Check for updates

Original Article

Qualitative Inquiry
1–11
© The Author(s) 2017
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1077800417743527
journals.sagepub.com/home/qix
SAGE

In Reciprocity: Responses to Critiques of Indigenous Methodologies

Sweeney Windchief[1], Cheryl Polacek[1], Michael Munson[2], Mary Ulrich[3], and Jason D. Cummins[1]

Abstract

This article will examine and respond to significant critiques of Indigenous research methodologies as part of an *Indigenous Methodologies in Educational Research* course at a midsized public university in the intermountain west. The authors will present their perspectives in response to critiques of Indigenous research methodologies as presented at the American Indigenous Research Association's annual meeting in October of 2014. This collection of responses is offered in an effort to facilitate an interactive dialogue with scholars who use Indigenous research methodologies applicable to multiple fields of study, support scholarship that is responsive to the needs of Indigenous communities, and ultimately center relevant research design and findings within Indigenous paradigms.

Keywords

Indigenous approaches to knowledge, ethnicity and race, Indigenous epistemologies, Indigenous ethics, Native American studies, decolonizing the academy, pedagogy

The primary emphasis of this manuscript is to respond to critiques of Indigenous research methodologies (IRMs) from the perspective of graduate students who have coconstructed and taken a graduate-level course called *Indigenous Methodologies in Educational Research*. This course was offered at a RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity) 4-year public university in the intermountain West during the spring 2015 semester. During the first half of the course, students read and discussed seminal texts and articles that centered Indigenous methodologies. This served to develop students' self-location statements and theoretical stances regarding Indigenous methodologies as they are applied in education. The texts for this course included selected works by authors who are known in the field of Indigenous methodologies as they pertain to research, which came primarily from Indigenous authors.

Subsequently, students were shown several of the presentation videos offered by American Indigenous Researchers Association (AIRA), including *Postulates of IRMs, Three Key Questions for Proponents of IRMs*, and *Eight Persistent Misgivings about IRMs*. (Gone, 2014; see appendix). In an effort to engage students in a pragmatic, scholarly, and contemporary manner, students were asked to respond to critiques of Indigenous methodologies, whether they indeed wanted to submit collectively a proposal to present at the conference, and coauthor a manuscript of the same sort. In authoring their responses, they apply their own lived experiences, positionality, the course material, and what they have learned as a result of taking the course.

Meaning

It is the collective aspiration of the authors to move the discourse forward under the auspices of academia; resultantly, authors will respond in a way that adds to the Indigenous collective in calling academia to consider Indigenous perspectives. This article serves to support the call for scholarship that is responsive to the needs of Indigenous communities, particularly as it pertains to research (Ball & Janyst, 2008; Burchill, Pyett, & Kelly, 2011; Chilisa, 2012; Smith, 2013; Wilson, 2008). The authors' collective intent is to reach a broad audience to include scholars and Indigenous community members, particularly those who perform Indigenous research and those who implement Indigenous methodologies in their research.

---

[1] Montana State University, Bozeman, USA
[2] Salish Kootenai College, Pablo, MT, USA
[3] New Mexico State University, Dona Ana Community College, Las Cruces, NM, USA

Corresponding Author:
Sweeney Windchief, Montana State University, P.O. Box 172940, Bozeman, MT 59717-2000, USA.
Email: sweeney.windchief@montana.edu

Indigenous Research and Indigenous Methodology

Indigenous research is defined as encompassing all research studying Indigenous communities, to include the plethora of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods. We caution the reader that Indigenous research includes research that is done *on* or *to* Indigenous peoples, which often excludes Indigenous perspectives. Importantly, Indigenous research is not limited to this demarcation and includes research that is done *with* and *for* Indigenous communities in a culturally responsive and community-centered manner (LaVeaux & Christopher, 2009). In other words, the authors make a clear distinction between Indigenous methodologies as a way of researching and Indigenous research as encompassing all research done in Indigenous communities regardless of the approaches used (Kovach, 2013).

It is vital for scholars and practitioners to understand that *Indigenous research* and *Indigenous methodologies* are two very distinct manifestations. For the purposes of this article, we maintain the aforementioned definition of Indigenous research. Indigenous methodologies are defined as the unique ways researchers use Indigenous positionality and perspective to perform research *with* and *within* Indigenous communities. Indigenous methodologies center and privilege the Indigenous community's voice(s) in an effort to contribute to the community (Battiste, 2011; Louis, 2007). It considers the relational aspect of research through Indigenous lenses while avoiding the dangers of inappropriately essentializing (Grande, 2000), romanticizing (Wainer & Chesters, 2000), or historicizing (Crosby, 2002; Ormiston, 2010) Indigenous peoples.

Indigenous methodologies are one answer to an invitation for research by Indigenous communities and for Indigenous peoples often through Indigenous scholars. The authors' responses will be provided in the oncoming pages to include self-location statements that reveal their unique perspectives. Responses to critiques of Indigenous methodologies will follow for each coauthor. The intent of the response is to be respectful of the listener, the researcher, the community, as well as Indigenous space, place, and context, while responding in an academic context.

