CHAPTER 1

SITUATING KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS

How is it possible to decolonize (social) research in/on the non-Western developing countries to ensure that the people's human condition is not constructed through Western hegemony and ideology? Patience Elabor-Idemudia (2002, p. 231)

Our current range of research epistemologies—positivism to post-modernisms, poststructuralisms—arise out of the social history and culture of the dominant race, . . . these epistemologies reflect and reinforce that social history and that social group and this has negative results for the people of color in general and scholars of color in particular.

James J. Scheurich (1997, p. 141)

OVERVIEW



The main thrust of this chapter is that current academic research traditions are founded on the culture, history, and philosophies of Euro-Western thought and are therefore indigenous to the Western academy and its institutions. These methodologies exclude from knowledge production the knowledge systems of formerly colonized, historically marginalized, and oppressed groups, which today are most often represented as Other and fall under broad categories of non-Western, third world, developing, underdeveloped,

2 INDIGENOUS RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

First Nations, indigenous peoples, third world women, African American women, and so on. The chapter commences with discussion of some of the concepts and terms used in the book and an outline of the process and strategies for decolonizing Western-based research. I discuss two approaches in postcolonial-indigenous research methodologies—(1) decolonization and indigenization of dominant research approaches and (2) research approaches informed by a postcolonial-indigenous research paradigm along with third space methodologies. Western research paradigms, the positivist/postpositivist, interpretive, and transformative, are discussed. The chapter will demonstrate that a paradigm implies a methodological approach with a philosophical base that informs assumptions about perceptions of reality, what counts as knowledge and ways of knowing and values. The researcher's perceptions of reality, what counts as knowledge and values, have an impact on the way research questions are conceived, research approaches, data-gathering instruments, analysis, and interpretation and dissemination of research findings. The dominant Western research paradigms are critiqued from a postcolonial-indigenous research perspective. A case study that shows how methodologies can silence and exclude the views of non-Western, formerly colonized societies is presented, as well as a case study that shows an approach based on decolonization and indigenization of Euro-Western methodologies.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the end of this chapter, you should be able to:

- 1. Explain the decolonization of research process and the strategies for decolonization
- 2. Appreciate the need for researchers to interrogate the "captive" or "colonized mind" and engage in multiple epistemologies that are inclusive of voices of those who suffered colonization, the disenfranchised, and dispossessed, often represented as the Other, non-Western, third world, developing, underdeveloped, First Nations, indigenous peoples, third world women, African American women, and historically marginalized groups
- 3. Critically appreciate the influence of Euro-Western history, culture, philosophy, and theoretical perspectives on research
- 4. Compare and contrast postcolonial-indigenous paradigms and Euro-Western paradigm assumptions about the nature of reality, what counts as knowledge and ways of knowing, and value systems in research

Before You Start

Read the introductory quotations. Make a list of studies that have been conducted in your communities by yourself or other scholars. List and discuss the research approaches, methods of collecting data and methods of analysis, and dissemination of research findings in these studies, as well as their impact on policy, practice, development change, and the standard of living of the people in these communities in general.

INTRODUCTION



There is growing evidence that social science research "needs emancipation from hearing only the voices of Western Europe, emancipation from generations of silence, and emancipation from seeing the world in one color" (Guba & Lincoln, 2005, p. 212). Social science research needs to involve spirituality in research, respecting communal forms of living that are not Western and creating space for inquiries based on relational realities and forms of knowing that are predominant among the non-Western Other/s still being colonized. I have always been disturbed by the way in which the Euro-Western research process disconnects me from the multiple relations that I have with my community, the living and the nonliving. I belong to the Bantu people of Africa, who live a communal life based on a connectedness that stretches from birth to death, continues beyond death, and extends to the living and the nonliving. I am known and communicate in relational terms that connect me to all my relations, living and the nonliving. It is common for people to refer to each other using totems as well as relational terms such as *uncle*, aunt, brother, and so on. For instance, my totem is a crocodile, and depending on who is talking to me and on what occasion, I can be referred to using my totem.

The importance of connectedness and relationships is not unique to the Bantu people of southern Africa. Shawn Wilson (2008) notes that in the speech of the Aboriginal Australians, other indigenous people are referred to as cousin, brother, or auntie. Ideally, the multiple connections that indigenous scholars have with those around them and with the living and the nonliving should form part of their social history and should inform how they see the world and how they relate with the researched. Euro-Western hegemonic methodologies, however, continue to dominate how we think and conduct research.

Recently, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) approved a proposal from the Centre for Scientific Research, Indigenous and Innovative

4 ¶ INDIGENOUS RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

Knowledge (CESRIK) at the University of Botswana to conduct a survey on indigenous knowledge systems. The CESRIK committee, of which I am a member, met to discuss the approach to the survey. First, there was brainstorming on the different categories of indigenous knowledge. The next step was to discuss the approach that would be used for a survey on a given category of indigenous knowledge. Some suggested that we should conduct a workshop where academic experts on indigenous knowledge systems would give keynote presentations to an audience made up of community elders, experts in indigenous knowledge such as herbalists, members of the association of traditional healers, storytellers, and traditional leaders. Others warned that the process of knowledge production—the naming, concepts, thought analysis, sources of knowledge, and what is accepted as evidence by indigenous knowledge experts—could be different from what academic keynote speakers accept; others pointed out that the translation from English, the official language, to local languages could distort the communication even further. Still, others noted that Indigenous experts from the communities could choose not to participate in the discussion unless they were assured of a copyright on the knowledge they brought into the discussions.

These discussions point to the operation of two knowledge systems. One is Euro-Western and indigenous to the Western academy and its institutions; the other knowledge is non-Western and peripheral, and it operates with the values and belief systems of the historically colonized. This peripheral knowledge system values relationships and is suspicious of Western academic discourse and its colonizing tendencies. Paddy Ladd (2003) notes that academic discourse systems

contain [their] own unspoken rules as to what can or cannot be said and how, when and where. Each therefore, constructs cannons of truth around whatever its participants decide is "admissible evidence," a process that in the case of certain prestigious discourses, such as those found in universities, medical establishments and communication media, can be seen as particularly dangerous when unexamined, for these then come to determine what counts as knowledge. (p. 76)

As more and more scholars begin to engage with imperialism and colonialism in research, make choices on what they research, and delve into areas that colonial epistemologies dismissed as sorcery, they are confronted by the real limitations of Western hegemonic research practices, for example, ethical standards such as the principle of informed consent of the researched.

Batshi Tshireletso's study (2001) on the Mazenge cult is an example of challenges that confront researchers. Mazenge is a cult of affliction (hereditary spirits of the bush or spirits). Its membership is entirely women. In this study, Tshireletso wanted to show how the concepts of sacred space in the Mazenge cult are constructed and to establish the meanings of sacredness in the Mazenge cult. In doing this research, he was confronted by several challenges. Talking about the Mazenge cult is a public taboo. The word *Mazenge* is not supposed to be mentioned in public. Access to the Mazenge spirit medium in connection with the Mazenge cult is impossible when the medium is not in a state of being possessed. As a result, Tshireletso observes, he was unable to interview the Mazenge spirit medium. The impression one gets is that he would have talked to the spirit, even if she were possessed. The ethical principles that arise are:

- 1. Is it ethical to seek consent from one who is being possessed?
- 2. If the principal informant, the Mazenge medium, cannot be interviewed while not possessed, how can data collection about the spirit be validated?
- 3. Is it ethical to write about the researched on the basis of what others say about them?
- 4. What is the message behind the community sanction against communication with Mazenge spirit mediums?
- 5. Is there a possibility that in researching Mazenge, Tshireletso was violating Mazenge community copyrights to their knowledge?

Tshireletso's study shows how mainstream practice and interpretations of informed consent and copyright are not inclusive of the knowledge stored in rituals and practices like Mazenge. Such examples demonstrate the need for the research community to expand the boundaries of knowledge production and research practices in order to stop further abuses of fundamental human rights of the researched in historically colonized societies. These rights should include the opportunity to have a say on whether they can be written about, what can be written about them, and how it can be written and disseminated; they should also have the option of being trained to conduct the research themselves. Currently, scholars debate the following questions:

- Is the knowledge production process espoused by mainstream methodologies respectful and inclusive of all knowledge systems? Are the following inclusive of all knowledge systems:
- 1. the philosophies that underpin the research approach,
- 2. methods of collecting data,

6 **▮** INDIGENOUS RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

- 3. sources of evidence, and
- 4. the analysis, reporting, and dissemination process?
- Are First Nation peoples, indigenous peoples, peoples of all worlds that is, first world, second world, third, and fourth world, developed and developing countries, disenfranchised and dispossessed peoples—given equal rights through the research process to know, to name, to talk, and be heard?
- What are the concerns about current research methodologies?
- What challenges arise in using Western-based theory when research is carried out among those who suffered European colonial rule and slavery and are continuously being marginalized by the current research tradition?
- What are the challenges that researchers encounter in the literature that informs research on these communities?
- What do the multiple voices of scholars from across the globe say about Euro-Western research methodologies?
- How can we carry out research so that it is respectful and beneficial to the researched communities?

Most of the concerns and questions raised above are addressed in this book. It will demonstrate how scholars continue to critique Euro-Western research paradigms and advance ways of transforming them so that they are inclusive of the indigenous knowledge systems and life experiences of the historically colonized, disenfranchised, and dispossessed communities. A postcolonial indigenous research paradigm and its methods and methodologies are discussed.

TERMINOLOGY IN POSTCOLONIAL INDIGENOUS RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

A variety of terms are used in this chapter and throughout the book. Although most of them are commonplace terms, it is important to spell out their precise meaning in this work.

