outcome.

Utilizing knowledges that come from the Haudenosaunee, this Research Primer document is structured using the Two-Row Research Paradigm, developed by researchers as part of Deyohahá:ge: The Indigenous Knowledge Centre, which is a repository of local knowledge and educators based at Six Nations Polytechnic in Ohsweken, on the Six Nations territory (Hill & Coleman, 2019; Freeman & Van Katwyk, 2020). The foundation for this model is the Two-Row Wampum Agreement that provides a framework for Indigenous research for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers to meaningfully engage with one another for the benefit of the communities and peoples we are in relations with.

1 epistemological position (i.e. how one views the world in terms of their philosophy, personal beliefs, theoretical influence and perspectives which guide the research).
2 Social and political contexts such as race, class, gender, sexuality and ability status that shape your biases and understanding of the world, and create your identity.
3 Also known as Kawentha, an agreement between the Haudeno- saunee and Dutch in 1613.
SECTION 3:
PURPOSE AND NEXT STEPS

The purpose of this Indigenous Research Primer is to guide those at McMaster University who are engaging with Indigenous Peoples and communities in their research. The Primer seeks to inform Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers at any stage of their career and/or education. There are many more solutions and recommendations that researchers look for when engaging in Indigenous research methodologies. This primer is not intended to be a “how to”; it is our intention to give insight into how researchers can work with Indigenous methodologies appropriately and effectively while building a strong research foundation.

Where it is appropriate, this document will refer to and will provide the links for other Indigenous-focused resources such as the Indigenous Strategic Directions put together by the Indigenous Education Council, the Indigenous Education Primer (release date TBD) in partnership with the MacPherson Institute and the Indigenous Studies Department, and the Indigenous Health Resource (release date TBD) produced by the Indigenous Health Learning Lodge.

As Indigenous Peoples and communities have continuously adapted and evolved in response to the ever-changing environments around them, so will the Indigenous Research Primer. This means this document, the videos and workshops will continue to be expanded upon and the primer will be a living and ongoing body of work. As in the McMaster Strategic Directions, the term “community” is used in the most inclusive way possible to include all treaty people, both Indigenous and settler populations. As noted above in the introduction, the Indigenous Research Primer is to benefit researchers, but most importantly, the communities engaged with us as an institution.

SECTION 4:
INDIGENOUS METHODOLOGIES WHAT IS IT?

In the most simple definition, Indigenous methodologies are the intersection of Indigenous Peoples and the world of research occurring since time immemorial. Dr. Kathleen Absolon, an Anishnaabe scholar, explains, “When First Nations create research methods that are in accordance with their own priorities, philosophy and traditions, they are using Indigenous methodologies and research practices.” (p. 22). Throughout this primer, we want to highlight relationality as one of the key foundations and distinctions of Indigenous methodologies.

Linda Tuhihai Smith (2021) explains Indigenous methodologies as an “approach to cultural protocols, values and behaviours as an integral part of methodology” (pp. 15-16). Conscious awareness of how we as researchers at all levels and experiences are in relation with our own and other beings’ minds, bodies and spirits. In Section 7 on pages 13-15, there is more detailed information on how we see the mind, body and spirit involved in Indigenous research methodologies as articulated by Hawaiian scholar Manulani Aluli Meyer.

Smith calls for more ethical and non-extractive research relationships, which is incredibly important, but this primer also would like to credit the work of Dr. Chelsea Gabel and Dr. Chris Andersen (2023) who note that the focus on what Indigenous methodologies is in comparison to what it is not (Western methodology) often reproduces binaries and limitations on how we use research to benefit Indigenous people and communities. Researchers who work with Indigenous communities should emphasize an open-ended and flexible program of research that can fluctuate in focus to make accommodations for emerging needs and requests from community partners, even if those align more closely with conventional, dominant and Western approaches (Andersen & Gabel, p. 27).

1 mutually beneficial research
2 social constructs composed of two parts that are framed as absolute and unchanging opposites
https://openbooks.library.umass.edu/introwgss/chapter/introduction-binary-systems/9-text-Binaries%20are%20social%20constructs%20composed%20of%20nothing%20in%20common. 
SECTION 5:
WORKING FOR INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES THROUGH RESEARCH

Introductions are foundational to many Indigenous communities. If you have ever witnessed an Indigenous person introducing themselves, often they will give you their name, Nation, Clan, and their roles and responsibilities within their communities before listing their official titles within an organization or institution. This protocol within Indigenous communities is not about centering ourselves but rather, it is about relationality to one another and to the reason for being. Shawn Wilson (2008) states that “relationships do not merely shape reality, they are reality” (p. 7). Introductions serve to find connections within a relational reality where everyone and everything is related (Tynan, p. 600).