Self-Location and Responsibility in Response

Presumably, those who read this article are likely to be engaged in research and/or an Indigenous community context. In congruence with Indigenous research axiology and the relational accountability that is interwoven throughout IRMs (Wilson, 2001), the authors offer self-location statements. This is accomplished by sharing their backgrounds and positions with the intent of developing a relationship with those who read this article. To consider and deliberate the critiques of IRMs, in a way that aligns with Indigenous ontology, maintaining cultural integrity is key. In the literature, Sium and Ritskes (2013) elaborate on the responsibility and accountability that come with the reclamation of Indigenous voice. The authors' hope is that this is accomplished by responding in a way that represents our relatives well.[1] The authors respond only to the degree that they feel is appropriate within the constraints of their own conceptualizations of community responsibility and their understanding of Indigenous ontologies while being dutiful in academic engagement. To make this article applicable to these audiences, the authors choose to share in a way that preserves authenticity of voice by writing in the first person.

Each contribution is delineated but is centered on Indigenous research in education, showing that collectively scholarship can be developed to promote an ongoing dialogue. Furthermore, the authors encourage a dialogue and together invite professional discourse through scholarship. Our intention in doing this is for the purpose of further developing Indigenous methodologies and adding to the substantive theory (Kovach, 2013) that supports a repositioning of researcher perspectives. Although this article is public and available to all, it is written for Indigenous communities; therefore, it is structured accordingly and uses language that is accessible to the broadest audience possible.

Multiple Perspectives

Contributors to this article were doctoral students enrolled in a graduate-level course titled *Indigenous Methodologies in Educational Research*. As a result, they have read and discussed at length *Research is Ceremony* (Wilson, 2008), *Indigenous Storywork* (Archibald, 2008), *Red Pedagogy* (Grande, 2004), and *Decolonizing Methodologies* (Smith, 2013), as well as numerous peer-reviewed articles that evaluate and confound IRMs. The authors have various connections to Indigenous communities both on Turtle Island[2] and abroad and enter the conversation with various identities and lived experiences that connect them to Indigenous communities. The author's identities and lived experiences serve an antiessentialist end of locating themselves in reality as opposed to leading readers to the false assumption that being Indigenous and/or working with Indigenous communities are uniform experiences. As a result, the authors come from various levels of grounding in multiple Indigenous communities exhibiting some of the variability that is experienced between Indigenous communities and researchers.

Author 1's Self-Location Statement

I am both a self-identified and federally recognized member of the Apsáalooke Nation, a child beneficiary of commodity cheese and food stamps, a rez baller, a 38-year-old sales *veteran of Crow's first firecracker stand, an ultimate warrior, a storyteller, and a rezbian.[3] The Apsáalooke are also referred to as the Crow and are located in Southeastern Montana. Attending K-12 in Hardin, Montana, I am a product of the secondary education system near the Crow Reservation. My introduction to a formalized school structure began in the Crow head start program, but my real education began at Crow Park, selling bottle rockets and recycling cans to make gas money for our 13-mile commute. My experiences growing up on the reservation, and in being part of a larger cultural community, everyone is connected and accountable in our Native circle. This has served as motivation to better serve my community through education and activism. My role as an Indigenous researcher and educator cannot be separated from my scholarly work. Being Indigenous is part of the way I design, implement, and interpret research, academic papers, observations and life, as connected components. Indian education, equity, relevancy, saliency, and respect in that education are passions that have shaped many of my perspectives. It is important for me to share and frame my experience for this article and the academic audience.*

Author 1's Response

When speaking at the 2014 American Indian Researchers Association conference in Pablo, Montana, about IRMs, Dr. Joseph Gone shared his thoughts about the "misgivings" that he believes are an integral part of Indigenous methodologies within research. He claimed that IRM places too much emphasis on the "form over findings" in research. He gave an example of a student using a medicine wheel in her presentation to explain four things rather than simply using a linear "line or arrow" and stated that the "four things are still the four things." It is problematic in IRM to not understand that the form is integral to the findings; this would be the equivalent of inappropriately using a quantitative survey tool to gather findings about American Indian student perceptions of predominantly White institutions. The process in which one chooses to look for answers will frame what answers she or he finds. Therefore, an emphasis on form is an emphasis on findings. Indigenous researcher Shawn Wilson (2008) offers the following:

> Traditional Indigenous research emphasizes learning by watching and doing. The relational building that this sharing and participating entailed is an important aspect of ethical Indigenous research. Relational accountability requires me to form reciprocal and respectful relationships within the communities where I am conducting research. This methodology is in contrast with observational techniques that attempt to be unobtrusive and not influence the environment studied. (p. 40)

Relationalilty, story, delivery, and protocol are necessary if we want real and honest answers. The form (how we do things and why we do things), the way that we do, builds trust and creates space for understanding and relating in that space. Creating space and building trust must happen if we wish to find the answers that we need to make research meaningful. The four things are not simply the four things as Dr. Gone stated that they were in his 2014 presentation. A student was asked to "list" four things that she needs. There is no attention to form in this question and response. She says (a) a story, (b) a heart, (c) warmth, and (d) time. A researcher not taking the time to acknowledge the importance and relevance of form in IRM might simply interpret the student as needing a book, an animal organ (for science purposes?), a space heater, and a watch/time piece. Results may be interpreted differently if we were to look deeper into what this response was and we gave flexibility and space for creativity in our delivery, in how we asked the student what she needed or even looked at what she was really asking for in her response. Maybe what the question should have been looking for was introspection and thought. Maybe what the student really needed could not be listed as items, she might have been asking for another person's attention and energy, for them to sit and visit with her. The form, in this example of a data collection research strategy, would offer very different results/findings when form is valued and practiced in the ways that IRM often utilizes.