Research: It is systematic, that is, it is the adoption of a strategy or a set of principles to study an issue of interest. The systematic strategy usually starts with the identification of an area of interest to study; a review of the literature to develop further understanding of the issue to be investigated; and choice of a research design or strategy that will inform the way the sampling of respondents is performed, the instruments for data collection,

the analysis, interpretation, and reporting of the findings. You should in addition problematize research as a power struggle between researchers and the researched. Michel Foucault (1977), for example, observes that

what we know and how we know [are] grounded in shifting and diverse historical human practices, politics, and power. There are in the production of knowledge multiple centres of power in constant struggle; [through] conflict, compromise, and negotiation ... whichever group is strongest establishes its own rules on what can be known and how it can be known. A non-power related truth game is not possible, thus humanity installs each of its violences in a system of rules and thus proceeds from domination to domination. (p. 151)

The research you do will have the power to label, name, condemn, describe, or prescribe solutions to challenges in former colonized, indigenous peoples and historically oppressed groups. You are encouraged to conduct research without perpetuating self-serving Western research paradigms that construct Western ways of knowing as superior to the Other's ways of knowing. The book draws your attention to the emphasis on the role of the researcher as a provocateur (Mertens, 2010a) and a transformative healer (Chilisa, 2009; Chilisa & Ntseane 2010; Dillard, 2008; Ramsey, 2006) guided by the four Rs: accountable responsibility, respect, reciprocity, and rights and regulations of the researched (Ellis & Earley, 2006; Louis, 2007; Weber-Pillwax, 2001; Wilson, 2008), as well as roles and responsibilities of researchers as articulated in ethics guidelines and protocols of the former colonized, indigenous peoples and the historically oppressed. The position taken in this book is that postcolonial indigenous research methodologies should stand on an equal footing with Western research paradigms and should be an essential and integral part of any research methodology course. You are invited to problematize a "captive or colonized mind" on the entire systematic set of principles to study an issue.

The captive mind. Partha N. Mukherji (2004) challenges all researchers to debate whether the social science methodologies that originated in the West and are indigenous to the West are necessarily universal for the rest of the world. What is your reaction to the challenge? The Malaysian sociologist Syed Hussein Alatas (2004) developed the concept "the captive mind" to refer to an uncritical imitation of Western research paradigms within scientific intellectual activity. Others (Fanon, 1967; Ngungi wa Thiong'o, 1986 a, b) discuss a process they call colonization of the mind. This is a process that involves stripping the formerly colonized and historically marginalized groups of their ancestral culture and replacing it with Euro-Western culture. The process occurs through the education system, where learners are taught in languages of the colonizers to reject their heritage and embrace Euro-Western worldviews and lifestyles as the human norm. The rejection of the historically colonized and marginalized groups' heritage and the adoption of Euro-Western norms occur throughout all the stages in the research process. For instance, the conceptual framework, development of the research questions, and methods of data collection in most studies emanate from the developed world literature, which is predominantly Euro-Western. In addition, the language in the construction of research instruments and the dissemination of research findings is in most cases that of the colonizers. You are invited to problematize research and doing research "as a significant site of the struggle between the interest and knowing of the West and the interest and knowing of the 'Other'" (Smith, 1999, p. 2). What follows is a discussion of imperialism and colonialism with special attention to the power imbalance that exists between the Euro-Western research paradigm and non-Western societies that suffered European colonial rule, indigenous peoples, and historically marginalized communities.

Imperialism, Colonialism, and Othering Ideologies

One of the shortfalls of Euro-Western research paradigms is that they ignore the role of imperialism, colonization, and globalization in the construction of knowledge. An understanding of the values and assumptions about imperialism, colonization, and globalization that inform Euro-Western research paradigms will enable you to appreciate and understand how Euro-Western methodologies carry with them an imperial power and how they are colonizing. Let us begin with a description of imperialism and the values and assumptions that inform Euro-Western methodologies.

Imperialism. Imperialism, in the more recent sense in which the term is used, refers to the acquisition of an empire of overseas colonies and the Europeanization of the globe (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 2000). The term is also used to describe the "practice, theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory" (Said, 1993, p. 8). The theory, practice, and attitudes of the metropolitan created an idea about the West and the Other that explains the dominance of Euro-Western research paradigms and the empire of deficit literature on the formerly colonized and historically oppressed. The term Othering was coined by Gayatri Spivak to denote a process through which Western knowledge creates differences between itself

as the norm and other knowledge systems as inferior (Ashcroft et al., 2000). Stuart Hall (1992) explains the West as a concept describing a set of ideas, historical events, and social relationships. The concept functions in ways that allow the characterization and classification of societies into binary opposites of colonizer/colonized or first world/third world. The concept also condenses complex descriptions of other societies into a sameness image judged against the West idea. Chapter 3 illustrates how the Othering and sameness ideologies work to marginalize and suppress knowledge systems and ways of knowing of the historically colonized and those disadvantaged on the basis of gender, ethnicity, and social class.

Colonization. Colonization, defined as the subjugation of one group by another (Young, 2001), was a brutal process through which two thirds of the world experienced invasion and loss of territory accompanied by the destruction of political, social, and economic systems, leading to external political control and economic dependence on the West: France, Britain, Germany, Spain, Italy, Russia, and the United States. It also involved loss of control and ownership of their knowledge systems, beliefs, and behaviors and subjection to overt racism, resulting in the captive or colonized mind. One can distinguish between different but intertwined types of colonialism—namely, political colonialism, which refers to occupation and external control of the colonies, and scientific colonialism, which refers to the imposition of the colonizers' ways of knowing—and the control of all knowledge produced in the colonies. In Africa, colonial occupation occurred in 1884 when Britain, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Portugal, and Spain met at the Berlin Conference and divided Africa among themselves. African states became colonies of European powers and assumed names related to the colonial power and its the settlers, explorers, or missionaries. For example, present-day Zimbabwe was named Southern Rhodesia and Zambia was named Northern Rhodesia after the explorer Cecil John Rhodes. European explorers, travelers, and hunters were notorious for claiming discovery of African lands, rivers, lakes, waterfalls, and many other of Africa's natural showcases and renaming them. This was a violent way of dismissing the indigenous people's knowledge as irrelevant and a way of disconnecting them from what they knew and how they knew it (Chilisa & Preece, 2005). Scientific colonialism speaks directly to the production of knowledge and ethics in social science research and has been described as the imposition of the positivist paradigm approach to research on the colonies and other historical oppressed groups. Under the guise of scientific colonialism, researchers travelled to distant colonized lands, where they turned the resident people into objects of research. The ideology of scientific colonization

carried with it the belief that the researchers had unlimited rights of access to any data source and information belonging to the population and the right to export data from the colonies for purposes of processing into books and articles (Cram, 2004a, 2004b). With these unlimited powers, researchers went out to collect data and write about the one reality that they understood. In the disciplines of psychology, anthropology, and history, operating on the positivist assumption of generating and discovering laws and theories that are generalizable, researchers mapped theories, formulae, and practices that continue to dictate how former colonized societies can be studied and written about. Psychology, for instance, developed standard conceptions and formulations by which all people of the world are to be understood; today, researchers molded to accept oppressive perspectives as the norm find it difficult to operate differently (Ramsey, 2006).

Scientific colonization has implications for the decolonization process. Reading and conducting research responsibly should involve reflecting on the following questions:

- 1. Does the research approach have a clear stance against scientific colonization?
- 2. Is the research approach of travelers moving to distant lands to acquire data to process them into books and journal articles ethical?
- 3. Where is the center of knowledge and information about a people or community located?

Globalization. Globalization is an extension of colonization. Spivak (1988) analyzes the contemporary relationship between colonial societies and the former colonizers and notes that we are witnessing a distinct phase in the way the world is ordered. She notes that, in the current phase of globalization, a mere extension of colonization,

the contemporary international division of labor is a displacement of the field of nineteenth-century territorial imperialism. Put simply, a group of countries, generally first world, are in the position of investing capital; another group, generally third world, provide[s] the fields for investment both through the comprador indigenous capitalists and through their ill-protected and shifting labor force. (p. 287)

Current attempts by researchers to find the cure for HIV and AIDS are an example of how people in former colonized societies provide the fields as objects/subjects for research by multinational corporations. Recently, there has been conflict over a trial of the drug Tenofovir, which researchers allege may eventually serve as an effective chemical vaccine against the human immunodeficiency virus that causes AIDS. In Cambodia, efforts to test the drug among prostitutes were unsuccessful. The sex workers wanted more pay, more information, and a promise of health insurance for 40 years. Although the researchers agreed to provide more information for the sex workers, they said they could not promise long-term insurance; it was not something that is typically provided in studies and would be prohibitively expensive, they argued (Cha, 2006). The question one asks is what research benefits can accrue to poor countries, where the drug may not be affordable to the HIV and AIDS at-risk groups like sex workers? The conflict between the researchers and sex workers arose when the sex workers demanded the right to define the benefits they wanted as research subjects. The conflict between the researchers and the researched, and the determination of the researched to speak out about their rights, are indicative of local resistance against colonization and its new form, globalization.