Through Western instruction in post-secondary institutions such as McMaster University, we are taught to remain objective and not to have too much personal influence over the research process and outcomes. Throughout this primer, it is our goal to insist that relationality, positionality and reflexivity are all vital to Indigenous epistemology, ontology, pedagogy and axiology, and therefore vital to Indigenous research methodologies.

Insisting on relationality may be difficult for researchers trained in a specific canon of thought, but we are never isolated, static or not known to the research and the research process. This Indigenous Research Primer uses the Two Row Research Paradigm to influence the structure and process of understanding Indigenous research and the researcher themselves intrinsically in relation to people, land, wampum and other-than-human beings. This is not a romanticized notion of connecting to other than human beings but a real example of how important it is to recognize relationality across beings, time and space, and the way it influences or teaches us about the research process. Thus, an essential component of Indigenous research is in the work of building relationships.

At this point it may be required to reflect upon the relationship that the university, higher education, and state-based education in general have, and have historically had, with Indigenous Peoples, and Indigenous epistemologies. How will your work address this relationality? How will you as a researcher go about building relations and trust between research partners? How, and when, should this relationship-building begin and end?

---

1 The study of what is real
https://builtin.com/data-science/ontology

2 the approach to teaching
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pedagogy

3 The study of value and value judgements
https://open.library.okstate.edu/programs/researchmethods/chapter/axiology/?q=text%3Daxiology%26n%20h%20study%26n%20beauty%2C%20
	taste%26n%20judgement
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SECTION 6: 
ETHICS OF RESPONSIBILITY

From a Western research ethics perspective, most research at McMaster requires appropriate ethics review and certification through either the McMaster Research Ethics Board (MREB) or the Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board in Health Sciences (HiREB) before beginning the recruitment phase of potential research subjects and/or partners. Ethics reviews are designed to protect research participants and communities from dangerous and invasive research and are based on the nationally recognized Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS2), which outlines the minimum requirements for research ethics in Canada. Chapter 9 of the TCPS2 focuses specifically on the requirements for conducting research involving First Nations, Inuit and Métis Peoples and highlights the minimum requirements for community engagement (including practical examples), respect for Indigenous governing authorities, and respect for community protocols. These responsibilities and obligations for researchers ensure that all research involving Indigenous people include both individual and collective informed and ongoing consent. Some Indigenous communities and organizations, both on and off reserve, have well-established research ethics and approval processes (examples include the Manitoulin Anishinabek Research Review Committee, which requires researchers to highlight how their research will respect the Seven Grandfather Teachings throughout their processes, and the Six Nations Elected Council - Ethics Committee). In these cases, you should be prepared to submit an ethics application to both McMaster University and the community’s ethics board. If a community does not have their own research ethics board, there is still an ethical requirement for collective community consent and you must attempt to meet with the leadership of the community to explain your research, answer questions, and work towards gaining trust with them prior to beginning any recruitment for research studies.

Conducting ethical research goes beyond research ethics approval. When thinking through Indigenous ethics and accountability, researchers must consider whose land, lives and bodies are being subject to inquiry. Conducting research in a relational way cannot be solely for the benefit of the researcher — some measure of reciprocity will be expected. Therefore, ethical researchers will have an idea of how the research will benefit the participants and the Indigenous community overall before they conduct their research and, ideally, will design their project in collaboration with Indigenous community members (Tallbear, 2014). It is important to think critically and expansively about what counts as risk and rightful benefit to whom while building knowledge (Tallbear, 2014).

Linda Tuhiwai Smith is often quoted as saying that “research” is probably one of the dirtiest words in the Indigenous world’s vocabulary. As researchers, it is your duty to be of service and when using Indigenous research methodologies, and for the benefit of all, it is important to not get drawn into the ego. Karen Martin (2003) explains that relational epistemology¹ is supported by relational ontology². Whether consciously, or not, our own experiences, beliefs, behaviours, realities and worldviews inform the framework of our research and therefore, as individuals, we cannot claim ultimate authority over all things in our research (p. 206).

There is a long history of unethical and negative research of Indigenous people that has harmed and/or has resulted in no benefits for Indigenous people. As a result, it is not uncommon for Indigenous people to be leery of people conducting Indigenous research. For these reasons, accountability and transparency — in terms of both research process and goals — are essential to building relationships grounded in trust. By respectfully explaining the reasons for the research (including the potential benefits and risks of participating), following community or family cultural protocols, providing appropriate compensation for their time, giving choices on how to participate in the research project (for example: including individuals as research partners and simply providing them an opportunity to review the interview transcript where they can add, delete, or change anything to more accurately reflect their views), and working towards creating/fostering long-term reciprocal relationships, you will contribute building trust in an ethical manner.

Researchers should be aware of who they are in relation to their research participants as this could, at least initially, influence the level of trust potential research participants may feel toward you. This includes that recognition alluded to previously, of the historic relationship between systems of education and the colonial project. It...
is essential to understand your location in this relationship, when working as a representative of the university. Researchers who are not Indigenous or from the Indigenous community they are researching may have to work harder to gain level of trust needed to conduct meaningful research.