Many who question the value and importance of Indigenous methodologies in research have not been shy to say that IRM focuses too much on "form over findings." The use of story, metaphor, analogy, abstract coding,[4] delivery, and even humor are not simply methods that can be used in research but that should be used in research, because research is generally looking for answers to real-life questions. Well, what better way to answer real-life questions with real-life answers from people who have real lives. The relationality and connectedness of these critical aspects as they pertain to capturing and representing meaningful findings help provide balance, accountability, and responsibility in research. Form and method in Indigenous research determine the findings because like everything else in our natural world, they are related and accountable to one another.

Author 2's Self-Location Statement

As a former middle school teacher interested in assisting in the contribution of culturally responsive, sustaining, and revitalizing educational materials to Montana's Indian Education for All, Indigenous education, and language revitalization efforts, and after growing up in Missoula, away from my Sqelix^{w5} culture, I now understand how blessed I was to begin my efforts along this journey under the instruction of the Salish-Pend d'Oreille Culture Committee (SPCC) and Elder Advisory Council (Elders). To do this in the best way, I approached our Tribal Education Department and the SPCC to seek guidance about a project on behalf of two mentor professors and myself. Throughout *that project, I learned the appropriate protocol to work with our Sqelix^{w} community and Elders. Before we were allowed to learn from and with our Elders, our hearts, values, and intentions were assessed while we were simultaneously taught numerous lessons about appropriate values and ways of being. Atwen*[6] *continuously reminded me, specifically, of educators, researchers, academics, scholars, and anthropologists who had come before, benefited firsthand, and neglected to give anything back to our Sqelix^{w} people. He reminded me of my responsibility for respecting those who shared their knowledge, the knowledge that was shared, and avoiding similar behavior. He taught me how to be a respectful Sqelix^{w} person who contributed to the well-being of our community.*

We spent a great deal of time visiting with numerous Elders throughout that project. We learned from and with one another. I still have so much more to learn. Together, I began to understand that the purpose in which I sought their guidance was shaped into something that took an entirely different form. The result was a project intended to educate Montana's children about the importance of Seliš and Qlispé place. Many turns were taken throughout those 4 years, but the project was completed, as Atwen had taught, "when it [was] supposed to."

Building relationships was the first step—with the Elders, with the Committee as a whole. We were respectful. We were responsible. And we reciprocated by returning a project, built by and with, the Elders. It was accurate, authentic, and appropriate. I strive, daily, to show my respect for and reciprocate to each of those relationships. I believe each of the lessons learned will assist Native youth in developing pride, identity, and empowering themselves to be leaders for our communities.(L. Adams, A. Incashola, & SPCCEAC, personal communications, April 2005-August 2010; Wilson, 2008).

Author 2's Response

According to their website, the AIRA carries a mission to "educate researchers and the public about the importance of IRMs and to promote incorporation of these methodologies into all research that engages Indigenous peoples and communities" (AIRA, 2015, Home, para. 5). It was the founding AIRA conference that validated my feelings about the value and importance of the ways in which I was taught to work with my Elders and community.

Ultimately, a true recognition, appreciation, allowance, and space for Indigenous epistemologies (IEs) within academia would allow for Indigenous scholars, especially those who are educators, to meld Indigenous and academic epistemologies so that (a) Indigenous scholars would be celebrated for the work they do within their fields, centered on the needs of their communities; (b) oppression based on Indigeneity within academia would be reduced significantly—Indigenous methodologies and scholarship would be revered with the same respect as non-Indigenous scholarship; (c) Indigenous scholars would no longer need to walk within two worlds or disregard their tribal epistemologies while engaged in their work; and (d) the success and leadership of Indigenous youth and scholars would be greatly improved. Eventually, tribal self-determination and national development would be significantly improved and Indigenous communities would have the ability to stand as sovereign communities.

As an educator who has been blessed with teachings from our Sqelix^{w} Elders and believes in the leadership of our up-and-coming generations, I was particularly drawn to the third set of questions posed to advocates of IRM during the second annual AIRA conference. This set of questions was centered on the broad question asking, How should we study, describe, and represent IEs? The question was focused by the following subquestions:

A. What qualifies particular Indigenous scholars to access IEs for academic purposes?
B. What is the methodology by which Indigenous scholars should recover IEs?
C. How could IEs be so ready-made for university-based knowledge production?
D. What are the sociopolitical, ethical, and economic implications of studying and writing about IEs?

As a result, I utilize the teachings that have been shared, by Elders, as well as what I have learned about Indigenous education and IRMs. The remainder will include each question of focus and will follow with a brief response.

What qualifies particular Indigenous scholars to access IEs for academic purposes?. As an Indigenous person, especially an educator, you are accountable to and have a duty to contribute to the communities you belong to. With this comes expectations that you will be respectful in all you do, will carry on in a responsible manner by reciprocating to your community and those you have relationships with, and will work from where you are, including your heart, making things relevant for your students, those you have relationships with, others who are affected similarly, and yourself. As an academic, you have a duty to contribute to knowledge surrounding the area in which you work for the betterment of the people. And, most importantly, as an Indigenous academic in education, you have a duty to combine each of these things to truly contribute to your communit(ies) to the best of your ability (Brayboy, 2005; Brayboy, Gough, Leonard, Roehl, & Solyom, 2012; Kirkness & Barnhardt, 2001; Wilson, 2008).