Elsewhere, Bagele Chilisa and Julia Preece (2005) noted how the stealing of African indigenous knowledge of local resources such as plants and herbs by Western-trained researchers and Western companies is a contemporary instance of how African indigenous knowledge systems continue to be marginalized. The authors give an example of the San and their knowledge of the hoodia cactus plant, which grows in the Kalahari Desert. The original home of the San, it is a vast area of land that cuts across Botswana, Namibia, and South Africa. Through observation and experiments, the San discovered that the hoodia cactus has medicinal properties that stave off hunger. Members of generation after generation of the San have thus chewed the plant on long hunting trips. According to Pusch Commey (2003), Phytopharm, a United Kingdom-based company working with the South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, isolated the active ingredients in the cactus that makes this possible. The company has renamed this property, long known by the San, P57, and it has been manufactured into a diet pill that fetches large amounts of money for pharmaceutical companies. The San had to fight to reclaim their intellectual property of the qualities of the hoodia cactus plant.

Postcolonial Indigenous Research

Postcolonial indigenous research methodologies must be informed by the resistance to Euro-Western thought and the further appropriation of their knowledge.

Postcolonial. The word postcolonial is highly contested and at the same time popular (Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Swadener & Mutua, 2008). The bone of contention is that some can read the post to mean that colonialism has ended, while others can interpret postcolonialism to include people with diverse and qualitatively different experiences with colonialism. For instance, the United States began as a British colony, but the white settlers ended up imposing colonization on Native Americans. The word postcolonial is used in the research context to denote the continuous struggle of non-Western societies that suffered European colonization, indigenous peoples, and historically marginalized groups to resist suppression of their ways of knowing and the globalization of knowledge, reaffirming that Western knowledge is the only legitimate knowledge. Part of the project in this book is to envisage a space where those who suffered European colonial rule and slavery, the disenfranchised and dispossessed, can reclaim their languages, cultures, and "see with their own eyes" the history of colonization, imperialism, and their new form, globalization and, with that gaze, create new research methodologies that take into account the past and the present as a continuum of the future. This is the in-between space where Euro-Western research methodologies steeped in the culture, histories, philosophies, and the social condition of the Westerners can collaborate with the non-Western colonized's lived experiences and indigenous knowledge to produce research indigenous to their communities and cultural, integrative research frameworks with balanced lending and borrowing from the West.

Throughout the book, I will use the term colonized Other to refer to those who suffered European colonization, the disenfranchised and dispossessed, often represented as the non-Western Other. These people live in what has been labelled the third world, developing countries, or underdeveloped countries. Included among the colonized Other are indigenous populations in countries such as Canada, the United States, New Zealand, and Australia. Ethno-specific groups who have lived in some Western countries, such as African Americans in the United States and Caribbean-born people in the United Kingdom, also fall under the category of Other. Immigrants, refugees fleeing war-torn countries, and the poor are also being colonized and marginalized by Eurocentric research paradigms and thus fall under the category of the Other referred to in this book. The term colonized Other emphasizes the fact that the communities described still suffer scientific colonization as well as colonization of the mind. Part of the project in this book is to show how the colonized Other resists scientific colonization and colonization of the mind. The book illustrates some of the methodologies informed by the worldviews and ways of knowing of the colonized Other.

Indigenous. The term indigenous has been used in different ways in thirdworld, fourth-world, and marginalized people's struggles against invasion, political domination, and oppression. In this book, the focus is on a cultural group's ways of perceiving reality, ways of knowing, and the value systems that inform research processes. Euro-Western research paradigms are, for instance, indigenous to Euro-Western societies. This is not to say that the other has not shaped the development of these methods. The questions we ask are: what is indigenous to the other two-thirds majority of people colonized and marginalized by Eurocentric research paradigms? What is real to the diverse cultural groups of the two-thirds majority? How can this reality be studied? How would those colonized in the third world, indigenous peoples, women, and marginalized communities define their reality and ways of knowing? Their ways of seeing reality, ways of knowing, and values systems are informed by their indigenous knowledge systems and shaped by the struggle to resist and survive the assault on their culture. That is what makes the methodologies indigenous.

Indigenous research has four dimensions: (1) It targets a local phenomenon instead of using extant theory from the West to identify and define a research issue; (2) it is context-sensitive and creates locally relevant constructs, methods, and theories derived from local experiences and indigenous knowledge; (3) it can be integrative, that is, combining Western and indigenous theories; and (4) in its most advanced form, its assumptions about what counts as reality, knowledge, and values in research are informed by an indigenous research paradigm. The assumptions in an indigenous paradigm guide the research process. The book also makes reference to indigenous peoples. Linda T. Smith (1999, p. 7) says *indigenous peoples* is a relatively recent term, that emerged in the 1970s out of the struggles of the American Indian Movement and the Canadian Brotherhood Movement; it is used to internationalize the experiences and struggles of some of the world's colonized peoples.

DECOLONIZATION OF WESTERN RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES



A number of scholars (Bishop, 2008a, 2008b; Chilisa, 2005; Chilisa & Ntseane 2010; Cram, 2009; Liamputtong, 2010; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Smith, 1999, 2008; Swadener & Mutua 2008; Wilson, 2008) articulate resistance to Euro-Western research methodologies by discussing a process called decolonization and strategies for decolonization. Decolonization is a process of centering the concerns and worldviews of the colonized Other so that they understand themselves through their own assumptions and perspectives. It is an event and a process that involves:

- 1. Creating and consciously using various strategies to liberate the "captive mind" from oppressive conditions that continue to silence and marginalize the voices of subordinated, colonized, non-Western societies that encountered European colonization.
- 2. It involves the restoration and development of cultural practices, thinking patterns, beliefs, and values that were suppressed but are still relevant and necessary to the survival and birth of new ideas, thinking, techniques, and lifestyles that contribute to the advancement and empowerment of the historically oppressed and former colonized non-Western societies (Smith, 1999, 2008).

Decolonization is thus a process of conducting research in such a way that the worldviews of those who have suffered a long history of oppression and marginalization are given space to communicate from their frames of reference. It is a process that involves "researching back" to question how the disciplines—psychology, education, history, anthropology, sociology, or science—through an ideology of Othering have described and theorized about the colonized Other, and refused to let the colonized Other name and know from their frame of reference. It includes a critical analysis of dominant literatures written by historians, psychologists, anthropologists, and social science researchers in general, aimed at exposing the problematic influence of the Western eyes (Mohanty, 1991) and how they legitimize "the positional superiority of Western knowledge" (Said, 1993). Vine Deloria (1988), reflecting on the role of anthropologist researchers, notes:

An anthropologist comes out to the Indian reservation to make OBSERVATIONS. During the winter period, these observations will become books by which future anthropologists will be trained, so that they can come out to reservations years from now and verify the observations they have studied. (cited in Louis, 2007, p. 132)

This quotation is important in showing how knowledge about the formerly colonized and historically oppressed communities is constructed and how this knowledge accumulates into a body of literature that informs future research activities. There is also the disturbing role of theory in framing research objectives and research questions. David W. Gegeo and Karen A. Watson-Gegeo (2001) note:

Anthropologists' accounts of other people's cultures are not indigenous accounts of those cultures, even though they may be based on interviews with and observations of indigenous community's

individuals and societies. All of the foregoing activities, while they draw on indigenous cultural knowledge, are imagined, conceptualised, and carried out within the theoretical and methodological frameworks of Anglo-European forms of research, reasoning and interpreting. (p. 58)

In Aoteroa/New Zealand, Russell Bishop (2008b) notes how the colonizers, using colonial paradigms, have developed a social pathology approach that dominates research on Maori. These observations about the role of literature and theory in the design of research studies remind us that we have to be critical readers of the research studies from which we draw and design future studies.

The Decolonization Process

Poka Laenui (2000) suggests five phases in the process of decolonization: (1) rediscovery and recovery, (2) mourning, (3) dreaming, (4) commitment, and (5) action.

Rediscovery and recovery. This refers to the process where the colonized Other rediscover and recover their own history, culture, language, and identity. It involves a process of interrogating the captive mind so that the colonized Other and the historically oppressed—for instance, women, the deaf, the disabled, children, and the elderly—can come to define in their own terms what is real to them. They can also define their own rules on what can be known and what can be spoken, written about, how, when, and where.

Mourning. This refers to the process of lamenting the continued assault on the historically oppressed and former colonized Other's identities and social realities. Mourning forms an important part of healing and moving to dreaming. As a researcher educated in the United States, my initial research uncritically used the dominant research methodologies. With time, I began to ask myself why the research was not making a difference in the lives of the people. I started asking myself if I could recognize myself in the people and communities described in the studies I and other scholars conducted. Imagine reading some of the research that distorts the life experiences of the peoples and communities you know. The first reaction to reading such texts would most likely be frustration and mourning. In Chapter 3, I relate my journey to the United States and back to conduct research in my country, Botswana. Decolonization requires going further than mourning to dreaming.

Dreaming. During this phase, the colonized Other explore their cultures and invoke their histories, worldviews, and indigenous knowledge systems to theorize and imagine other possibilities. My journey to learn methodologies indigenous to the Western culture and going back to my country, a former British colony experiencing a plethora of research-driven interventions to address social problems such as poverty and HIV/AIDS infections, took me to a phase beyond frustration and mourning to that of dreaming and imagining other ways of doing research. You are invited throughout this book to dream and imagine other ways of conducting research, employing methodologies that are indigenous to the communities you study. Imagine, for example, that there are other literatures indigenous to the communities you study that have not found their way into the global communities of knowledge and practice. Imagine that in the lived experiences, oral traditions, language, metaphorical sayings, and proverbs of the communities that you research are concepts and theoretical frameworks that can inform the research process. Imagine that in the communities where you conduct research there are researchers and that they, too, can theorize and conduct research and that they, too, have the right to ownership of the knowledge they produce. Imagine the research questions, methods, literature reviewed, ways of disseminating data, and the language used if research was by the formerly colonized and historically silenced. To dream is to invoke indigenous knowledge systems, literatures, languages, worldviews, and collective experiences of the colonized Other to theorize and facilitate a research process that gives voice and is indigenous to the communities you research.