Being Indigenous and a member of a community where the research is being conducted does not mean you will not have to work on gaining the trust of participants. There are various factors that can label you as an outsider and hamper your ability to have to an interaction where the participant feels comfortable enough to share their information with you. Simply being a researcher can make you an outsider in the eyes of participants, no matter how well they may know you. Even if the participants treat you as a community member or relative before the actual interview, that could change once the informed consent is signed and the recorder turned on. A research interview is a whole different dynamic than a casual conversation with someone you know, as you are now in an artificially created interaction meant to obtain information from participants for an academic research project.

SECTION 7:
THE TRIANGULATION OF MEANING IN THE UNVEILING OF THE INDIGENOUS RESEARCH PRIMER

“Theory gives Indigenous academics the space to plan, strategize and take greater control over our resistances. What makes the ideas ‘real’ is the system of knowledge, the formations of culture and relations of power in which these concepts are located” (Smith, p. 50).

We have taken a holistic approach to the primer that seeks to engage McMaster researchers and Indigenous communities in Indigenous research in more ways than just a physical written document. There are different ways to create and absorb knowledge and therefore, we looked to the Triangulation of Meaning to shape how the knowledge is disseminated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BODY</th>
<th>MIND</th>
<th>SPIRIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>Ways of Being</td>
<td>Ways of Doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decolonization</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Written Document</td>
<td>Short Clips from Researchers</td>
<td>Quarterly &quot;Sharing Sessions&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

entitled, Seasons of Research
How we come to know is derived from the land and territories specific to our families and communities. This document serves as a body for the Research Primer where Indigenous Ways of Knowing are outlined based on our relationships to our research, but also in relation to our responsibility to one another.

Manulani Aluli Meyer (2008) refers to the body as the external, that which can be observed in the physical. This sphere of knowing relates to what may be known as objective, or empirical, knowing (p. 225). Here is a both a commonality and crucial point of distinction between Western and Indigenous ways of knowing. Relating to your research, the creation of the body is the phase of gathering ideas: identifying and expressing your unique research question. Some self-reflexive questions to guide you are: What, informed by my place in the physical world, can I access? What form will my research take, and how will it in turn affect the world?

The body is that which we see, can touch, can articulate. “It is the form that consciousness has shaped” (Meyer, p.218). Thus, this primer is the form our collective consciousness has taken.

The mind part of triangulation puts the body into context. Ways of being are developed through lived experiences, something tangible, to be seen, heard and expressed, that is also informed by the land and territories we come from. As everyone’s experience through life is unique so, too, are the mechanics of each mind. This point asserts that while the body is indeed observable, that which is brought by each party to the research relationship is subjective, and equally valued as lived knowledge.

Approaching research from this perspective establishes an expansive rather than a reductionist model that may affect or influence the final form of your project. Self-reflection becomes key to this process and – as in the Two-Row model detailed in Section 8 – it becomes essential to understand the workings of one’s own mind, to recognize personal limitations and perceptions. Research partners need to be open to the validation of various types and expressions of intelligence and thus need skills of self- and emotional regulation that must be cultivated individually. Institutional researchers will need to keep in mind this flexibility particularly when working with, or for, community partners.

Our short video clips from a variety of researchers serve as the Mind of the Research Primer and showcase the diversity of minds and thought worlds at work at McMaster. Listen to these McMaster community members speak on their specific projects and contexts.

The spiritual category of triangulation is identified as an extension of the first two categories, representing that which connects the body and mind; and the individual to creation, the land and the universe. Spirit insists upon interconnectedness, and values subconscious, direct and intuitive knowledges. Meyer articulates that this idea of spirit is not to be confused with religion or dogma, rather “it is the joy or truthful insights of your lessons and the rigour found in your discipline and focus that is not so much written about but expressed nonetheless.” (p. 229) Shawn Wilson also references the distinction between spirituality and religion within his research framework: “Spirituality is something that is personal, or individual, whereas religion is a social exercise.” (p. 91).

For those coming from a Western cultural and academic background, consider: What is the spirit of your discipline? What animates your drive as a researcher and your intended and unique contributions to scholarship and change? Spirit asks us to see what is significant and to have the courage to discuss it (Meyer, p. 229). Spirituality and spiritual knowledge are not separate, but integral, and elemental to an Indigenous worldview. As such, an important element of your relationship to research and knowledge is in attending to your spirit through self-care, and attention to emotional regulation1, and accountability.

Quarterly sharing sessions entitled Seasons of Research, hosted by MIRI, will serve as our Way of Doing. It is important keep the Indigenous Research Primer alive by engaging with experienced Indigenous methodology researchers and community members.

