FOOTPRINT IN THE SAND:

A DISCUSSION ON INDIGENOUS AND NON-INDIGENOUS RESEARCH COLLABORATION

https://www.indigenous.ncrm.ac.uk/resources/footprint-in-the-sand-a-discussion-on-indigenous-and-non-indigenous-research-methods/

Transcript of an audio discussion about developing effective collaborations between Indigenous and non Indigenous researchers, part of an international collaboration initiative funded by UK Research and Innovation through the ESRC National Centre for Research Methods.

Participants: *Christine Garrington* (Interviewer, Maltstore Communications), *Rosalind Edwards* (University of Southampton), *Helen Moewaka Barnes* (Massey University), *Tula Brannelly* (Bournemouth University), and *Deborah McGregor* (York University).

Interviewer: Welcome to Footprint in the Sand, a discussion about developing effective collaborations between indigenous and non-indigenous researchers. Our panel are Helen Moewaka Barnes, Deborah McGregor, Ros Edwards and Tula Brannelly who share their thoughts and experiences on good and bad practice.

Ros: Oh hi, I'm Ros Edwards, my family has got roots in East and South Europe, and they arrived in the UK after they were sort of driven out from their original countries. I do feel very English though. I became interested in indigenous methodologies when I was in New Zealand on a visiting scholarship. Intellectually and personally as well, that was quite a challenging experience, because many of the institutionalised sort of academic approaches to research practice that I just took for granted, they were being called into question and so I felt upside down, not just globally, but mentally as well. But that said, I also felt very excited by the possibility of a different sort of research partnership and it was actually a research partnership which was offered very generously by indigenous researchers who I'd got to know in New Zealand. And it's an approach that works with indigenous researchers rather than trying to appropriate from them.

Helen: [Introduction in Te Reo Māori.]
Ko Mahuhukiterangi te waka
Ko Whiti te tupuna
Titiro iho ana ki tana pa tumoana, ko Motukura
Ko Kapowai te maunga
Ko Waikare te awa
Ko Turuki te marae
Ko Te Kapotai te hapu
Ko Ngapuhi te iwi
I'm Helen Moewaka Barnes, and I'm a researcher from Aotearoa New Zealand. I work for Māori, who are the indigenous people of Aotearoa, New Zealand. The work that we do is highly relational. Usually when we first meet, we make connections, so we ask, "Ko wai koe?" – "Who are you?" or "Where are you from?", literally meaning, "Whose waters are

you from?" The introduction that I provided in Te Reo Māori, in the Māori language, is specific to my particular area, to my hapu, my sub-tribe, and to the people of that particular marae, or gathering place. It locates me in relation to an ancestor, a waka, which is a type of ocean-going vessel, a large canoe, my river, my mountain and the marae, my gathering place, the sub-tribe and my tribe. In making these connections, we establish not just the relationships and who we are and where we're from, but also our accountabilities and our commitments. So, who I am and where I'm from determines my role, it determines what I can contribute, when I step forward and when I step back. My connections aren't just of a moment or developed for a specific research project; by continuous relationships with ancestors and the generations to come, as well as the people we're connecting with in the present day. So, our participation in research occurs within this on-going context. It moves beyond discrete projects and individuals. It determines how I conduct myself. This has implications across time and space, not just what I contribute, but how I go about it. Not what I take away, but importantly, what I leave behind.

Tula: Hi, my name's Tula Brannelly. I identify as Irish and I hold an Irish European passport, and a New Zealand passport as I was born and brought up in the UK, but I lived in New Zealand for 10 years. My Irish roots mean that I have an appreciation of the implications of colonisation and an awareness of the fight for freedom and recognition. Working in mental health, it's possible to see how people wear the consequences of poor treatment and oppression for a long time. When I moved to New Zealand, I was explicitly interested in working with Māori and expected to develop my knowledge about colonisation and its direct impact on mental health. In my research I found that I was carried by willing Māori collaborators. When I felt out of my depth in terms of my political knowledge and awareness of how I may be operating, unknowingly reinforcing or suggesting colonial or oppressive practices, I had to think very carefully about how to approach hui – meetings – and how I conducted myself. I really valued being cared for and nourished to help me understand what I brought that supported or challenged a shared understanding of social justice. My freedom to take up citizenship of other countries is a good reminder of my own privilege.