Commitment. Dreaming is followed by commitment where researchers, for example, define the role of research in community development and their roles and responsibilities to the communities and scholarship of research. Researchers become political activists demonstrating commitment to addressing the challenge of including the voices of the colonized Other in all the stages of the research process and conducting research that translates into changes in the material conditions of the local peoples as well as their control over produced knowledge. There is a growing concern, for instance, that researchers feel compelled for career reasons to conduct research that they are ill equipped to carry out and that their passive dissemination of research findings through professional journals hardly results in meaningful changes in the lives of the researched. The third world mourns, for example, that the "massive landing of experts, each in charge of investigating, measuring, and theorizing about this or that little aspect of Third World Societies" (Escobar, 1995, p. 45) has resulted in a situation where "our own history, culture and practices, good or bad, are rediscovered and translated into the journals of the North and come back to us re-conceptualized, couched in languages and paradigms which make it all sound new and novel" (Namuddu, 1989, p. 28).

Action. The last phase is action when dreams and commitment translate into strategies for social transformation. Researchers at this phase embrace participatory research methods that give voice to the colonized Other and promote empowerment, inclusivity, and respect for all involved in the research process. The key aspect of participatory research is that the researched are actively involved in analyzing their situations, finding solutions, and taking action to address their concerns and to work for the betterment of their communities. The researcher has a moral responsibility to support the colonized Other in their belief that their collective experiences, indigenous knowledge, and history are valuable. The moral stance of the researcher as an activist committed to social transformation, indigenizing mainstream research methodologies to include other knowledge systems, is necessary to address concerns about the captive mind and the undervaluing, belittling, and marginalization of the practices, values, and worldviews of the colonized Other.

Strategies for Decolonization

Linda Smith (1999) has identified strategies for decolonization as follows:

Deconstruction and reconstruction. This refers to destroying what has wrongly been written—for instance, interrogating distortions of people's life experiences, negative labeling, deficit theorizing, genetically deficient or culturally deficient models that pathologized the colonized Other—and retelling the stories of the past and envisioning the future. These strategies facilitate the process of recovery and discovery.

Self-determination and social justice. For scholars, academics, and the overresearched former colonized and historically oppressed peoples disempowered by Western research hegemony, issues in research should be addressed within the wider framework of self-determination and social justice. Self-determination in research refers to the struggle by those marginalized by Western research hegemony to seek legitimacy for methodologies embedded in the histories, experiences, ways of perceiving realities, and value systems. Social justice in research is achieved when research gives voice to the researched and moves from a deficit-based orientation, where research was based on perceived deficits in the researched, to reinforcing practices that have sustained the lives of the researched. Social justice is addressed by ensuring that those historically oppressed groups, marginalized and labeled, former colonies, descendants of slaves, indigenous peoples, those people in the third world, fourth world and developing countries, or those pushed to the margins on the basis of their gender, race/ethnicity, disability, socioeconomic status, age, religion, or sexual orientation, and immigrants and refugees are given space to decenter dominant Western research paradigms and to place at the center of analysis the realities, knowledges, values, and methodologies that give meaning to their life experiences. Chapter 8 discusses research strategies that counter deficit-based research and reveal the researched's positive aspects, resilience, and acts of resistance to Western research hegemony, which is needed for social change.

Ethics. There is a need to recognize—and where none exists, formulate, legislate, disseminate, and make known and understood internationally—ethical issues and legislation that protect indigenous knowledge systems and ways of knowing of the colonized Other. The international community of researchers is increasingly aware of the researcher's responsibility. The American Psychological Association (2002) describe the researcher's ethical responsibilities working with Asian American/Pacific Islander populations, people of African descent, Hispanics, and American Indians:

As an agent of prosocial change, the culturally competent psychologist carries the responsibility of combating the damaging effects of racism, prejudice, bias and oppression in all their forms, including all of the methods we use to understand the population we serve ... A consistent theme....relates to the interpretation and dissemination of research findings that are meaningful and relevant to each of the four populations. (p. 1)

Developing countries and indigenous communities have come up with their own ethics review boards and ethical guidelines. The Maori of New Zealand, for instance, have Guidelines for Research and Evaluation with Maori (Ministry of Social Development, 2004); in Australia, the aborigines have the Mi'kinaw Research Principles and Protocols (Aboriginal Research Centre, 2005). Elsewhere, Chilisa (2009) notes how the plethora of ethics review boards, each operating with its own ethics guidelines, has given rise to conflict over which ethics guidelines should be used, especially where there is partnership or collaborative research between researchers from developed countries and those from former colonized societies. Some researchers from developed countries, still operating with colonial tools of manipulation and

power to access, control, and own all types of data from the former colonies, invoke contract agreements to rewrite, write over, erase, and relegate to marginal and irrelevant the ethical guideline from former colonized societies. Still, others are compelled by research funding agencies, many of them international corporations based in developed countries, to enter into contract agreements that privilege Euro-Western ethical frameworks. (See Chapter 3 for these malpractices). Committed researchers define their responsibilities and are consistently engaged in self-reflection and self-questioning that promotes and privileges the right of the disempowered to be heard.

Language. Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1986a, 1986b, 1993) and Ali Mazrui (1990) advocate for writing in indigenous languages as part and parcel of the anti-imperialist struggle. Chapter 3 discusses how language mediates the research process, recovering and revitalizing, validating indigenous knowledge and cultures of the historically marginalized, and thus creating space to decenter hegemonic Western research paradigms.

Internationalization of indigenous experiences. Indigenous scholars internationalize their experiences, issues, and struggles of the colonized people by coming together in global and local spaces to plan, organize, and struggle collectively for self-determination.

History. People must study the past to recover their history, culture, and language to enable a reconstruction of what was lost that is useful to inform the present.

Critique. There is a need to critique the imperial model of research, which continues to deny the colonized and historically marginalized other space to communicate from their own frames of reference.

A POSTCOLONIAL INDIGENOUS RESEARCH PARADIGM



In this book, I discuss a postcolonial indigenous research paradigm as a framework of belief systems that emanate from the lived experiences, values, and history of those belittled and marginalized by Euro-Western research paradigms. The term paradigm was first used by Thomas Kuhn (1962) to represent a particular way of thinking and seeing the world that is shared by a community of scholars, researchers, or scientists, and also one that is used to represent commitments, worldviews, beliefs, values, methods, and approaches that are shared across a discipline. A research paradigm is a way of describing a worldview that is informed by philosophical assumptions about the nature of social reality (ontology), ways of knowing (epistemology), and ethics and value systems (axiology). A paradigm also has theoretical assumptions about the research process and the appropriate approach to systematic inquiry (methodology). A postcolonial indigenous research paradigm articulates the shared aspects of ontology, epistemology, axiology, and research methodologies of the colonized Other discussed by scholars who conduct research in former colonized societies in Africa, Asia, and Latin America; among indigenous peoples in Australia, Canada, the United States, and other parts of the world, and among the disempowered, historically marginalized social groups that encounter the colonizing effect of Eurocentric research paradigms. The main argument is that ethics and value beliefs that define relations and responsibilities of researchers to the researched should be addressed before ontological and epistemological questions and should drive the research process from formulation of research proposal to dissemination of findings. A common thread that cuts across the beliefs of the colonized Other is that people are spiritual beings with multiple relationships that should be nurtured throughout the research process. A postcolonial indigenous research paradigm is thus informed by relational ontologies, relational epistemologies, and relational axiology. In his book, Research Is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods, Wilson (2008) describes a research paradigm shared by indigenous scholars in Canada and Australia as a paradigm informed by relational ontologies, relational epistemologies, and relational accountability. Philosophical assumptions on the nature of reality, knowledge, and values guide research in a postcolonial indigenous paradigm.

ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE NATURE OF REALITY, KNOWLEDGE, AND VALUES

Ontology. Ontology is the body of knowledge that deals with the essential characteristics of what it means to exist. In a relational ontology, the social reality that is investigated can be understood in relation to the connections that human beings have with the living and the nonliving. The thrust of the discussion is that among indigenous people, in the colonized and former colonized societies, people are beings with many relations and many connections. They have connections with the living and the nonliving, with land,

with the earth, with animals, and with other beings. There is an emphasis on an I/We relationship as opposed to the Western I/You relationship with its emphasis on the individual. Among the Bantu people of southern Africa, this principle is captured under the philosophy of *ubuntu*, in which one view of being is the conception that nthu, nthu ne banwe (Ikalanaga/Shona version). An English translation that comes close to the principle is: "I am we; I am because we are; we are because I am" or "a person is because of others" (Goduka, 2000). Communality, collectivity, social justice, human unity, and pluralism are implicit in this principle. Reality implies a set of relationships. *Ubuntu* is further elaborated in Chapter 6.