What is the methodology by which Indigenous scholars should recover IEs?. As shown through my own experiences with our Sqelix^{w} Elders, there are tribal responsibilities and methods associated with IEs, regardless of whether you work in academia or not. Being an Indigenous person, who is also an educator and a scholar, does not make you separate from those expectations—rather, they are amplified. Therefore, the methodologies by which you, as an Indigenous educator/scholar, should recover (work with) IEs are completely dependent upon the protocol set forth by your community. For example, the Seliš and Qlispé protocol requires those who are working with our community to demonstrate a level of commitment, responsibility, and respect for our values and community as a whole. This is done by making and taking the time to build relationships with the Elders, our students, their families, and other community members. It is only then, when they have determined your heart is in a good place, when you are allowed to work with the community.

How could IEs be so ready-made for university-based knowledge production?. Although Dr. Gone questions that IEs are ready-made for university-based knowledge production, I do not share his beliefs. Too many Indigenous scholars are working in IRMs to avoid acknowledging that they (and we) are working together to fight for the right to include IEs within academia. This is shown through various submissions to research (Archibald, 2008; Brayboy et al., 2012; Grande, 2004; Kirkness & Barnhardt, 2001; Kovach, 2010; Lambert, 2014; Smith, 2013; Wilson, 2008).

To recognize the sacrifice and work of our ancestors, and those Indigenous scholars who have come before us, we, as a collective of Indigenous educators and scholars, devoted to working within our own communities, must work with a particular devotion to our community. We must work with great diligence, respect, reverence, purpose, and perseverance for recognition and approval of the work we are doing with and for our communities by our Elders, students, communities, and within academia.

What are the sociopolitical, ethical, and economic implications of studying and writing about IEs?. Scholarship surrounding IEs, including those related to Indigenous education, will affect and reduce systematic and institutionalized oppression within academia, education, politics and governance, and the world. Indigenous educators and scholars aim for true recognition, appreciation, allowance, and equity concerning epistemologies within the classroom, academia, and the world. Indigenous educators and scholars are bound by ethical dilemmas and expectations on both sides of the spectrum. A true recognition, appreciation, allowance, and space for IEs within academia would allow for Indigenous educator scholars to meld Indigenous, academic, and educational epistemologies. If scholarship surrounding IEs is able to affect and reduce systematic and institutionalized oppression within education, academia, politics and governance, and the world, then equity can truly occur. If equity becomes a reality, then our tribal nations will benefit as education serves as a tool for tribal self-determination and national development to become a reality. If true self-determination is a possibility, then Native youth will be more inclined to develop pride, identity, and empower themselves to be leaders for our communities. Eventually, tribes can become self-sustaining—economically, spiritually, and in all other aspects of the world.

Importance of argument for education and communities. A true recognition, appreciation, allowance, and space for IEs within the field of education would allow for Indigenous scholars to meld Indigenous, educational, and academic epistemologies so that (a) Indigenous scholars would be celebrated for the work they do within their fields, centered on the needs of their communities; (b) oppression based on Indigeneity within academia would be reduced significantly—Indigenous methodologies and scholarship would be revered with the same respect as non-Indigenous scholarship; (c) Indigenous scholars would no longer need to walk within two worlds or disregard their tribal epistemologies while engaged in their work; and (d) the success and leadership of Indigenous youth and scholars would be greatly improved. Eventually, tribal self-determination and national development would be significantly improved and Indigenous communities would have the ability to stand as sovereign communities.

Author 3's Self-Location

I grew up in a White, middle-class family in the rural, western state of Montana, dreaming about traveling and exploring the world. For me, higher education facilitated intercultural growth. I was able to gain glimpses of the world through the study of history, language, and culture. I was introduced to different purposes of research in my undergraduate history program. Distinctions were made between researchers who discovered the "truth" and those who studied history to correct injustices and enhance social justice. At the time, the scholarship of discovery was greatly valorized over the scholarship of engagement or social change. As I critically engage in higher education research, I am coming to understand more concretely how my role as a researcher can be in partnership with the community. Also, by prioritizing indigenous research methodologies and indigenous epistemologies, I, as a non-Indigenous researcher, can work to ensure that my research is truly community-centered.

Author 3's Response

In his 2014 presentation at AIRA, Gone questioned the place of IEs and IRMs in "academic knowledge production." He characterizes research as "asking questions and finding answers," which assumes that there is a knowable reality out there to be discovered by a researcher. Gone places "academic knowledge production" within the dominant paradigm of Western, progressive, and rational knowledge production excluding other sources of knowledge production or ways of knowing within the academy. This understanding is rooted in positivist or perhaps postpositivist worldview (Creswell, 2013). Although the scholarship of discovery can be characterized as "asking questions and finding answers," engaged scholarship views research with a different purpose. Like Coyote's mismatched eyes (Archibald, 2008), dominant research paradigms are not well suited to work with a community, especially in global Indigenous communities, and most likely will result in answers that, at best, are irrelevant to the community and, at worst, answers that will harm or oppress the community (Chilisa, 2005, 2012; Smith, 2013; Wilson, 2008).