1 Relationships with: One another (body) Knowledge (mind) and Ideas (spirit)
SECTION 8:
TWO ROW RESEARCH PARADIGM

The Two-Row Research Paradigm as discussed in the articles written by Freeman & Van Katwyk, 2020 and by Hill & Coleman, 2019 is informed by early treaty agreements between the Haudenosaunee and Dutch settlers, later extended to other European nations such as the British.

Utilizing the founding principles in the Two Row Wampum Agreement and the Covenant Chain Wampum Belt¹, we can speak to many different researchers and community members that bestows the responsibility to the individuals rather than the broader Indigenous community engaged in research here at McMaster. This means that individuals are accountable for themselves and how they conduct themselves. The Two Row Research Paradigm utilizes five principles to guide researchers to develop and sustain relationships that allows for the development of far-reaching knowledge.

Throughout this primer, we often reference the Two Row Wampum Agreement. The reference we are making is directly related to the very specific moment in history in 1613 between the Haudenosaunee and the early Dutch settlers. The Two Row Wampum Agreement is the oldest known agreement between Indigenous People, the Haudenosaunee; and Europeans, the Dutch; here on Turtle Island or what most know as North America. In the article, The Two-Row Wampum – Covenant Chain Tradition as a Guide for Indigenous-University Research Partnerships, Rick W. Hill Sr. and Daniel Coleman explain that this agreement explicitly outlines a dialogical² Indigenous-European relationship in a framework for how healthy relationships between two peoples from different “laws and beliefs” can be established (p. 340).

When the Two Row Wampum Agreement was made, the belt and its tenets were never intended to be — nor could the parties have predicted that it would be — used to support healthy research relationships between universities and Indigenous Peoples. However, in the article written by Rick Hill Sr. and Daniel Coleman (2019), they discuss their intentions for using the agreement as an effort to “dust off” and “repolish” the set of understandings that have been foundational to the development of North American social and political relations (p. 340). Here are the founding principles of the Two Row Wampum Agreement as explained and used within a research context by the authors, Hill, Coleman, Freeman and Van Katwyk.

¹ The Covenant Chain complements the Two Row Wampum... “the Two Row Wampum-Covenant Chain agreement constitutes the oldest known formalization of friendly relations between incoming Europeans and Indigenous North Americans.” (Hill and Coleman).

² characterized by dialogues
**PRINCIPLE 1:**

**RESEARCH RELATIONSHIPS ARE DIALOGICAL**

Dialogical relationships in research in and with Indigenous communities are essential. When working with Indigenous Peoples and communities, it is important to remember that dialogical relationships should not be limited to humans but expand to include the land, waters, animals and other non-human beings. This will be expanded upon further in the primer. Dialogical relationships take time, so the pace of your research is going to need to be shaped according to the space and time given in nurturing rich bonds with the people you are working in partnership within this research (Freeman & Van Katwyk, p. 6).

In the article by Bonnie Freeman and Trish Van Katwyk, they discuss engaging the Two Row Research Paradigm through a canoe trip on the Grand River. Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers enter the vessel, travelling down the white strand in between the purple rows. When the researchers enter a natural environmental space with the elements of and surrounding the Grand River, they can reflect on themselves and the people they work with in this research project (Freeman & Van Katwyk, p. 63).

To enter this space together, the Kariwiiio (Good Mind) must be present and at the forefront. The Good Mind is a shared ideology of the people using their purest and most unselfish minds. It occurs when people put their minds and emotions in harmony with the flow of the universe and the intentions of the Good Mind (Freeman & Van Katwyk, p. 65). Making space for this form of emotional regulation and self-reflexivity within the research process, we change our practices of collaboration with one another to not only be for the sake of publishing and getting information out to other researchers, but to have our collaborations be based on dialogical relationships and maintained by the Good Mind.

**PRINCIPLE 2:**

**THE IMPORTANCE OF PLACE**

The Two Row Wampum is one of the oldest agreements between Indigenous (specifically Haudenosaunee) Nations and early settlers. Similarly, the Covenant Chain is another nation-to-nation agreement and serves as an ongoing council for both parties. These wampum belts and agreements are still binding, but have also been used as ceremonies for welcoming visitors from far away and to ground everyone with a Good Mind. Like the Dish with One Spoon Wampum Agreement, McMaster occupies and benefits from all relations that are embedded within these wampum agreements and therefore, researchers from McMaster should be conscious of the importance of this place and its impact on their research, whether with Indigenous or non-Indigenous communities/peoples. It is imperative that all parties to these relationships educate themselves on their implications. Both the Dish with One Spoon, and the Two Row wampum agreements express an agreement and responsibility between the Haudenosaunee and new settlers to coexist in a way that was peaceful and respectful in their territory in Northeastern North America and surrounding lands of Lake Ontario (Freeman & Van Katwyk, p. 64). The responsibility to maintain a Good Mind and peaceful relations is ongoing and never-ending.