Epistemology. Epistemology inquires into the nature of knowledge and truth. It asks the following questions: What are the sources of knowledge? How reliable are these sources? What can one know? How does one know if something is true? For instance, some people think that the notion that witches exist is just a belief. Epistemology asks further questions: Is a belief true knowledge? Or is knowledge only that which can be proven using concrete data? If we say witches exist, what is the source of evidence? What methods can we use to find out about their existence? A relational epistemology is all the "systems of knowledge built on relationships" (Wilson, 2008, p. 74). Wilson explains the difference between an indigenous and a dominant research paradigm:

The major difference between those dominant paradigms and an indigenous paradigm is that those dominant paradigms are built on the fundamental belief that knowledge is an individual entity: the researcher is an individual in search of knowledge, knowledge is something that is gained and therefore knowledge may be owned by an individual.An indigenous paradigm comes from the fundamental belief that knowledge is relational. Knowledge is shared with all of creation. It is not just interpersonal relationships, or just with the research subjects I may be working with, but it is a relationship with all of creation. It is with the cosmos; it is with the animals, with plants, with the earth that we share this knowledge. It goes beyond the individual's knowledge to the concept of relational knowledge....you are answerable to all your relations when you are doing research. (p. 56)

Axiology. Axiology refers to the analysis of values to better understand their meanings, characteristics, their origins, their purpose, their acceptance as true knowledge, and their influence on people's daily experiences. It is the branch of philosophy that deals with the nature of ethics, aesthetics, and religion, where religion encompasses spirituality (Guba & Lincoln, 2005), and their role in the construction of knowledge. A relational axiology is built on the concept of relational accountability. The four Rs-relational accountability, respectful representation, reciprocal appropriation, and rights and regulations during the research process (Louis, 2007)—embrace a relational axiology. Relational accountability refers to the fact that all parts of the research process are related and that the researcher is accountable to all relations. Respectful representation is about how the researcher listens, pays attention, acknowledges, and creates space for the voices and knowledge systems of the Other. Reciprocal appropriation refers to the fact that all research is appropriation and should thus be conducted so that benefits accrue to both the communities researched and the researcher. Rights and regulations refers to the need for ethical protocols that accord the colonized and the marginalized ownership of the research process and the knowledge produced. The *ubuntu* worldview, "I am because we are," is an example of a framework that calls on the researcher to see "self" as a reflection of the researched Other, to honor and respect the researched as one would wish for self, and to feel a belongingness to the researched community without feeling threatened or diminished. Ubuntu "is the very essence of being human," according to Desmond Tutu (1999):

It is not, "I think therefore I am." It says rather: "I am human therefore I belong. I participate, I share." A person with ubuntu is open and available to others, affirming of others, does not feel threatened that others are able and good, for he [or] she belongs in a greater whole and is diminished when others are humiliated or diminished, when others are tortured or oppressed, or treated as if they were less than they are. (p. 33)

In the book, *In the Spirit of Ubuntu: Stories of Teaching and Research* (Caracciolo & Mungai, 2009), authors illustrate the application of *ubuntu* as both an ethical framework and a way of knowing in research. Swanson (2009) notes that *ubuntu* offered her ways to resist normalized positions of dominance and damage-focused and deficit discourses; it contributed to decolonizing hegemonic meanings. *Ubuntu* offers guidance with regard to the researcher's responsibilities and obligations to the researched and promotes community, belongingness, togetherness, and well-being. In a study about the role of teachers in interpreting Malawi's political and social history and Malawi's contemporary problems of structural violence, Steve Sharra (2009) used *ubuntu* as an African-centered theoretical framework. Sharra notes that the lesson learned was how to shift from the preoccupation with a gloomy analysis of how bad

things are in Africa to asking how to use Africa's heritage and diverse knowledges to create new social, cultural, economic, and educational programs informed by *ubuntu* as an ethical framework and also as a way of knowing and perceiving reality. *Ubuntu* offers an example of how the researcher's ethical and moral obligation foregrounds and is intertwined with perceptions of reality and ways of knowing. This also underscores the connectedness and relatedness in the I/We relationship, where hierarchy is discouraged.

METHODOLOGY



A postcolonial indigenous paradigm is driven by decolonizing methodologies as well as third-space methodologies. The quotes at the beginning of the chapter illustrate a critique of Euro-Western research paradigms from different theoretical perspectives. bell hooks (1990) speaks to representation and voice of the researched. The questions raised on voice, representation, and rights and ownership in the knowledge production process compel researchers to engage directly with the debates on how the colonized and historically silenced researched are represented in the texts that we write. Fine (1994) reminds us, for instance, that

traditional social sciences have stubbornly refused to interrogate how we as researchers create our texts....That we are human inventors of some questions and repressors of others, shapers of the very contexts we study, co-participants in our interviews, interpreters of other's stories and narrators of our own, are sometimes rendered irrelevant to the texts we publish. (p. 14)

Postcolonial indigenous research techniques include a process of decolonizing the conventional interview technique, using indigenous interview methods such as talking circles and invoking indigenous knowledge to inform alternative research methods compatible with the worldviews of the colonized Other. Chapter 6 presents culturally responsive indigenous research methodologies.

The quote by Elabor-Idemudia (2002) at the beginning of this chapter reminds us that the social sciences are founded on the culture, history, and philosophies of Euro-Western thought and are either antagonistic to the history and cultures of non-Western societies or have no strategy to give voice to their cultures (Smith, 1999, 2008). Scheurich (1997) describes social science research methodologies as racially biased. In Chapter 2, you will learn about how critical theory—more specifically, postcolonial theory, critical indigenous theory, and critical race theory—informs approaches and research practices of discovering and recovering voices of the oppressed. In this chapter, it is important to underscore decolonizing research approaches, indigenization, and third-space methodologies as essential aspects of a post-colonial indigenous paradigm.

Decolonization and Indigenization

A decolonization research approach has been described. It is important to add to the discussion possibilities of integration of knowledge systems and indigenization. While scholars critique the dominance of Euro-Western paradigms over the rest of the world, you should take note that they also value the integration of knowledge systems. Syed H. Alatas (1974), while critical of the captive mind, also asserts that "no society can develop by inventing everything on its own. When something is found effective and useful, it is desirable that it should be adapted and assimilated, whether it be an artifact or an attitude of mind" (p. 692).

Writing about third world feminism in the book, *Methodology of the Oppressed*, Chela Sandoval (2000) articulates what she calls a *coalitional consciousness* as an approach to bring subjugated peoples who suffered colonial rule or slavery together with all the peoples of the world to work together toward social change. She calls for a mixture in the appropriation of ideas, knowledge, and theories, arguing that the mixing reflects the necessary reality of surviving as a minority or Other, which entails using every and any aspect of dominant power. Mixing is the methodology of survival for the oppressed. Decolonization and indigenization of dominant research approaches entail attempts to resist universalized knowledge, critique Euro-Western research approaches, and invoke indigenous knowledge systems of the colonized Other to inform research methodologies that are inclusive of all knowledge systems and respectful of the researched.

Complementing the coalition strategy, Beth Swadener and Agenda Mutua (2008) call for the forging of cultural partnerships "with, between and among Indigenous researchers and allied 'others." These partnerships should create space for working collaboratively on common goals and engaging in a multidirectional lending and borrowing from diverse cultures. It is only when researchers from multiple cultures work collaboratively to acknowledge and interrogate the theories, the literature, the methodologies, and the embedded ethical and moral issues that decolonization and indigenization can become a reality.

Third-Space Methodologies

When one discusses Euro-Western paradigms and postcolonial indigenous paradigms, these paradigms become essentialized, compelling thought along binary opposites of either/or. There is also the danger of conceptualizing indigenousness as a fixed and unchanging indigenous identity (Kinchella & Steinberg, 2009). Homi Bhabha's (1994) concept of "the space in between" has led some researchers to speak of a "third space" (Moquin, 2007). In this space, Western research paradigms are contested and declared invalid because they are based on a culture that has been made static and essentialized. There is also a recognition that essentialized views of indigenous cultures inform indigenous research paradigms and methodologies, which must be interrogated and opened up to include the voices and knowledge systems of the subgroups within indigenous essentialized cultures potentially excluded within the already marginalized indigenous cultures and research paradigms. Thus, in the third space, indigenousness is interrogated to include the voices of those disadvantaged on the basis of gender, race, ethnicity, ableness, health, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, age, and so on. In the space in between, "all cultural statements and systems are constructed, therefore all hierarchical claims to the inherent originality or 'purity' of cultures are untenable" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 54).

The space in between involves a culture-integrative research framework. This is a tapestry, a mosaic of balanced borrowing of less hegemonic Euro-Western knowledge and its democratic and social justice elements and combining it with the best of the democratic, liberatory, and social justice essentialized indigenous knowledge and subgroups' knowledges. Postcolonial indigenous feminist methodologies present some of the examples in this category of postcolonial indigenous research methodologies. (See Chapter 9.)

EURO-WESTERN RESEARCH PARADIGMS



Knowledge of the dominant Euro-Western research paradigms is necessary to enable you to contextualize a critique of these research methodologies as well as appreciate the decolonization and indigenization of these research approaches. What follows is a brief description of each dominant research paradigm in terms of the philosophies that inform its approaches and the way questions on reality, knowledge, and values are understood, explained, and incorporated in the research processes and procedures. A description of these dominant paradigms will also enable you to draw a distinction between the philosophies and histories that distinguish postcolonial indigenous research methodologies from the dominant Euro-Western methodologies and those that do not.

Most Euro-Western research books classify research methodologies into three paradigms: positivist-postpositivist, interpretive, and transformative. Philosophical assumptions and a long history of application and practice in each of these categories inform the methodology, data-gathering techniques, analysis approaches, and reporting and dissemination of the findings. The differences in these paradigms can be understood by looking at:

- The philosophies and theories that inform the approach
- How each approach perceives or explains the nature of reality (ontology), knowledge (epistemology), and values (axiology)
- The methodology used in the research

The Positivism/Postpositivism Paradigm

Positivism is a position or approach that holds that the scientific method is the only way to establish truth and objective reality. Can you imagine using scientific methods to carry out research on witches? The positivists would conclude that witches do not exist because the scientific method does not yield any tangible results on the nature of witches. Positivism is based on the view that natural science is the only foundation for true knowledge. It holds that the methods, techniques, and procedures used in natural science offer the best framework for investigating the social world (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995). Many Western philosophers, among them Aristotle (383–348 BCE), Francis Bacon (1561–1626), and John Locke (1632–1704), contributed to what we know as positivism today.