In contrast, I believe that IEs and Indigenous research methods not only have a place in the academy, and in educational research specifically, they have at least two important roles in (a) disrupting harmful research and educational practices within Indigenous communities worldwide and (b) providing a framework for ethical, responsible, and respectful, community-based educational research (Chilisa, 2012; Wilson, 2008). Research "done to" or "on" Indigenous communities across the globe in the name of science or discovery has a long record of harm and oppression. Tuck (2009) describes this research as "damage-centered" and "intent on portraying our neighborhoods and tribes as defeated and broken" (p. 412). One such "damage-centered" area of research is on the failures of educational systems that serve communities. The focus is often on how these systems do not measure up and produce the results pre-determined as valid in a contemporary educational system. In a brief review of the literature, I present several examples of how Indigenous ways of knowing and knowledge production serve to better inform and better connect to the lived experience of people in the areas of formal and nonformal education across the globe. These examples are significant, because, unlike Gone, I believe the purpose of research, or "university-based knowledge production," is to improve the well-being of people and communities, to create a more sustainable future for all, and to increase social justice.

Assessment and research on educational systems in formerly colonized regions tend to focus on what is lacking and problematic: inadequate facilities and materials, unequal access, lack of teacher training and authoritarian teaching methods, teacher absenteeism, and in some cases, corruption and abuse (Woolman, 2001). The formal education system based on the Western paradigm can exacerbate social, economic, and class divides among communities and community members (Wane, 2000; Woolman, 2001). African writer Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1981) describes the daily onslaught of colonial education and continued imperialism as a "cultural bomb." He writes,

> the effect of a cultural bomb is to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environments, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities, and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and . . . it even plants serious doubts about the moral righteousness of the struggle. (p. 3)

Colonial, or Western, education taught in schools around the world is largely irrelevant to the lives and realities of Indigenous students and communities especially in rural areas and leads to failure, grade repetition, or dropout (Gegeo & Watson-Gegeo, 2002; Woolman, 2001). In the Solomon Islands, a nonformal education and entrepreneurial project, the "Oka Village Youth Project" (1980s) was created in response to large numbers of youth migrating to urban centers. The project was centered in IE and cultural knowledge, based on shared leadership and egalitarian teaching and learning that consisted of people with specific knowledge sets sharing with others. Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo (2002) describe that the success of the nonformal education project was based on its foundation in Indigenous knowledge as compared with the inadequacies of the formal education system to educate the youth for the realities of their lives.

Likewise, in the northwest United States, Johansen (2004) describes Darryl Kipp's efforts to revitalize the Blackfeet native language through the foundation of The Piegan Institute in Browning, Montana, in 1987. Johansen quotes Kipp regarding some of the fundamental reasons to start the Institute:

> Out of the 17,000 that belong to my band, less than one per cent have a college education. Sixty-five per cent of the students in our schools never finish the tenth grade. These are damning statistics about a Western form of education that fails to educate us. The promise that we would give up our language, move forth as English-speaking people and become successful in the world, has not come true. (p. 571).

This hegemonic "promise," well-articulated by Kipp here, that when "better" educational systems modeled on the Western, Eurocentric model are implemented and funded across the world, we will see positive outcomes and transformations of communities.

Furthermore, in many instances, the Western model of education is implemented completely ignoring the local context, such as when the World Bank prescribed the same educational policies for all of Africa, as noted by Brock-Utne (2012). The Millennium Development Goals (2000-2015) also were implemented by large international agencies and organizations, the second of which concerned education. However, despite the organized efforts, the 2014 UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and

Cultural Organization) Education for All *Global Monitoring Report* found that almost 250 million children in 37 countries between the ages of 15 to 24 years were illiterate, unable to read part of or a whole sentence. In sub-Saharan Africa, almost half the children who reached fourth grade had not learned basic numeracy or literacy (UNESCO, 2014). The goal of universal primary education was partially reached with many more children entering primary school; however, the quality of the education in too many areas failed to achieve the basic goals of education—literacy and numeracy.

The failure to provide a sustainable, appropriate, and successful educational experience for children in developing countries, children from ethnic minority groups, and children in Indian Country stems mostly from the reliance on hegemonic educational systems and curricula that are delivered in colonial languages (Asante, 2010; Brock-Utne, 2012; Johansen, 2004; Sefa Dei, 2010; Woolman, 2001). Brock-Unte (2012) decries the ongoing educational environment for many African children where they enter school not knowing how to speak the language of instruction, typically a European colonial language. They, then, must learn the language of instruction at the same time they learn content in that language. This additional challenge slows their progress and may actually impede children from learning any content in the first years of schooling. Combined with age-based promotion and the irrelevant curricula, the children are set up to not acquire basic skills. Furthermore, assessments and evaluations of educational progress, such as the TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study) are usually offered in the official language. Literacy or numeracy assessments of children in their native language often have very different results (Brock-Unte, 2012).

Several case studies and examples exist of the power of the local language in motivating learners and providing relevancy. In the southwest Unite States, the Cochiti Pueblo began an immersion program to revitalize their language in 1996. Romero, a Karas (Cochiti) member, describes the effect:

> When the [first group of thirty] kids went home, they spread the news that, “Wow, they’re not using any English. They’re not writing. It’s just totally in Cochiti.” We started out with four teachers. The next day we got 60 kids. By the third week, we had 90 kids. By the end of the summer, the kids were starting to speak. (Johansen, 2004, p. 566)

Furthermore, by the end of the summer program, Romero had observed major behavioral changes in the young learners:

> These kids came in rowdy as can be. By the time they left, they knew the appropriate protocol of how you enter a house, greet your elder, say good-bye. The fact that they could use verbal communication for the most important piece of culture, values, and love started a chain reaction in the community. (Johansen, 2004, p. 566)

Similarly, in Tanzania and Brock-Utne (2012) observed that children when taught in Kiswahili were much more engaged than a group learning from the same teacher teaching the same topic in English.