One specific way that researchers can elevate their consciousness is by understanding the history and culture of the people as an acknowledgement of treaty relations that we are all party to (Freeman & Van Katwyk, p. 63). When seeking engagement with an Indigenous community, some questions to consider are, is this a Christian, traditional or mixed community? What is their definition of membership within their community? Where is their traditional land? What treaties govern their lands? Do these community members all live in one area or are they spread out (on reserve/off reserve)? What are their goals as a community and how can your position within the institution of McMaster University assist in accomplishing these self-determined goals on their terms?
PRINCIPLE 3: EQUITY WITHIN DISTINCTIVENESS

The Equity and Inclusion Office (EIO) at McMaster University promotes and supports institution-wide commitments to equity, diversity, inclusion, and accessibility, and principles of inclusive excellence, to foster a campus culture and community that respect the human rights, integrity and dignity of all community members. Most EIO initiatives include Indigenous Peoples and communities in their programming reach. While integration of Indigenous communities and Peoples in equity, diversity, inclusion and accessibility is appreciated, it simply is not enough.

When we include Indigenous Peoples as a homogenous group, we erase the unique and sophisticated epistemology and assume that every Indigenous person experiences the same or similar oppressions. Approaching Indigenous research and individuals as a homogenous group also assumes that every Indigenous person and/or community is privy to the same treaty rights. In a settler nation like Canada, many complex and sometimes competing relationships between Indigenous people and colonial governments or representatives pre-dated Canadian Confederation. For example, only First Nations peoples can hold Indian status cards, and thus are the only ones subject to the controls of, and eligible for the rights held under, the Indian Act of 1876. Non-Status First Nations, Metis and Inuit Peoples are not able to receive the same rights from Canada because they are not included within the Indian Act. This is an important consideration because funding and access to resources will vary depending on the relationship these Peoples and their communities have with the federal government.

Through the Two Row research paradigm, relationships are connected to distinct responsibilities rather than reoriented hierarchy or deficit-based groupings. The strength of Indigenous Peoples is based in their specific ontology and epistemology that is grounded in their nations, languages, territories and cosmologies. The Two Row is described as an agreement between brothers. Likewise, Indigenous researchers can provide guidance as an older sibling about ontology and epistemology that is unfamiliar to researchers informed by Euro Western worldviews (Freeman & Van Katwyk, p. 67). It is then the responsibility of the younger sibling in this arrangement to learn, listen and be respectful (Freeman & Van Katwyk, p. 67).

Contemporary and useful tools for engaging in this sibling like arrangement between Indigenous Peoples and researchers most familiar with Euro Western worldviews could be the Royal Proclamation, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls.
PRINCIPLE 4:  
INTENTIONAL PLURALISM AND DIVERSITY

We can see from this image of the Two Row Wampum Agreement, that the two purple rows are parallel and within the belt’s edges, there is room to grow and continue the development of relationships between the two groups but neither purple row is internally homogenous (Hill & Coleman, principle 4).

When this agreement was made, it was made between the Haudenosaunee, which is a confederacy of 6 separate and distinct Nations (Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, Seneca and Tuscarora) who are united under the Great Law of Peace brought to them by the Peacemaker. Although this agreement was originally made with the Dutch, as explained above, the Two Row Wampum Agreement was later extended to other settler nations such as the British and French.

In the context of McMaster University, we can also see that although we are on the territory of the Haudenosaunee and Anishnaabe, there are many different nations from across Turtle Island that work, learn and share on this land and the same applies for the settler nations although, their row has taken up more space than what was originally agreed upon. Regardless of the changes that have happened to the landscape, people and politics of this territory, it is crucial we remember that the tenets of this agreement are still operational.

PRINCIPLE 5:  
SHARING KNOWLEDGE, NOT OWNING IT

In Indigenous epistemology, knowledge is not made by humans; rather, it is a gift that is given and a byproduct of good relations (Freeman & Van Katwyk, p. 67). This means two things: If we are looking to find knowledge or a greater understanding, developing relationships with all beings involved (humans, land, etc.) is critical. And it means that not everyone or everything is deserving of knowledge.

Researchers should take the time and effort to connect with communities within their territory, and go to meetings with them rather than always bringing partners to you. Not only is this more likely to be more convenient for the community partners, but it also allows you, the researcher, to get to visit the place that informs much of their knowledge. Visiting communities also gives university-affiliated researchers the opportunity to see some of the barriers that the people face in order to better understand lived experience and where these communities are coming from.