Aristotle believed that the world operates on fixed natural laws that can be discovered through observation and reason. He also believed that these fixed laws can be tested and measured quantitatively, with the results verified. He is considered a realist, and his thinking typifies the philosophy of realism. Realism takes the stand that reality is viewed in material terms. Realism assumes an external reality that can be objectively investigated. The basic tenet of this philosophy is that if something exists, it exists in a quantity, and we can measure it. The realist maintains that truth exists in nature, that is, the physical world, and it is discoverable by people through the use of scientific method. Knowing begins with sensory intake, which is then ordered and organized by means of intellect.

Francis Bacon (1561-1626) and John Locke (1632-1704) also added to our understanding of positivism as we know it today. Their thinking has

been labeled *empiricism*. Empiricists believe that the senses and empirical data are the most important sources of knowledge. According to the empiricists, we know from seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, and observing. The empiricist uses deductive methods to generate generalizations from specific sensory data. Augustine Comte (1798-1857), a 19th-century French philosopher, summed up these related ideas by different philosophers as positivism. Like the empiricists and realists, he believed that genuine knowledge is based on sense experience and can be advanced only by means of observation and measurement.

The middle part of the 20th century saw a shift from positivism to postpositivism. It is influenced by a philosophy called critical realism. The postpositivists, like the positivists, believe that there is a reality independent of our thinking that can be studied through the scientific method. They recognize, however, that all observation is fallible and has error and that all theory is revisable. Reality cannot be known with certainty. Observations are theory laden and influenced by the researcher's biases and worldviews. Objectivity can nevertheless be achieved by using multiple measures and observations and triangulating the data to get closer to what is happening in reality. It is important to note that the postpositivists share a lot in common with positivists. Most of the research approaches and practices in social science today would fit better into the postpositivist category. The two will therefore be treated as belonging to the same family. It is important to note that a number of philosophers working over a long period of time contributed toward the thinking and the body of knowledge and worldviews embodied in each paradigm.

Assumptions About the Nature of Reality, Knowledge, and Values

Let us look closely at the positivist/postpositivist assumptions about the nature of reality (ontology), knowledge (epistemology), and values (axiology).

Ontology. On the question of what is the nature of reality, the positivists hold that there is a single, tangible reality that is relatively constant across time and setting. Part of the researcher's duty is to discover this reality. Reality is objective and is independent of the researcher's interest in it. It is measurable and can be broken into variables. Postpositivists concur that reality exists but argue that it can be known only imperfectly because of the researcher's human limitations. The researcher can discover reality within a certain realm of probability (Mertens, 2010a).

Epistemology. For the positivist, the nature of knowledge is inherent in the natural science paradigm. Knowledge is those statements of belief or fact that can be tested empirically, confirmed or verified, or disconfirmed; they are stable and can be generalized (Eichelberger, 1989). Knowledge constitutes hard data, is objective, and therefore is independent of the values, interests, and feelings of the researcher. Researchers need only the right data-gathering instruments or tools to produce absolute truth for a given inquiry. The research designs are quantitative and include experimental, quasi-experimental, correlational, causal, comparative, and survey designs. The techniques of gathering data are mainly questionnaires, observations, tests, and experiments. Within this context, the purpose of research is to discover laws and principles that govern the universe and to predict behaviors and situations. Postpositivists believe that perfect objectivity cannot be achieved but is approachable.

Axiology. For the positivist, all inquiries should be value free. Researchers should use scientific methods of gathering data to achieve objectivity and neutrality during the inquiry process. Postpositivists modified the belief that the researcher and the subject of study were independent by recognizing that the investigator's theories, hypothesis, and background knowledge can strongly influence what is observed, how it is observed, and the outcome of what is observed.

Methodology. In positivism and postpositivism, the purpose of research is to predict, test a theory, and find the strength of relationships between variables or a cause-effect relationship. Quantitative researchers begin with ideas, theories, or concepts that are operationally defined to point to the variables in the study. The problem statement at minimum specifies variables to be studied and the relationship among them. Variables are operationally defined to enable replication, verification, and confirmation by different researchers. Operationally defining a variable means that the trait to be measured is defined according to the way it is used or measured or observed in the study.

In Activity 1.1, a sample survey design was adopted, and variables, for instance, *literacy* and *ability*, were operationally defined. Research questions, research objectives, or hypotheses were constructed to further clarify the research problem. The researcher, independent of the participants, constructed these. The variables are therefore predetermined and fixed. Research objectives and procedures were built around the definition of literacy used by UNESCO. Tests were used to measure reading and numeracy. Skills measured in numeracy and readings are clearly delineated and are again limited

Activity 1.1

Read the study extract included here and answer the following questions:

- 1. Discuss how the methodological features of this study reflect positivist or postpositivist ontology, epistemology, and axiology.
- 2. Refer back to the concept of the "captive mind." In what ways are the researchers captives of the dominant literature on literacy and methodologies in the postpositivist research paradigm?

Source: Adapted from Central Statistics Office (1997), Literacy Survey Report, Gaborone, Botswana: Government Printer.

Background to study

Statement of the problem

The survey was designed to measure the country's literacy not only by the number of years spent at school (formal school), but also through the testing of objective literacy skills. In this survey, objective literacy was defined as the ability to read and write in Setswana, English, or both and the ability to carry out simple mathematical computations. Ability was ascertained through results of literacy tests in Setswana, English, and mathematics.

Specific objectives were:

To assess gender and age literacy differentials

To assess factors influencing school attendance

To assess the impact of literacy programs and factors relating to accessibility of educational facilities

To identify the most pressing needs in terms of educational policies and provision in order that the priorities can be set for the future direction of adult literacy programs in Botswana

To assess socioeconomic and cultural factors that may be associated with literacy problems in the adult population

Research design: Sample survey

Sampling procedures

Enumeration areas (EA) were identified. These are small geographic areas, which represent an average workload for an enumerator. The (Continued)

(Continued)

average EA was 120 to 150 dwellings. EAs were subdivided into blocks. An average block was 50 households. Blocks were organized according to type of area. Urban blocks were grouped into a stratum of their own. Rural areas were organized into the following strata: villages, lands, cattle posts, and freehold farms. Probability sampling was carried out at block level, type of dwelling, and household and individual levels. Total sample size was 46,129 households.

Instruments and procedure

Questionnaires and tests were used.

An individual questionnaire was administered only to Botswana citizens in the age group 12 to 65 with an educational attainment of Standard 4 or lower and not currently attending school.

In this study, the process of decoding was assessed through tasks that required respondents to read orally some words and sentences and those that required them to identify and match words with pictures, in both Setswana and English. The process of writing was assessed through tasks that required respondents to write down dictated sentences in both languages.

The numeracy tests covered the skill of number naming, in which the respondents were required to read given numbers aloud; number writing, in which respondents were required to write down dictated numbers; and solution of written arithmetic problems. In the latter task, respondents were given written problems to read and solve. The problems involved addition of a number of cattle to that of donkeys; the numbers were embedded in the prose text. Other numeracy skills tested in this study included the ability to solve arithmetic equations involving the concepts of addition and subtraction (50 - 20 =; 10 + 40 =) and that of reading time. The survey came up with a pass mark of 50% to determine the literate and illiterate, basing on a 2-point scale of correct and incorrect answers to test items.

Results

The survey found out that 68.9% of adults are literate in either Setswana or English. Females had a higher literacy rate: 70.3% compared to males, 66.9%. Also, 193,662 persons aged 12 years and over never attended formal school.

by the definition of literacy. How relevant do you think the study's definition of life is to the life experiences of people? Do you think the researched people would have a similar meaning of what it is to be literate? In most cases, research within the positivist/postpositivist paradigm is more about what researchers want to know, and what knowledge and what theory they want to legitimize. For instance, the researchers in the literacy study noted, "The narrow definition of literacy currently held by the Botswana National Literacy Programme may, to some extent, have influenced the development of tests for this survey.... Advanced functional literacy skills were not tested" (CSO, 1997, p. 9).

Commeyras and Chilisa (2001) have questioned the value of this research in providing information on the development of literacy in Botswana. They argue that the survey results reveal very little about the actual literacy of Botswana's people and the variety of literacies that exist. William L. Neuman (2010) notes that researchers in the positivist-postpositivist research paradigm adopt a technocratic approach where they ignore questions on relevancy, ethics, and morality to follow orders and thus satisfy a sponsor or a government. The paradigm is thus generally viewed as a "legitimating ideology of dominant groups" (Neuman, 1997, p. 45).

Postcolonial indigenous research methodologies challenge the ideologies embedded in these methods and propose ways of decolonizing and indigenizing the research methods so that the methods are inclusive of local and indigenous knowledges that are relevant and responsive to the experiences and needs of researched communities. How can one, for instance, carry out a literacy survey that uses local and indigenous knowledge on literacy as a conceptual or theoretical framework to inform the variables in the study? Postcolonial indigenous research methodologies propose ways in which researchers can invoke indigenous knowledge systems to decolonize dominant research methodologies and offer complementary new methods and approaches that are informed by postcolonial indigenous philosophies, histories, and indigenous knowledge systems. Indigenous Beliefs and Attitudes to AIDS Precautions in a Rural South African Community: An Empirical Study (Liddell, Barrett, & Bydawell, 2006) demonstrates ways in which researchers indigenize quantitative research methodologies. See Chapter 3.