In Mozambique, in 2003, the Ministry of Education revised the national curriculum to include “local curriculum” to occupy 20% of the teaching of each subject (Castiano & Mkabela, 2014). The purpose of the inclusion of local curriculum in the primary education system is “to educate the future citizens to use the local knowledge in their communities to improve their own quality of life, that of their families, their communities, and the country at large” (Castiano & Mkabela, 2014, p. 29). In consultation with parents during the design phase, parents noted that the current curriculum was “obsolete” and nonfunctional: Children did not gain literacy or numeracy skills. The parents hoped that “through the local curriculum, children would be given the chance to learn relevant contents so that they could ‘survive’ after leaving the school” (Castiano & Mkabela, 2014, p. 33). Further research is needed to examine the effects of indigenizing the curriculum on measures such as next level success, retention, and completion and the community-level factors that influence these indicators in differing Indigenous communities.

Finally, tertiary education needs to incorporate IRMs and epistemologies as salient educational research practices to ask questions and find answers that are relevant to global Indigenous communities (Chilisa, 2005; Pallas, 2001). First of all, the inclusion of learning about multiple ways of knowing within undergraduate and graduate curricula supports the mission and vision of most institutions of higher learning today. This inclusion supports teaching and learning goals of forming critical thinkers, with the ability to hold multiple viewpoints in tension at the same time. This ability and process forms part of becoming interculturally competent citizens of the world (Bennett, 2008) and in developing a stance of cultural humility (Hook, Davis, Owen, Worthington, & Utsey, 2013). In addition, Pallas (2001) argues that researchers today encounter diverse epistemologies and must be prepared to conduct research from more nuanced stances. Finally, for all of academia, the philosophies, processes, and procedures within IRMs offer an essential framework for Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers to conducting relevant, respectful, reciprocal, and responsible work in communities. As educational researchers, we seek understanding on how to serve our children better in schools and colleges worldwide. We must pay attention to the failures of the Western education models for Indigenous children and youth and seek to create more just, sustainable, and relevant education systems.

Author 4's Self-Location Statement

I am an enrolled member of the Apsáalooke Nation and currently serve my community as education leader at Crow Agency Public School and also work with other K-12 school leaders across the state to promote the education and well-being of Native American students. I spent my formative years in Bineete, an area close to the foothills of the Big Horn Mountains, within a close-knit family. Among the Apsáalooke Nation, I am a member of the Sore-Lip Clan, and I am named Awaachia'ookaate which was received by my grandmother through a dream. Through the experience and guidance of family I have never viewed education as anything other than a means of protecting, helping, and preserving our people. I view it as a means of preserving the story, identity, language, and culture of our community, as well as empowering us toward a successful future.

Author 4's Response

In addressing some of the points made, I come from a critical framework that seeks to question the major assumptions within the dominant (Western) frame, which carries the assumption that empirical evidence is more sound than cultural knowledge. Empirical knowledge is not the only way of knowing (Wilson, 2008). Klug (2012b) states, "Throughout the history of American Indian education, conflicts have occurred between the government and Native peoples concerning perceptions of the best way to educate Indigenous students" (p. 71). As a Native American educator, this is important for many reasons; one of which Bird, Lee, and Lopez (2013) point out, that in schools today there is bias in what counts as knowledge and that colonizing ideologies maintain hegemonic influence over Native American students' educational experience.

Gone's presentation alarmed me somewhat because it reinforces the negative and harmful aspects of the educational system's ideological management (Spring, 1996) in regard to Native students where their worldviews and knowledge are dismissed as untrue. Writer (2012) wrote that "Education was once a weapon of choice against Indigenous Peoples" (p. 60). Whether conscious or not, this is essentially where Gone is speaking from, the dominant and sometimes oppressive Western thought that generations of Native students have been subjected to, and harmed by, in order to socialize (Writer, 2012) and assimilate. The Western educational system attempted to eradicate Native American worldviews and drown tribal epistemologies (Writer, 2012). As a result, entire communities had their traditional social lives irrevocably altered.

I have to admit that I do not feel qualified or well equipped to argue or answer any questions set forth in Dr. Gone's critiques, as he is obviously well versed and an expert within his field of study. However, I will say that this approach may not be questioned as inappropriate decorum regarding the Indigenous sharing of ideas. Wilson (2008) mentions that critiquing the work of others does not fit within an Indigenous framework, as it is not congruent with the principle of relational accountability within an Indigenous axiology (p. 43.). In the Western paradigm, students are challenged to find fault (within prescribed parameters), the missing link, or the weak link in other's work. They are expected to question, argue, challenge, critique, and use these adjectives in reference to the work of their peers. This makes room for the faulty assumption that if one can find fault with others, then one's own work will look better. There must be a winner and a loser; however, this type of approach in an Indigenous paradigm could be considered disrespectful and uncouth (Wilson, 2001, p. 57).

It does seem counterintuitive and a little humorous to critique Dr. Gone's critiques, as it can elicit combative language that is often frowned upon in Indigenous ways of communicating. To respond in a similar fashion would be outside of the Indigenous framework and enter into a western framework where these types of dialogue are expected and encouraged.

In comment to Dr. Gone's critiques, I describe IRMs and the need for them in a respectful conversational tone. I choose to visit about them rather than debate, debunk, or critique. With this in mind, the question arises, "how can one, outside of relationship and context, understand the work of a person when their whole journey of how their work came to be is not in view?" Without relationship and context, the view of one's work is severely limited, how can I properly address his work from an Indigenous paradigm when I do not have elements of a relationship with him?