If Indigenous people and communities are not forthcoming or wanting to enter a dialogical relationship with you and/or your research, that must be respected. If a person or community’s refusal is a target area of interest for you and you would like to read about this in greater detail, please see Section 13.
SECTION 9:

COMMUNITY BASED PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH (CBPR)

This approach to research and inquiry in concert with Indigenous communities with whom we are working and doing groundwork combines research, education and action (Tallbear, 2014). Thinking through CBPR and the Two Row Research Paradigm, it is integral for researchers within and beyond the institution of McMaster University to consider their ethics of accountability. Researchers looking to engage with Indigenous communities can be accountable by considering whose land, lives and bodies, are being inquired about, and asking, “What do these lands, lives and bodies get out of the process and outcomes?”

Committing to finding these answers or likely outcomes based on the relationships you are trying to build with Indigenous Peoples and communities will allow you as a researcher to think more expansively about what counts as risk and rightful benefit while building knowledge (Tallbear, 2014). Ethics of accountability in Community Based Participatory Research will also create space for the community to make better decisions towards the overall outcome of the work you are doing together.

Approach research in a way that community partners are actively involved in every stage of the research process. When we think of tangible ways that Community Based Participatory Research can be utilized, it could mean that, for example, university researchers will be doing the heavy lifting of co-writing and submitting the grant proposals, but nothing is put in the funding agreement without the full and enthusiastic consent of the community partners. Community partners are then paid and engaged with throughout the process as Community Research Coordinators (CRCs).

CRCs then are responsible for the support of the lead researchers to implement the objectives of the project within their community. This could mean that these community research coordinators are conducting surveys, doing interviews, submitting data collected from different sources, etc. Once the required data for the research is collected and organized, community research coordinators and elders should be consulted on the information that has been collected before dissemination.

Analysis of the data by the individuals who live and work in their community is essential prior to including it in any documents or reports outside of the community. Based on the information collected, elders and CRCs are the experts on what information is vital and needs to be included, and which information is not as pertinent to the research topic/community needs. Should there be a disagreement on what information is to be included in the reports, a discussion is encouraged where all members of the research team (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) can inform each other of their opinions.

If there is a report and research is being shared at conferences, in classrooms, etc., the university researchers should make an effort to always include as many elders or CRCs as possible to assist or lead in the presentation of the findings.
SECTION 10: COLLABORATIVE ANALYSIS

Collaborative analysis is when members of a research team, who play different roles in a project, work together to review and analyze the results. Team members build collective knowledge about the meaning of the results, generating rich insights and creating a more complete and representative picture of the topic being researched. This involves sharing and discussing diverse interpretations and identifying key messages of what was learned through the project. It also involves discussing and deciding how best to communicate those messages to different audiences.

People can play different roles in collaborative analysis. There is a lot of work involved in preparing the results to review and presenting them in such a way that is accessible and understandable to all team members involved. There are also a variety of interactive activities that can be used to facilitate discussions and record the feedback that is raised when interpreting results. Some activities to consider include small group review and interpreting results. Some activities to consider include small group review and interpreting results. Some activities to consider include small group review and interpreting results.

All perspectives are considered when reviewing and presenting results of the research. In terms of what gets shared, the community does have the final say. If there is a disagreement, continue to discuss it as a team until you can come to a consensus. If the team can’t come to an agreement within the time frames of the project, decide to leave that part of the research out. This does not mean that you and your team will not return to this part of the research and data analysis or that the findings were not valuable to the community. However, it may just not be the appropriate time to focus on that area of the findings.

SECTION 11: SHARED CONCEPTUAL GROUND

Kim Tallbear (2014) explains that often relationships between researchers of an institution and an Indigenous community that wouldn’t typically be read as hierarchical still can be in many ways. The relationship that McMaster has with Indigenous people, communities and researchers can be understood as increasingly non-hierarchical with the implementation of an Indigenous Chancellor, increasing Indigenous spaces on campus and the creation of the Indigenous Studies Department. However, levelling the playing field of a game designed by and for the Western world is quite simply just a gesture of inclusion. While these gestures should not be taken for granted because they do increase Indigenous visibility within the institution, we are still playing a game; a game not designed for Indigenous Peoples. There are fundamental differences in how the university and Indigenous Peoples understand knowledge production. McMaster’s Strategic Research Plan states, “Universities are the foundation of knowledge,” whereas in Indigenous epistemology, knowledge and its foundations are rooted in cosmology, place and time. It is important to recognize and acknowledge that despite differences in how knowledge production is actualized, Indigenous people, communities, researchers, etc. are undeniably influenced in some way by Western thought and knowledge production as well.

Dr. Robert Innes (2010) suggests that rather focusing on Indigenous difference, that we instead shift our focus to Indigenous persistence (p. 4).

“Researchers who work in partnerships with Indigenous communities should emphasize an open ended and flexible program of research that can shift in focus to accommodate emerging needs and requests from community partners, even if those appear to align with conventional, dominant and Western approaches” (Andersen & Gabel, p. 27).