The Interpretive Paradigm

The interpretivists differ with the positivists on assumptions about the nature of reality, what counts as knowledge and its sources, and the values they hold and their role in the research process. The interpretive approach can be traced back to Edmund Husserl's philosophy of phenomenology and to the German philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey's philosophy of hermeneutics (Eichelberger 1989; Neuman, 2010). Let us examine each one of these. We will also examine assumptions on ontology, epistemology, axiology, and methodologies used in the interpretive paradigm.

Phenomenology. Phenomenologists use human thinking, perceiving, and other mental or physiological acts and spirituality to describe and understand human experience. From the phenomenologist's perspective, truth lies within the human experience and is therefore multiple and bound by time, space, and context. Under these assumptions, a belief or claim coming from a culture one does not understand is consistent and correct. In contrast to the positivist/post-positivist paradigm, phenomenologists or interpretivists believe that research should produce individualized conceptions of social phenomena and personal assertions rather than generalizations and verifications.

Hermeneutics. The term comes from the name Hermes, a god in Greek mythology who had the power to communicate the desires of the gods to mortals (Neuman, 2010). Hermeneutics involves a reading and an interpretation of some kind of human text. The text of our social world is complex. Hermeneutics is therefore the process whereby we come to an understanding of a given social text and choose between two or more competing interpretations of the same text. In reading and interpreting the text, we look at the relation of parts to the whole, and we do it in a dynamic and interactive way that will lead us to a fuller and newer understanding of the actual life situation (Eichelberger, 1989). Interpretations occur within a tradition, space, time, and a situation. They are also dependent on the identity of the researcher, that is, gender, age, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic background. Phenomenology and hermeneutics thus largely inform assumptions on the nature of reality, knowledge, and values in the interpretive paradigm: Let us examine these assumptions.

Assumptions About the Nature of Reality, Knowledge, and Values

Ontology. On the question of what is reality, the interpretivists believe that it is socially constructed (Creswell, 2009; Creswell & Clark, 2011; Mertens, 2010a) and that there are as many intangible realities as there are people constructing them. Reality is therefore mind-dependent and a personal or social construct. Do you believe, for instance, that witches exist? If you do, it is your personal reality, a way in which you try to make sense of the

world around you. Reality is, in this sense, limited to context, space, time, and individuals or group in a given situation and cannot be generalized into one common reality. These assumptions are a direct challenge to the positivist's assumption about the existence of a tangible external reality. The assumptions legitimize conceptions of realities from all cultures. The question, however, is how many of the realities as viewed by formerly colonized, historically marginalized groups have been considered valid in the academic construction of knowledge. In Botswana, for example, the understanding of reality in most communities is influenced by their connectedness to earth (lefatsbe) and the spirits (Badimo) (Chilisa, 2005). There are individual realities as well as group-shared realities. Of interest is how these assumptions about the nature of reality are built into the research process. In Chapter 4, I will explore possible ways in which assumptions about the nature of reality in postcolonial indigenous contexts can be built into the research process.

Epistemology. Interpretivists believe that knowledge is subjective because it is socially constructed and mind-dependent. Truth lies within the human experience. Statements on what is true and false are therefore culture bound and historically and context dependent, although some may be universal. Within this context, communities' stories, belief systems, and claims of spiritual and earth connections should find space as legitimate knowledge. Often, however, even interpretivist research operates within the mode of a Western historical and cultural-bound research framework and treats indigenous ways of knowing as "barriers to research or exotic customs with which researchers need to be familiar in order to carry out their work without causing offence" (Smith, 1999, p. 15).

Axiology. Interpretivists assert that since reality is mind constructed, mind dependent, and knowledge subjective, social inquiry is in turn value bound and value laden. The researcher is inevitably influenced by the investigator's values, which inform the paradigm chosen for inquiry, the choice of issue, methods chosen to collect and analyze data, interpretation of the findings, and the way the findings are reported. The researcher, therefore, admits the value-laden nature of the study and reports values and biases.

Methodology

The purpose of interpretive research is to understand people's experiences. The research takes place in a natural setting where the participants make their living. The purpose of study expresses the assumptions of the interpretivist to understand human experiences. Assumptions on the multiplicity of realities

also inform the research process. For instance, the research questions cannot be established before the study begins but rather evolve as the study progresses (Mertens, 2010a). The research questions are generally open-ended, descriptive, and nondirectional (Creswell, 2009). A model of a *grand tour question* followed by a small number of subquestions is used. The grand tour question is a statement of the problem that is examined in the study in its broadest form, posed as a general issue not to limit the inquiry (Creswell, 2009).

The researcher gathers most of the data. In recognition of the assumption about the subjective nature of research, researchers describe themselves, their values, ideological biases, relationship to the participants, and closeness to the research topic. Access and entry to the study site are important, and sensitive issues need to be addressed. Researchers have to establish trust, rapport, and authentic communication patterns with the participants so that they can capture the subtle differences and meanings from their voices (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Ethics is an important issue that the researcher addresses throughout the study whenever it arises.

Common designs include ethnography, phenomenology, biography, case study, and grounded theory (Creswell, 2009). Data-gathering techniques are selected depending on the choice of design, the nature of the respondents, and the research problem. They include interviews, observations, visual aids, personal and official documents, photographs, drawings, informal conversations, and artifacts.

Imagine that you are carrying out research with and on colonized Others. What are some of the issues that might limit the inquiry process? Colonial rule created a dichotomy of the colonizer as knower and colonized as ignorant. It also created a midway space of the educated as better than those who did not go to school, although still lesser than the colonizers. Within this context, the position of the researcher as more educated than the majority of the researched still limits the inquiry process, as the researched are most likely to suppress indigenous knowledge in favor of knowledge acquired from the media and Euro-Western paradigms. Postcolonial indigenous research methodologies challenge the interpretivists to interrogate power relations between Western-educated researchers, as colonizers using dominant methodologies that legitimize ideologies of dominant groups, and the researched, as colonized and relegated to the position of an ignorant subject. Postcolonial indigenous methodologies propose ethics protocols that are informed by the value systems of the researched. These are value systems that promote, in the research process, the incorporation of spirituality, respect for the researched, cooperation between researchers and the researched, and a holistic approach to problem solving. The main argument from a postcolonial indigenous perspective is that knowledge production

from the interpretive paradigm has been socially constructed using Euro-Western philosophies, cultures, and a long history of an application and practice of knowledge production that exclude the worldviews and practices of former colonized societies. The Four Seasons of Ethnography: A Creation-Centered Ontology for Ethnography (Gonzalez, 2000) illustrates ways of indigenizing ethnography. See Chapter 4.

The Transformative Paradigm

There are scholars who criticize both the positivist/postpositivist and the interpretive paradigms. Some scholars, for example, Carol Gilligan (1982), argue that most research studies that inform sociological and psychological theories were developed by white male intellectuals on the basis of studying male subjects. In the United States, for example, African Americans argue that research-driven policies and projects have not benefited them because they were racially biased (Mertens 2010a). In Africa, scholars, for example Robert Chambers (1997), and Arturo Escobar (1995), argue that the dominant research paradigms have marginalized African communities' ways of knowing and have thus led to the design of research-driven development projects that are irrelevant to the needs of the people. A third paradigm, labeled critical social science research (Neuman, 2010), action participatory and feminist designs (Merriam & Simpson, 2000), research with the aim to emancipate (Lather, 1991), or transformative paradigm (Mertens, 2010a) has emerged. The term transformative paradigm is adopted in this book to denote a family of research designs influenced by various philosophies and theories with a common theme of emancipating and transforming communities through group action (Mertens, 2010a). One of the influential theories is Marxism, originated by the German philosopher, Karl Marx. He believed that those who controlled the means of production, that is, the ruling class, also controlled the mental production of knowledge and ideas. Inevitably, the knowledge produced perpetuates the domination of other social classes by the ruling class, he said. The theory also helps to explain the dominance of Western-based research paradigms and the marginalization of knowledge produced in other cultures. Other theories include critical theory, feminist theories, Freirian theory, critical race theories, and postcolonial and indigenous theories.

Assumptions About the Nature of Reality, Knowledge, and Values

Ontology. The transformative paradigm adopts the stance that social reality is historically bound and is constantly changing depending on social, political, cultural, and power-based factors (Neuman, 2010). Scholars within this paradigm adopt the stance that reality is constructed based on social location and that different versions of reality are privileged over others (Mertens, 2009). Reality has multiple layers, the surface reality and the deep structures that are unobservable. Theories and a historical orientation help to unmask the deep structures.

Epistemology. On the question of what is truth, the researchers within this paradigm maintain that knowledge is true if it can be turned into practice that empowers and transforms the lives of the people. Theory is the basic tool that helps the researcher to find new facts. The facts are built into theory that is consistently improved by relating it to practice (Neuman, 2010). True knowledge in this context lies in the collective meaning making by the people that can inform individual and group action that improves the lives of the people. Knowledge is constructed from the participants' frame of reference. The relationship between the researcher and the researched is not based on a power hierarchy, as in the interpretive paradigm, but involves a transformation and emancipation of both the participant and the researcher.

Axiology. Researchers who adopt the transformative paradigm view research as a moral and political activity that requires them to choose and commit themselves to the values of social justice, furthering human rights and respect of cultural norms. Researchers achieve objectivity by reflecting and examining their values to ensure that they are appropriate for carrying out the research study. Whereas in the interpretive paradigm, in which every viewpoint is correct, some views will facilitate an increase in social justice while others will sustain oppressive systems (Mertens, 2009).