Grande (2004) describes a discourse of conquest or rhetorical imperialism, which is the ability of those in power to assert control of others by setting the terms of a debate. She says, "To argue on behalf of Indigenous nationhood within the dominant western paradigm is self-defeating" (p. 57). I would like to adapt her quote and say that "to argue on behalf of IRMs within the dominant western paradigm is self-defeating." This reframing reflects a need for Indigenous researchers to use an Indigenous research paradigm.

So, rather than engage in an exchange of words on a proverbial field of battle where we are assured defeat, let us forge onward and continue to set the terms of our own discourse as Indigenous researchers. I believe that we should continue to conduct research from an Indigenous paradigm with Indigenous ontology, epistemology, and axiology, within academia and institutions of higher education that prepare the next generation of educators and education leaders who will serve Native America's future generations.

Conclusion

We offer four unique perspectives, specifically in an attempt to thwart the dangers of essentializing Indigenous identity and perspective. In presenting the importance of lived experiences and self locations, we present the importance of emphasizing "Form and Findings." We collectively refute the idea that being Indigenous and doing research with Indigenous communities is an undeviating experience and honor the importance of relationships in our work. We are in a unique position to share the perspectives of different scholar/identity locations that have evaluated *Indigenous Methodologies in Educational Research* and subsequently speak in a way that aligns with Tuck and Yang (2012) "so that settler colonial structuring and Indigenous critiques of that structuring are no longer rendered invisible" (p. 3).

In participating in Indigenous research, we all (Indigenous and non-Indigenous alike) must accept the knowledge keepers' resistance, reluctance, and refusal, to share knowledge, support the protective nature of community as it relates to people, and trust that time, space, and context are out of our hands. In short, some knowledge is not for the academy. The ethical implications of this are substantial. If the community does not want information shared, how can Indigenous knowledge keepers simultaneously protect it and pass it on? The answer is . . . the same way it has been done in the past. We refuse to offer examples in the spirit of Indigenous peoples retaining their knowledge, for if we were to offer examples, some "Western knowers" with the intent of gaining access for their own financial gain and professional prestige may read this as they are simultaneously looking for ways to access Indigenous knowledge. Academic freedom as enjoyed by scholars is something that needs to be considered differently within the Indigenous paradigm.

We are not convinced that the romantic notions of work within Indigenous communities are reason enough to engage in the work as the dangers of historicizing, generalizing, and romanticizing, Indigenous peoples lie in the dehumanization of Indigenous community. In the past, researchers have referred to Indigenous peoples as "subjects," "respondents," "they," "them," and so on. This is the crux of inappropriate decorum and serves to remove Indigenous legitimacy in scholarship. It is time to flip the script and create spaces of "aspiring allies," Apsáalooke, Sqelix^{w}, Nakóna, and others, using vernacular that is inclusive such as "we," "our," "our relatives," "our relations," "our boys," "our girls," "our elders," and so on, and one day we hope that there are enough Indigenous researchers, able to do this in a way that centers research within Indigenous paradigms to the degree that it is done in multiple Indigenous languages thus asking questions and finding answers that are relevant to Indigenous communities.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Sweeney Windchief http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9792-4370

Notes

1. A reference that speaks to relational accountability. The authors are critiquing the academic work and delivery as opposed to critiquing the scholars who provide academic inquiry.
2. An expression for North America used by some Indigenous peoples.
3. A self-identified lesbian/two spirit who is not only a product of but strongly identifies with an Indian Reservation and or tribal community.
4. Communicating in a way that protects community-held knowledge.
5. Sqelix^{w} is the linguistic identification for both the Seliš (Salish) and Qlispé (Pend d'Oreille) tribes, who are Salishan-speaking tribes and now reside primarily on The Flathead Reservation.
6. Atwen is Tony in the Sqelix^{w} language as the Sqelix^{w} language does not contain the same letters and sounds as English.

References

Archibald, J. A. (2008). *Indigenous storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body, and spirit*. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.

Asante, M. (2010). Foreward. In G. J. Sefa Dei (Ed.), *Teaching Africa: Toward a transgressive pedagogy* (pp. vii-xvi). London, England: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-5771-7

Ball, J., & Janyst, P. (2008). Enacting research ethics in partnerships with Indigenous communities in Canada: "Do it in a good way." *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, *3*, 33-51.

Battiste, M. (2011). *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision*. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.

Bennett, J. M. (2008). On becoming a global soul: A path to engagement during study abroad. In V. Savicki (Ed.), *Developing intercultural competence and transformation: Theory, research, and application in international education* (pp. 13-31). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Bird, C. P, Lee, T., & Lopez, N. (2013). Leadership and accountability in American Indian education: Voices from New Mexico. *American Journal of Education*, *119*, 539-564.

Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review*, *37*, 425-446.

Brayboy, B. M. J., Gough, H. R., Leonard, B., Roehl, R. F., & Solyom, J. A. (2012). Reclaiming scholarship: Critical Indigenous research methodologies. In S. D. Lapan, M. T. Quartaroli, & F. J. Reimer (Eds.), *Qualitative research: An introduction to methods and designs* (pp. 423-450). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brock-Utne, B. (2012). Language and inequality: Global challenges to education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *42*, 773-793.

Burchill, M., Pyett, P., & Kelly, S. (2011). Reflections on aboriginalising the research process: "Hunting and gathering" as a focus group methodology. *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies*, *4*, 29-39.