In sections 13 and 14, there are examples of some practical applications when engaging with Indigenous research methodologies. While the research primer is not intended to be a “how-to”, or fully explain all the processes involved in Indigenous research, it is important to have more practical application examples now that you have read through the physical document.
SECTION 12:
WHAT TO DO WHEN A COMMUNITY OR INDIVIDUAL SAYS ‘NO’

The following scenario provides an opportunity to reflect upon a potential community response and provides recommendations for next steps.

You have submitted your research proposal to the local community of Mississaugas of the Credit (MCFN). You went through their ethics board in addition to McMaster’s ethics board. When you received feedback, the MCFN ethics board denied your application to conduct research in their community. What is next?

1. Review your application thoroughly. Try brainstorming or mind-mapping to see if you can find incongruous or potential gaps in your approach. This removes the ego and might help prevent you from taking the rejection personally. There could be many reasons why your project was deemed not feasible:
   a. Not relevant — not within the band council’s plan or portfolios
   b. Capacity — currently too much work on the community
   c. Other urgent priorities; or
   d. Simply not interested at this time

2. If the ethics committee of MCFN expresses a genuine lack of interest in the project, this is where it needs to end with MCFN. If the community passes on your research, perhaps you have missed some steps to fully and ethically engage with the community. You can continue to build and enrich your relationship with the Mississaugas of the Credit.

3. Going forward: Organize a follow-up discussion to debrief on why the project was denied. Building and nourishing relationships with Indigenous communities and individuals does not begin and end with research projects. Developing a reciprocal relationship creates trust and respect and can cultivate a less hierarchical rapport. A denial of your research project could present unexpected opportunities. Use this experience to:
   a. Co-apply for grant to create capacity within the community
   b. Consider the alignment with the communities’ current needs and priorities
   c. Re-evaluate — the scope may be too broad. Perhaps just one section of the research would suffice
   d. Examine the relationality between the project and/or other research being done; check for redundancies
   e. Create a research assistant position for an Indigenous grad student

These recommendations are only suggestions to help foster respectful and fulfilling research relationships. These actions demonstrate goodwill and your ongoing commitment beyond the scope of the research project.
The following scenario provides an opportunity to reflect upon the process of navigating research and university protocols in building and supporting an Indigenous-led research project. Consider how you will manage your relationships at each turn of the river.

A community priority has come from community to you, as an academic researcher. You have found a relevant grant opportunity. How can you work together through the research life cycle to prepare a grant and administer it in a way that aligns with Indigenous research principles?

1. Develop Indigenous health research proposal
   - In developing the research proposal, the content should be co-developed with the community that has identified the priority. This includes close partnership on the framing of the research, the research questions, the methods to be used, and the approaches to partnership, knowledge mobilization and respect for Indigenous knowledges.
   - As noted in the TCPS-2, Indigenous community engagement is required; however, the nature and extent of community engagement will be mutually agreed upon in collaboration between the community and researchers.
   - A tool that can be helpful for both the development and review of Indigenous health research proposals is the Indigenous Research Level of Engagement Tool, which outlines ways of assessing four engagement criteria: partnership, knowledge into practice, strength-based approach, and Indigenous Knowledges and ways of knowing.

2. Apply for health research funding
   - The list of principal applicants, co-applicants, collaborators and knowledge users should include community members and community partner organizations, as appropriate. Directly supporting non-academic community members to set up CVs or profiles on granting agency systems can be critical for culturally safe involvement.
   - Timelines need to account for community protocols and decision-making cycles. For example, if a resolution is required at a community-level and/or if community approvals need to happen before presentations or reports go out beyond the community, it is important to build those key items into the timeline at the appropriate points.
   - The budget needs to be developed in a collaborative and community-informed way.
   - Considerations for budgets include:
     i. Community partners may have added administrative costs to participate in research projects that should be considered in the budget (e.g., HR, finance). While universities and other eligible institutions often receive additional overhead or research support funding from granting agencies, community partners often do not.
     ii. Carefully consider the number of meetings that people will be asked to attend and the time it will take.
     iii. Honoraria for participants, advisors and Elders.
     iv. Hiring community-based researchers.
     v. Supporting capacity strengthening in Indigenous communities through involving and supporting Indigenous students.
     vi. Community gatherings, including food at the gathering, covering transportation costs, funding for elder helpers to attend.
3. Establish funding agreements and sub-agreements

- Funding agreements must be established to ensure the flow of funding from the funding agency to McMaster. These agreements must include the following information:
  i. Scope of work
  ii. Research proposal
  iii. Budget
  iv. Budget justification
  v. Ethical approval (as available)

- To flow funding to external partners, sub-agreements must be created. When establishing sub-agreements with community partners and organizations, it is important to consider that these agreements will require review by all parties and will take a month to process internally.

- When developing timelines for projects, it is important to consider these potential funding delays to ensure that partners can use their funding for their goals.