Deborah: (Introduction in Anishinaabemowin)
Aanii/Boozhoo (Greetings). Deborah McGregor ndi-zhinikaaz (my name). Mkwa (bear) ndoodem (clan). Whitefish River First Nation ndoo-njibaa (where I am from). Anishinaabe kwe ndaaw (I am Anishinaabe-woman).
I am an Anishinaabek from the Great Lakes area. I live and work in my traditional territories. My research is informed by my ancestors, family, community, nation and the lands and waters are relatives that I come from and continue to work for. I am motivated by my respect for the people and my desire to ensure future generations can enjoy the mino-bimaadiziwin, which is a good life.

Interviewer: So first and foremost, Ros and Tula, in your introductions, you talk about feeling turned upside down and the need to tread carefully when looking to work with indigenous researchers whilst you spent time in New Zealand. I wonder what you learn from those experiences. Ros, can you kick us off?

Ros: Stepping outside of my comfort zone. That was a sort of personally and methodologically, that was a learning process and it brought me up against different perspectives on research issues that were challenging in a good way. So I found that what is a priority may be different. So, for example, I have never seen a UK institutional ethical approval enquiry, you know, routinely enquire if you've consulted with the relevant communities. That would be a priority in New Zealand, for example. And also, substantively for you to sort of turn around the other way, so you're not focusing necessarily on people who are lacking in some way, but you turn around and you look at the privilege and how that is creating that situation of marginalisation. I also learnt that personal relationships and trust are important, you know, it's not necessarily your professional expertise and standing that is

the basis for a collaborative relationship. You know, those personal relationships and trust take time to develop with effort and with good will. So I learnt that a collaborative relationship is not a quick fix.

Tula: I mean, often in our sort of roles as academics, we're told that we are experts and that we should be displaying kind of expertise all the time. And instead of that what we need to do is adopt a kind of vulnerability position and say that we're really open to being educated and shown a different kind of way of doing things. That's part of that relational work that goes on, so being able to demonstrate that or invite people in to support you to learn how to do things differently.

Interviewer: So Helen and Deborah, let's talk a bit now about some of the sort of historical context that's at play here. Helen, perhaps you could start by talking us through some of the sort of the key things from the Māori perspective.

Helen: There has been a lot of discussion, I think, and a lot of things written around colonisation and the damage that colonisation has done, and how it's an on-going process; it's not something that started and ended. You know, the structures, the power, the way that cultures have been decimated or attempted decimation of cultures – that remains, and it remains as a legacy. But it also remains as an on-going process in terms of the governments that are in place, the kind of assumed universal cultures and norms of any particular country, and all the power and financial and value systems, institutions. And so when we come to any relationship or any particular process, we have very, very different experiences. So the common things talked about in research is about research being done on Māori, Māori as subjects, about people coming into communities or coming to a subject and harvesting knowledge and taking it away and then the indigenous people not being particularly involved. And sometimes that information comes back as very negative, damaging, deficit-focused and framed research and findings. It's not just something that's happened in the past, we've had quotes from people in the ministries in the relatively recent time, talking about harvesting Māori knowledge. And then Māori become essentialised as well, but our languages and our culture and our knowledge is seen as fitting in a particular frame, and often that's the pre-colonisation frame. So that's the only kind of knowledge that we supposedly have a right to name and claim. So we don't see science as being indigenous; we see that as being something Western. Whereas obviously Western people have named and claimed knowledge from all over the world. And we have a right to develop our own knowledge systems, and we have used science throughout our survival and throughout our history and throughout our lives for generations. So science and research are a part of our knowledge and our history, from the past through to the present day. But colonisation often tends to look at that as being a particular thing belonging to the West that then needs to be taught to indigenous people as opposed to us developing our own knowledge systems and having the power to name and determine and to practise our own science.