Castiano, J., & Mkabela, Q. (2014). Towards an argumentative dialogue between local knowledge and official school curriculum: A case of local curriculum in Mozambique. *Indilinga: African Journal of Indigenous Knowledge Systems*, *13*, 28-40.

Chilisa, B. (2005). Educational research within postcolonial Africa: A critique of HIV/AIDS research in Botswana. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *18*, 659-684.

Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous research methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Crosby, M. (2002). Construction of the imaginary Indian. In J. Giltrow (Ed.), *Academic reading: Reading and writing across the disciplines* (pp. 488-498). Peterborough, Ontario, Canada: Broadview Press.

Gegeo, D. W., & Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2002). Whose knowledge? Epistemological collisions in Soloman Islands community development. *The Contemporary Pacific*, *14*, 377-409.

Gone, J. P. (2014, October). *Considering Indigenous research methodologies: Critical reflections by an Indigenous knower*. Symposium conducted at the annual conference of the American Indigenous Research Association held at the Salish Kootenai College in Pablo, MT.

Grande, S. (2000). American Indian identity and intellectualism: The quest for a new red pedagogy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *13*, 343-359.

Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought* (1st ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E., Owen, J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Utsey, S. O. (2013). Cultural humility: Measuring openness to culturally diverse clients. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *60*, 353-356.

Johansen, B. E. (2004). Back from the (nearly) dead: Reviving indigenous languages across North America. *American Indian Quarterly*, *28*, 566-582.

Kirkness, V. J., & Barnhardt, R. (2001). First nations and higher education: The four Rs—respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility. *Journal of American Indian Education*, *30*(3), 1-15.

Klug, B. J. (2012a). Falling from grace. In B. J. Klug (Ed.), *Standing together: American Indian education as culturally relevant pedagogy* (pp. 71-86). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Klug, B. J. (2012b). *Standing together: American Indian Education as culturally relevant pedagogy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kovach, M. (2010). Conversational method in Indigenous research. *First Peoples Child & Family Review*, *5*, 40-45.

Kovach, M. (2013, October 12). *Indigenous methodologies*. Address presented at American Indigenous Research Association, Salish Kootenai College, Pablo, MT.

Lambert, L. (2014). *Research for Indigenous survival: Indigenous research methodologies in the behavioral sciences*. Pablo, MT: Salish Kootenai College Press.

LaVeaux, D., & Christopher, S. (2009). Contextualizing CBPR: Key principles of CBPR meet the Indigenous research context. *Pimatisiwin*, *7*(1), 1.

Louis, R. P. (2007). Can you hear us now? Voices from the margin: Using Indigenous methodologies in geographic research. *Geographical Research*, *45*, 130-139.

Ormiston, N. T. (2010). Re-conceptualizing research: An Indigenous perspective. *First Peoples Child & Family Review*, *5*, 50-56.

Pallas, A. M. (2001). Preparing education doctoral students for epistemological diversity. *Educational Researcher*, *30*(5), 1-6.

Sefa Dei, G. J. (2010). *Teaching Africa: Toward a transgressive pedagogy*. London, England: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-5771-7

Sium, A., & Ritskes, E. (2013). Speaking truth to power: Indigenous storytelling as an act of living resistance. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *2*, 1-10.

Smith, L. T. (2013). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). London, England: Zed Books.

Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, *79*, 409-428.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*, 1-40.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2014). *Teaching and learning: Achieving quality for all* (Education for All Global Monitoring Report). Paris, France: Author.

Wainer, J., & Chesters, J. (2000). Rural mental health: Neither romanticism nor despair. *Australian Journal of Rural Health*, *8*, 141-147.

wa Thiong'o, N. (1981). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literatures*. London, England: James Currey.

Wilson, S. (2001). What is an Indigenous research methodology? *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, *25*, 175-179.

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Black Point, Nova Scotia, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.

Woolman, D. C. (2001). Educational reconstruction and postcolonial curriculum development: A comparative study of four African countries. *International Education Journal*, *2*, 27-46.

Writer, J. H. (2012). The savage within. In B. J. Klug (Ed.), *Standing together: American Indian education as culturally relevant pedagogy* (pp. 55-70). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Author Biographies

Sweeney Windchief (Assiniboine) is an assistant professor in the Department of Education at Montana State University. He received his EdD in Educational Leadership and Policy from the University of Utah in 2011 and has recently been working on community informed Indigenous research.

Cheryl Polacek is the athletic director of the Health and Wellness Center at Little Bighorn College. She received her PhD in Adult and Higher Education at Montana State University in 2017. Her research has focused on Indigenous students in higher education.

Michael Munson currently serves as faculty at Salish Kootenai College. She recently graduated with her doctorate in the Indian Leadership Education and Development (I LEAD) program at Montana State University, and her work is connected to language, culture, and identity revitalization with her Sqelix^{w} tribal communities.

Mary Ulrich is the director of Workforce Development and Career Readiness at the Dona Ana Community College of New Mexico State University. She received her PhD in Adult and Higher Education at Montana State University in 2016. Her recent research is on the capacities of engaged scholars to work in reciprocal and respectful ways with African indigenous communities.

Jason D. Cummins (*Awaachia'ookaate*), is an enrolled member of the Apsaalooke Nation and an administrator at Crow Agency Public School; he is currently a doctoral candidate utilizing Indigenous research methodologies in his research.