4. Develop Research / Collaboration Agreement

- Collaborative research agreements ensure that all parties of the research project can discuss their collective roles and responsibilities for the work and establish clear principles of working together prior to the beginning of work. These agreements are established in collaboration with the McMaster Industry Liaison Office (MILO) who can provide guidance and templates to ensure the collaborative research agreement reflects community-informed approaches to research.

- The collaborative research agreement may include:
  i. Nature of the collaboration
  ii. Project scope
  iii. Responsibilities of parties
  iv. Duration of the agreement
  v. Data storage and management

- Timelines need to account for review of the agreement by all parties. For example, community partners may seek the review of the agreement by their legal counsel prior to signing the agreement.

5. Develop a Research Data Management Plan

- Research Data Management Plans must be developed in collaboration with all community partners involved in the research project to ensure that the unique considerations of each community are considered and integrated into the plan. Individual research data management plans may be required for each respective community partner on the project.

- The Research Data Management Plan may include:
  i. First Nations, Inuit, and/or Metis principles of data governance
  ii. A collective understanding of how knowledge generated from the project will be shared
  iii. A clear understanding of where the data will be stored, who will have access to the data, and for how long

- The research contracts advisor at MILO will be able to work with you to develop Research Data Management Plans that reflect principles of Indigenous data governance and ensure a culturally safe plan is developed and mutually agreed upon by all parties.

6. REB Approval

- Appropriate ethical approval from McMaster is mandatory before beginning research.

- At McMaster, there are two different bodies that review research ethics applications: the Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board (HiREB) reviews research conducted through the Faculty of Health Sciences (FHS), Hamilton Health Sciences (HHS), St. Joseph's Healthcare Hamilton (SJHH) and Niagara Health. The McMaster Research Ethics Board (MREB) reviews research conducted by the faculties of Science, Social Sciences, Humanities, Engineering, and the DeGroote School of Business.

- The format and questions included in
many institutions’ research ethics board applications may not be appropriate within an Indigenous research context. For example, many ethics boards may still ask the researcher to classify research involving Indigenous people as research with vulnerable populations. Directly supporting seeking research ethics approval ensures the culturally safe engagement of community partners.

• When developing timelines for community-driven research projects, it is important to consider that ethics approval for research projects may take upwards of two months.

7. Hiring project staff and recruiting students (if applicable)

• Elder supports include assigning someone to be responsible for the comfort and involvement of Elders: meeting the Elder when they attend gatherings and helping them to find their way, get a parking pass, have refreshments.

• The McMaster Indigenous Research Institute hosts an eight-week program for upper-level Indigenous undergraduate students interested in graduate school called IndigiNerds. Utilizing these initiatives can help you to bring Indigenous members into your team through mentorship.

8. Ongoing project management of budget, timelines, outcomes.

9. To ensure culturally safe work, respectful project management practices should be considered in the approach to the work. Strong consideration should be given to how to respect Indigenous protocols and approaches to communication (e.g., non-interfering, less directive) while balancing project timelines and ensuring clarity of roles.

10. Planning and ensuring that the research projects meet timelines and commitments while also being respectful of changing community priorities, needs and timelines.

SECTION 14:
ADDITIONAL TRAINING AND SOURCES FOR INDIGENOUS RESEARCH

This list is not exhaustive, but will give you tools and resources to further your education or pass it on to others who are seeking more information.

• Fundamentals for Community Engagement: A Sourcebook for Students at McMaster University.

• The First Nation’s Principles of OCAP asserts data sovereignty for First Nations. They provide educational training on the Fundamentals of ownership, control, access and possession.

• The Indigenous Community Research Partnerships is an open education training resource developed through the lens of the health sector. However, the training and modules are relevant to any individual wishing to work with Indigenous Peoples or communities.

• The Indigenous Research Level of Engagement Tool is beneficial for grant review committees, faculty, researchers, academics, students, patient partners and trainees.


• Indigenous Canada is a free, 12-lesson online course from Native Studies at the University of Alberta that is designed to explore the different histories and contemporary perspectives of Indigenous People living in Canada.

• The Wabishki Bizhiko Skaanj Learning Pathway is a resource for building better relationships with Indigenous Peoples. The module, Indigenous Research Ethics and Protocols, is a three-part series that discusses ethical principles of engagement with Indigenous Peoples.

• Toronto Metropolitan University’s Guidelines for Research Involving Indigenous Peoples in Canada

• Canadian Geographic’s research priorities section within its Indigenous People’s Atlas of Canada: https://indigenouspeoplesatlasofcanada.ca/article/research-priorities/
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The purpose of this Indigenous Research Primer is to guide those at McMaster University who are engaging with Indigenous Peoples and communities in their research. Indigenous scholars are disproportionately overburdened and inundating with questions and seeking complimentary support regarding your project(s) adds to their ever-increasing burden. Always educate yourself first. Engage in dialogue with the successful allied researchers already working with Indigenous communities.