Deborah: The broader paradigm is indigenous peoples are this problem that needs to be solved and we need, apparently, all these other people to help us do that. But a specific example in Canada of colonial research, one that came to light during the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, a series of experiments that were done on children that were in the schools, nutrition experiments, essentially starving some children in the schools, no consent from the parents, parents had no idea that this was happening, to figure out what the children could live on, because the schools were state-funded and they were always trying to save money. Essentially it was government supporting university researchers to do this. There was no benefit whatsoever to the communities. There had been others who were advocating, saying this was a grossly inappropriate process, but those concerns were completely ignored. So that's unfortunately a pretty gross example but one that happened, that came to light during the Truth and Reconciliation Commission research that was undertaken.

Interviewer: I want to ask you all now really what you think, I mean, I think in some respects we've hinted at it already, but what the dangers are that are inherent in researchers from predominantly Western cultures and with Western academic research backgrounds trying to enter into partnership with indigenous researchers and peoples. I want to start off with Ros, if I may.

Ros: Well, obviously I'm talking from a non-indigenous perspective here about the risks. So I suppose actually some non-indigenous researchers may see it as a risk to themselves, as a risk to their expertise. It is a sort of expertise to open yourself up, if you like, rather than be asserting your authority. In collaborations, so if you are going to sort of be asserting yourself as the authoritative expert, then the biggest risk, I should imagine, is that you're getting it very wrong and perpetuating the sort of misleading and deficit ideas that Helen and Deborah have been talking about. And even more importantly, you're not actually going to be addressing the real issue that would help communities rectify and societies rectify inequalities.

Helen: One of the risks is that it's simply a waste of time and money, and of course, most of our research would be public-funded, so if that money's being spent on research that doesn't make any difference, then that's a risk to everybody. It's a risk to the whole country. The other thing is I think it's a risk to the wellbeing of the people involved if it's not done well, and that damage is usually accrued to the indigenous people involved in the research. And, you know, it's a risk that if we don't make a difference, we often tend to actually make things worse. How you come to the relationship, how you position that power, how you position the relationships between indigenous and non-indigenous people and between the different knowledge systems, determines really very strongly how that research is going to be designed, how the processes are going to be, how the findings are going to be interpreted, through whose eyes and in what way? So is it going to be deficit-framing? Is it going to be positioning indigenous people as a problem who are being helped by non-indigenous people? And that kind of positioning often sees Māori, for example, as being the vulnerable population that we need to protect, we need to help them, we need to try and solve their problems. So it perpetuates power imbalances and it perpetuates stereotypes. You know, we're not just people who are vulnerable and fragile and who need to be protected. To understand power, you have to understand and value both knowledge systems and the strengths that both groups bring to it, and if you don't do that, you just perpetuate this idea of indigenous people as needing to be helped, and who don't have the ability to determine our own lives.

Deborah: I find that non-indigenous students tend not to know themselves. I mean, this is true of researchers as well. They don't think that it's part of their process to make themselves known the way that indigenous peoples are having to make themselves known, including researchers in a research process. And what I mean by that is they don't know their own bias; they don't know their own privilege. Like, in Canada, people will say, "Oh well, I'm settler-Canadian," and go on for 10 minutes about all their privilege because they've become really good at doing that, it's all kind of the rage right now. But they have no idea how to account for it in research. The frame of reference is always Western, so that becomes that by which indigenous peoples, even in knowledge systems, everything else is then compared. I remind them that indigenous peoples were here for thousands of years and we had our own modes of inquiry and validating our own ways and if we had problems, our own ways of solving them, and that's the appropriate frame of reference, and the other stuff is the new stuff. You completely unsettle people when you do that. When everything that they think that they know to be true and that they operate from, I come along and say, "Well actually, that's kind of new; our stuff's been here a lot longer and it stood the test of time, so you have to be accountable to us, rather than the other way around," and that can be really problematic. It doesn't take much for there to have been trust and then mistrust. And if there has been harm, it's really, really challenging to undo that. It's probably billions of dollars over time, of the amount of research that's been directed (funded) to try to solve the 'indigenous problem'. But meanwhile, in reality, the

lived experience of people is still not a good situation. All of that research and all that problem definition happening through others and all the work ocurring hasn't done much. I don't know what people (researchers) would do if indigenous people didn't exist and have some problems. Like, I don't know what questions they would have or research that they would do. People also have done really good research as well in partnership or that has been led by indigenous peoples. I mean, clearly there's a lot of room for partnership and collaboration.