Methodology. In the transformative paradigm, the purpose of research is to destroy myths, illusions, and false knowledge and therefore empower people to act to transform society. Quantitative as well as qualitative methods are used in the research process. Techniques of collecting data and sampling procedures suitable to quantitative and qualitative studies are used. Participants are involved in identifying and defining the problem, collecting and analyzing the data, disseminating the findings, and using the findings to inform practice. Common designs are the participatory rural appraisal approach and action research. Refer to Chapter 8.

In the study by Michael Omolewa et al. (1998), survey methods were used along with oral texts, focus group interviews, and individual interviews. The meanings of literacy evolved from the people's experiences and eventually informed the changes in the literacy program.

Activity 1.2

Read the study extract included here and answer the following questions:

- 1. Discuss how the methodological features of the study reflect the transformative research paradigm ontology, epistemology, and axiology.
- 2. Discuss the concept of integration of knowledge systems and give your own evaluation of its application in the study.

Source: Adapted from Michael Omolewa, Olukemi Anthony Adeola, Gbolagade Adekanmbi, Michael B. M. Avoseh, & Dele Braimoh (1998), Literacy, Tradition and Progress: Enrollment and Retention in an African Rural Literacy Programme.

Research problem

While there has been an increasing involvement of government in literacy promotion activities, it is observed that literacy has been constrained by the problem of non-growth, which includes an inability to replicate activities, an increasing pattern of wastage, the problem of learner reluctance and rejection, and the neglect of the ultimate objective of asking learners to take over the literacy venture. All the agencies involved in literacy promotion have had their share of these problems, thus making necessary the search for an alternative.

Research objectives

Identify alternative strategies for the promotion of literacy in Nigeria, especially in rural settings Provide a solution to the intractable problem of non-growth Improve the replicability of literacy programs Reduce the pattern of wastage and learner apathy Promote learner empowerment as literacy's ultimate goal

Method

Using elements of both qualitative and quantitative research designs, combining a survey of the village with a historical analysis and a qualitative approach.

Instruments and procedures

Questionnaires; oral texts such as stories, language, proverbs, and sayings; interviews

(Continued)

(Continued)

Results

During the research, it was established that the indigenous apprenticeship system offered an attractive, alternative training program. First, the system demanded that people should begin to serve as guides (teachers) soon after a smattering of skill had been acquired. The guides, however, continue to serve under others who themselves continue their own learning.

There is a need to use aspects of the indigenous culture and practices to attract learners and to consolidate their interest. It is not enough to attract learners; it is even more important to retain learners in the program and to use them to publicize the value of the program to the hitherto unreached. Tradition encourages the cultivation of the virtues of tact, sympathy, understanding, courtesy, patience, punctuality, doing by example, and practicability, all of which seek to enhance adult learners' commitment.

Discussion

The learners have cultivated an attitude that restores learning to its status in precolonial times, when education was continuing and lifelong and promoted even beyond death in stories and songs. The suspicion of learning, resulting from intervention of Islamic traders and Christian teachers, has given place to a revival of learning for learning's sake. Thus, the participants in our project contend that learning is by no means a once-and-for-all affair, found only in pages of books and ending with the award of certificates. Rather, they contend that even the songs of birds teach lessons, and the color of the sky conveys a message to one who is eager to learn. The pride in learning is thus a return to the roots of the indigenous society, which took pride in the art of learning. It is also a rejection of the wrong ideas about Western education. For in the West, one is told, even in a village school, the truly educated person knows how little he or she knows and understands that there is no end to learning.

The postcolonial indigenous research methodologies have assumptions similar to those in the transformative paradigm. Postcolonial indigenous research methodologies adopting a decolonization and indigenization approach, however, emphasize how indigenous knowledges can be used to transform conventional ways of producing knowledge so that colonial and

imperial impositions are eliminated, and knowledge production is inclusive of multiple knowledge systems. Decolonization and indigenization research methodological approaches require, for instance, that theory does not necessarily come out of written texts but can be inferred by the researcher from oral traditions, stories, legends, language, and artifacts. In postcolonial indigenous methodologies, the researcher has a duty to retrieve from the oral texts perspectives, concepts, and theories that form conceptual and theoretical frameworks for research studies, rationale, and justification for selected data-gathering techniques, data analysis, and research finding dissemination strategies. In the study on literacy in Nigeria by Omolewa et al. (1998), the researcher relinquishes conventional concepts of literacy for those based on the indigenous knowledge systems. The participants undergo a transformation and are empowered through a realization of their potential as teachers, as well as renewed confidence in their culture, its values, and what they already know. Knowledge is built through practice as it unfolds in the practice of the people and the researchers.

SUMMARY



Postcolonial indigenous research methodologies consist of approaches to decolonize and indigenize dominant research methodologies. They include the articulation of a postcolonial indigenous research paradigm informed by a relational ontology, epistemology, and axiology. The framework adopted in this chapter and throughout the book is that current dominant methodologies should be decolonized to legitimize and enable the inclusion of knowledge production processes that accommodate shared knowledge and wisdoms of those suffering from the oppressive colonial research tradition. There is also recognition that integrating indigenous perspectives in dominant research paradigms may not be the most effective strategy to legitimize the histories, worldviews, ways of knowing, and experiences of the colonized and historically oppressed. A postcolonial indigenous research paradigm is discussed as an alternative to indigenizing approaches and Western research paradigms. As a researcher, you can make a choice of the paradigm or approach that will inform your research, taking into consideration the nature of the problem you are investigating and your worldview. You will have a responsibility to critically assess the research process and procedures to see if they allow the researched to communicate their experiences from their frames of reference. Chapters 2 and 4 will illustrate further some of the ways that research can be carried out in ways that privilege the colonized's ways of knowing. For a summary of the characteristics of each paradigm, refer to Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Beliefs Associated With the Four Paradigms

	T	T		T
Indigenous Research Paradigm	To challenge deficit thinking and pathological descriptions of the formerly colonized and reconstruct a body of knowledge that carries hope and promotes transformation and social change among the historically oppressed	Informed by indigenous knowledge systems, critical theory, postcolonial discourses, feminist theories, critical race-specific theories, and neo-Marxist theories	Socially constructed multiple realities shaped by the set of multiple connections that human beings have with the environment, the cosmos, the living, and the nonliving	All research must be guided by a relational accountability that promotes respectful representation, reciprocity, and rights of the researched. The ethics theory is informed by appreciative inquiry and desire-based perspectives
Transformative Paradigm	To destroy myths and empower people to change society radically	Informed by critical theory, postcolonial discourses, feminist theories, race-specific theories, and neo-Marxist theories	Multiple realities shaped by human rights values, democratic and social justice values, and political, cultural, economic, race, ethnic, gender, and disability values	Researchers prioritize the value of furthering social justice and human rights.
Interpretive Paradigm	To understand and describe human nature	Informed by hermeneutics and phenomenology	Multiple socially constructed realities	Values are an integral part of social life; no group's values are wrong, only different
Positivist Paradigm	To discover laws that are generalizable and govern the universe	Informed mainly by realism, idealism, and critical realism	One reality, knowable within probability	Science is value free, and values have no place except when choosing a topic
	Reason for doing the research	Philosophical underpinnings	Ontological assumptions	Place of values in the research process

Objective	e	Subjective; idiographic	Dialectical understanding aimed at critical praxis	Knowledge is relational, as is all the indigenous knowledge systems built on relations
Based on precise Tru observation and dej measurement that is verifiable		Truth is context dependent	It is informed by a theory that unveils illusions	It is informed by the set of multiple relations that one has with the universe
Research Research designs: desynantitative, qui correlational, pho quasi- eth experimental, syr experimental, inticausal nat comparative,	Res des qua pho eth eth syr inte	Research designs: qualitative, phenomenology, ethnographic, symbolic interaction, naturalistic	Research designs: combination of quantitative and qualitative action research; participatory research	Participatory, liberatory, and transformative research approaches and methodologies that draw from indigenous knowledge systems
Mainly Ma questionnaires, inte observations, par tests, and experiments pic pho do	Ma interpretation of the process of	Mainly interviews, participant observation, pictures, photographs, diaries, and documents	Culturally responsive techniques of data collection	Techniques based on philosophic sagacity, ethnophilosophy, language frameworks, indigenous knowledge systems, talk stories, and talk circles; adapted techniques from the other three paradigms

KEY POINTS

- Research methods are dominated by Western modes of thinking.
- Research is value laden, and the choice of a methodology used in a study implies a worldview or way of thinking about the topic of research, the community researched, the data collection procedures, analysis, and reporting.
- The range of research approaches and designs, from surveys to ethnography, should open space for the inclusion of indigenous knowledge systems.
- Postcolonial indigenous methodologies interrogate imperial and colonial power in research and invoke indigenous knowledge systems to envision other ways of doing research that are informed by the worldviews of the colonized and historically marginalized groups.

Activity 1.3

- 1. Debate the main points from this chapter and use research studies to support your views.
- Selectajournalinyourdisciplineandanalyzestudies donewithina 5-year period for visibility of the colonized and historically marginalized groups' worldviews, ways of knowing, and indigenous knowledge.

SUGGESTED READINGS

- Creswell J., & Clark P. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Deloria, V. (1969). Custer died for your sins: An Indian Manifesto. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Fixico, D. L. (Ed.). (2003). *The American Indian mind in a linear world: American Indian studies and traditional knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- Liamputtong P. (2010). *Qualitative cross cultural research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mertens, D. M. (2010). Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Scheurich, J. J., & Young M. D. (1997). Coloring methodologies: Are our research epistemologies racially biased? Educational Researcher, 26(4), 4-16.
- Smith, L.T. (1999). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples. London: Zed Books.
- Wilson, S. (2008). Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods. Manitoba, Canada: Fernwood.