Tula: Institutions are clearly problematic in terms of their framing of how things go. I think where people turn up and try to kind of present themselves as a naïve outsider who can wander in and kind of do their bit of research and go away again, really need to understand that there's so much more that precedes their relationship in this way. That they need to raise some awareness around that, otherwise they do completely miss the point. I do think that researchers need to understand that they are going into a situation which holds this presence, this legacy that they are then going to be negotiating. For me as a Pākehā, a non-indigenous researcher, part of that was understanding that there are the long-term impacts and harms of colonisation that are on-going, and understanding where my privilege comes from in terms of, like, where am I from in the world and what is my background and, you know, where colonisation has come from and how it's impacted. And having to own some of that legacy, even though I'm not directly responsible for it.

Interviewer: Indeed, so we talked about some of the dangers inherent in researchers from Western cultures and Western academic research backgrounds trying to enter into partnerships. So how does that actually play out in reality? I wonder if you can all sort of share some of your own experiences?

Helen: For me, it's an everyday thing that we grapple with. You know, we have put in funding projects where we've had very strong partnerships with indigenous led projects, working with multiple communities, and not got funding, and seen non-indigenous people get funded for very similar projects and then they can't carry out the work because they don't have the relationships. So that indicates what's valued and what's not valued. People might look at a research project and see some real harm or damage that was done and go, "Oh, I'd never do that," but in our own ways, every day we can perpetuate things that make things difficult and hard and not positive experiences often for indigenous people involved in the research. Projects that I'm involved in where people with the best will in the world want to work with indigenous communities and want their work to look at power and to make a difference, but they really don't know how to step out of their comfort zones. And so you spend all this time draining your energies and questioning, "What's the value of me being involved in this research? How much time am I spending talking to non-indigenous people that I could be spending time on other things?" Some of our Pākehā people who are what we basically call the Crown partners, not necessarily just white people, but the non-Māori people in this country, Pākehā – you see them come into marae, into our gathering places, to talk to us about research, and you can just see and hear the assumptions that they make around who they're talking to and what the knowledge is of those people, and how they position the knowledge of those people. And you can see the struggles and the anger often that's held back in those kind of encounters, where we can be incredibly kind to people and we play nice so much of the time. And then if we don't play nice, we're seen as being the difficult Māori, the person who says no, the person who stands in the way of progress or who stands in the way of these researchers doing their work, and you get this resentment. Or you get people thinking that the communities don't care about the issue or the problem because they actually don't want to work with those Pākehā researchers.

Deborah: Communities, they don't have to do it, they can say no. And that causes an unbelievable amount of stress and anxiety, I find, in a lot of our colleagues and students, because they just assume that indigenous people should be as thrilled about the research question as

they are. And I've actually even had a student who, when a community didn't want to do the research, who wanted me to intervene to make them do the research. And I said, "No," because they can say no, they don't have to do this. But then there's this perception of these uncooperative kind of people as opposed to that the consideration again that the researcher may have been the problem. I mean, I also think that there is value in partnerships, I think as long as the indigenous communities and people are self-determining within it. I always just try to say, "It's a proposal, nothing bad is going to happen because it changed." So there has to still be this place for self-determination, for people to have questions, for people to change their mind and not get labelled in a negative way. Because a lot of times, the research, even if it is partnership and collaborative, isn't the community's idea. The researcher's stuck within this institution that's still very colonial and thinks about knowledge in very particular ways and rewards certain kind of behaviour and outputs and deliverables, compared to what the communities actually might need.

Tula: I was applying for a grant and thought, "I need indigenous partners in this, so who shall I phone and what shall I do?" And I think there was very little advice. When I went looking for information, which there is on the Research Council site and things, it was all very generic and I didn't feel like it gave me a lot of steer about who to approach or how to start really, never mind what to do when I got there. In Helen's introduction, she talked about stepping forward and stepping back, and I think that's a really key thing for researchers to think about is, "So when I start to do this partnership work, at which points should I step forward and step back?" And I think that's a really good framing for researchers to think about how to start that kind of negotiation. But I have to say that all of the work that I did, which was research projects, I was also supervising students and working in education in partnership with Māori as well, doing service-user involvement in education in mental health and all of it was a complete ball. Like, I loved it. And I did absolutely get those kindnesses that Helen was talking about and people invited me in, they were very understanding, they were gentle, they allowed me to fumble about and kind of make some mistakes, but also to be open and vulnerable. And I think once you show that you're a person who is willing to engage and be present and listen and understand, that people really do actually really let you in, but beyond that, warmly invite you into communities which are amazing. And I had a fantastic time, and I loved going to hui and the marae and being brought into places where sometimes I was the only white person and treated really, really well. And doing quality research, I think, along the way.

Interviewer: A couple of the things that Helen and Deborah both mentioned along the way is that how important it is to remember that indigenous researchers have their own long-established research methods. So what are the sort of key things about the methods that need to be remembered? Deb, perhaps you'd like to kick us off here?

Deborah: My default position would be for the communities to decide that for themselves. In my own work, I speak about what I call a knowledge-sharing paradigm as opposed to the knowledge-extracted paradigm, which is kind of what communities tend to experience. Typically people would go in and want to do this research indigenous knowledge, kind of research in communities. They might design a survey, which in my opinion is the worst way to ever do that kind of research, because you're constraining knowledge, thousands of years old knowledge that operated in the system and supported societies. They might go in and identify 20 of the most knowledgeable people and then go interview them, and they could use the fanciest methods ever to do this, record it. An indigenous method would be, "This is really fascinating that these people are coming in and they want to know about our knowledge and we're coming in and we're talking to this person with their microphone and their video-recorder, but really who we want to share this with is our own communities and with youth". With the knowledge-sharing one, we bring youth and others together with community. Because generally knowledge was shared often in a family kind of context, so it was multi-generational, and shared within that context, so that, yeah, as a researcher, I'm still getting what I might need for whatever reason. Like

right now I'm doing work like this actually for Chiefs of Ontario so I'm having to meet what they need for their requirements, but at the same time, this is what elders have said and communities have said, how they want to share directly with you. So I'm still getting what I need in this framework but it's actually sharing knowledge within the community itself. And they'll decide what it is that's going to go external or not external to the community, and they'll decide how they then want that represented. It may be that that's fine, having this opportunity to share this over time with each other and ideally as much as possible in the language. Even if First Nations are given that opportunity, I had my quotes there, that still gets translated and there's nothing ever that translates perfectly over. So, to me, that's kind of like a difference.

Helen: Māori, and indeed all indigenous peoples have long-established scientific processes of inquiry. So science is something that we have always used to generate knowledge. So there are some things that people might identify more as Māori methods and those are the kinds of things people might see as being different. But it's not just about difference, You know, that we have the right to be as a collective, as adoptive, as adaptive and as strategic as non-Western science and non-Western researchers. And here in Aotearoa, we have Kaupapa Māori research, which has really provided a space for Māori to be Māori. But in terms of the academy, when people talk about Kaupapa Māori, some people have some quite specific things that they think are features of it, but it's very broad and it's very eclectic and I think it enables us to make that space and to work out what it means for us and our processes and the way in which we work. I think the general things that people would see as features of Kaupapa Māori is that it's about being Māori, that it has a sense of collectivity, so collective processes and collective purposes, but that doesn't necessarily mean it's going to be qualitative research, or it's going to be done in particular ways. But the methods need to suit the purpose of that research. Sometimes people will only think we have a right to name and claim those things that they see as being different from Western research and you'll start talking about particular ways of doing things and they'll say, "Oh, but that's just grounded theory," or, "That's just participatory research." But I think the critical thing is going back to perhaps we have called point of reference or we might call them Māori world views, is that when particular methods are done within a Western scientific paradigm, it's done in a particular way and it's done within that particular sense of identity. When it's taken into a Māori paradigm or a Māori frame of reference, then regardless of what the method might be or what the method might be called, it becomes Māori research, and for us it becomes Kaupapa Māori research. So, we can do a whole range of methods, but the way in which we do it, the types of collectivity and identity and strategic intent and the processes and the relationships are, I think, what makes it Kaupapa Māori.

Interviewer: Tula, did your experiences in New Zealand get you thinking differently about methods, about research methods?

Tula: One of the things that you need to do as a non-indigenous researcher working in partnerships is to understand that there's absolutely a limit to a non-indigenous researcher's understanding, for example, of what Kaupapa Māori research is about. You can bring something to the relationship and to the research, but you just need to understand that what constitutes being informed enough about what's going on and that you're never going to fully understand. You don't speak the language, you don't understand the concepts, or the concepts can't be translated or aren't translatable into a Western world-view. So there's just what being, you know, what constitutes being informed enough about what's going on. I mean, the thing for me was that I'm a participatory methodologist, so that's generally what I use and that, I think, offered some, at least a way in for people to see that I was interested in understanding multiple perspectives and open to the collective. And so that echoed or had some resonances with the things that were valued by the people who I was going to work with in their world-view, so I think that opened a door at least.

Ros: What I've gained from chatting with people and reading and so on is that actually, you know, there's methods and methods that you know, talking, walking, seeing, counting, those sorts of things. You know, as Helen mentioned, you could come in and say, "That's just grounded theory," as she said, or, "That's just like an interview or a focus group," or whatever, but that's actually not the point as I understand it. It's the how and the why that they're used and what I find fascinating is how those methods of finding out things about the world and passing on knowledge about the world are actually rooted in a much broader and established system of knowledge and thinking about the world. So that's the bit I find quite exciting actually.

Interviewer: We've talked about the challenges and differences, we've alluded to some of the positives as well, but I want to ask you all really; what can be gained from really good partnerships or collaborations between non-indigenous and indigenous researchers and groups? And what you think those good collaborations look like?

Tula: There's something about creating solidarity, so there's something about working to the aims and preferences of the people or the community that you're working with and having the space for those to emerge through research projects. Going in with an opportunity to open the conversation and to start a new path, I think that really works. And part of that is about finding mutual benefits, so why is the partnership attractive to the people who are involved in it? What is everybody going to get out of it? And how can that be leveraged? What is it that the people within the community actually want to happen? And trying to find those kind of mutual benefits or having the opportunity to change and the potential to kind of make things different as you go, in order to meet the needs of people. There's something about this problem of extraction and having a respect for indigenous knowledge and who has access to that and what level of access that should be. Making sure that you don't go in thinking that you're going to just kind of turn up and take – we call it quick and dirty research elsewhere – but that is absolutely not what's going to happen going into communities. The thing that happened for me was creating a really critical and friendly exchange, that reviews how the partnership progressed. One of the things that I found working with Māori particularly, was that there's an absolute honesty and it kind of reminds me of my big Irish family as well, but there's an absolute honesty, so everything is on the table. If you're not doing something or if you're doing something that people don't like, it was out on the table. People were very upfront and honest about that in a critical but very friendly way. So in a kind way, but something which didn't let anything pass that people didn't want to happen. And that was very reassuring, because it meant that I knew that people weren't letting me just do stuff that was problematic in any way. People were stopping me and going, "No, no, this doesn't work here," and that was a good thing. And lastly, I'll just say, what is the potential for transformation through the partnership? Whose transformations might it be? And how might that be attained? So often when we're applying for grants and funding, it doesn't give us a lot of scope to write in change and transformation along the way in research projects. We sort of have to pretend that we know what the outcomes are going to be in order to create the impacts and things. And it would be much more beneficial really if we could create some space there for that potential for transformation for change to come through the relationship and through the research and make that happen on the ground.

Helen: It is very much, I think, about the people who are involved and where they're coming from, and I think that's one of the things that we look at first of all is; who is this person? Do they know themselves? What's their agenda? What do they want? And we have a saying, ngākau tapatahi, which is a one-sided heart, so it's kind of looking through inside that person and seeing who they are, do they know themselves? What's their agenda? What do they want to get out of this? And are they being honest about this and do they really understand that as well? We can do thousands, unlimited numbers of topics of research that could be useful, but if you don't have the right processes and people, the agendas, the Kaupapa, then it won't make a difference. So it's not just about understanding the supposed 'other' which is sometimes what people think of, I think, with cultural safety

and cultural competency that if you learn a way of behaving or if you learn the language, that you'll be safe and able to work with people from other cultures. People from ministries and institutions and academics will come and go, but those people in those communities will remain, and if they're not there in person, what they know and what they understand, and their experiences will be passed down through generations. And so, it's understanding if there's a commitment from people within particular ministries or institutions, is that commitment with that person, because if they go, what will happen and will the promises be broken? The most positive experiences I've had is when it's been a Kaupapa set by Māori communities, things that they want to achieve and then the call goes out and people gather around that particular Kaupapa or agenda or aspiration and come on as partners. Non-indigenous people don't determine or lead what's going on, but they join and they contribute to what's happening. And that, I think, is where the most creative things happen as well, things that people can't expect or, as was said before, you can't necessarily write into a research proposal. When people come together with their own knowledge and their own expertise, but respecting and understanding this is a space where new things might emerge, through the joining and the contributions of everybody involved. Where people step forward and step back at particular times depending on their knowledge, their roles, and their skills, all working to a common purpose. And that's where I've seen the most positive things happen in transformation with Māori agendas of what Māori want to achieve.

Deborah: In Ontario we have treaties and the treaties lay out the obligations of the treaty partners, so settlers and non-indigenous people, so to me, I see part of the research as fulfilling those obligations to people. They require certain kind of conduct and behaviour from people. Increasingly, indigenous communities and organisations are developing their own protocols, because they still remain unhappy. Researchers, whoever they are, indigenous or non-indigenous, have to comply and respect those different protocols. One of the ones that I like is one that's on Manitoulin Island for Anishinaabek communities and embedded within it is the teachings of the seven original teachings, or seven grandmother teachings, and one of them is love. So, they have to answer the question, "How does their research show love for future generations?" and the elders review any proposal coming in and your proposal has to be able to answer that question. Not too many protocols have that as a requirement. If people know you and trust you and feel comfortable, like they will hold you accountable. There's a lot of work to get to the point where people trust the relationship enough that it's going to withstand mistakes, it's going to withstand conflict, it's going to withstand all those ups and downs that humans have.

Helen: We take big risks as indigenous people when we bring others into our research project, when we bring non-indigenous people in. Because basically what we're saying is, "This person is to be trusted," and that person comes in under our protection basically. I remember working on one project and I was stressing out because I was trying to get all the right people together and to develop this process and relationships and a Pākehā, a non-indigenous colleague said to me, "Well, you're doing everything you can and you're doing the best you can and if it doesn't work out, you'll know that you tried". I said, "Not working out is not an option. If it doesn't work out I'm going to have to hide under the bed for several years or emigrate, because they know my mother, they know my grandparents, they know, now, my children and generations to come". So it's not just about whether a project works out or doesn't work out, it's all those accountabilities through people knowing who you are, where you're connected and what it means when you are that face in that community and when you do say, "Here's a colleague that I want to bring into this project, or I think would be valuable in terms of what we're doing".

Interviewer: Lots to think about, a long way to go, Ros, but I hope some optimism in this discussion today. What do you take from it all?

Ros E: Well actually, I think it's been quite interesting doing this project with Deb and Helen and Tula. I'm hoping where we've ended up is something that was steered around what

indigenous colleagues, Helen and Deb thought would be helpful for non-indigenous researchers to know about collaboration. We've hopefully sort of developed some resources that support non-indigenous researchers to think about their processes and their assumptions and their behaviour, in the way that we've been talking about, and that this is what indigenous researchers will feel is useful for them in that respect.

Interviewer: Footprint in the Sand is a discussion between Helen Moewaka Barnes, Deborah McGregor, Ros Edwards and Tula Brannelly, who are project partners in the UKRI International Collaboration Initiative, Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Research Partnerships. You can find further information and resources on the project website at www.indigenous.ncrm.ac.uk.