Active Listening in Traditional and Indigenous Research Methods

Laura Brantley and Amy Nantkes[1]

Western Political Science Association

Panel 09.02

April 14, 2017

[1] Both authors contributed equally to this project, order of authorship is simply listed alphabetically.

## Introduction

Indigenous methods are fluid and recognize interconnectedness, while the formalities of social science research can often be strict and rigid.[2] There seems to be an obvious tension between the two research practices, however there is no need for the two methods to be mutually exclusive. An emerging body of work shows the benefits of collaboration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers, which enhances the dialogue, understanding, and experience of all involved. In this study, we will explore this space between the two methodologies as well as the components necessary to execute such research effectively.

First, we will give a brief overview of the literature, including the work by scholars that calls for a merging of traditional and Indigenous research methods when studying Indigenous populations. Next, we will describe the aims and methods employed in this study, including our self-administered survey questions and findings. We predict that active listening and self-awareness will be critical to navigating the tension between the two methodologies.  This application helped us to form relationships and engage in meaningful discourse with research participants and community leaders as we conducted research in Native American communities. As such, we put forth that self-inquiry regarding active listening and self-awareness is efficacious for social scientists to holistically consider the "space between" traditional and Indigenous research methods.

## Researching Indigenous Communities

Historically, Native American populations have been widely ignored by political science. The lack of engagement is so great that leading political scientists recently went so far as to write

---

[2] There is no single term that is universally accepted as it pertains to American Indian populations. In this project, we have decided to use the terms "Native American" and "Indigenous," though the terms "Native American" and "Indian" are appropriately used interchangeably throughout scholarly research and within the Native American community.

that the discipline "hates Native Americans" (Ferguson, 2016). Ferguson and others like him claim that the Native way of thinking is directly opposed to ideas popular in non-Native political thought; ideas like sovereignty, collective decision-making, environmental justice, and the rule of law are principally different for each community (Ferguson, 2016 and Fryer, 2016). This divergence in perspectives along with the difficulty of penetrating a deeply mistrustful community can lead to false categorizations when traditional social scientists study Native American political behavior. With so much still unknown about native Indigenous communities, gaps are filled with information about other minority groups with dissimilar histories and cultures (Peterson, 1997), further perpetuating stereotypes and misunderstanding.

Education level, socioeconomic status, and age are three of the definitive predictors of political behavior – that is, of the politically active groups political scientists have historically studied.[3] Additionally, demographic background, such as race and gender, is a good indicator of an individual's likelihood to vote. While the academic community continues to research each of these factors as they pertain to Black and Latino communities, political science has yet to determine how to effectively work within Indigenous communities to understand political engagement and disenfranchisement in this population.

We are encouraged by some of the literature that is emerging from non-Native and Native researchers, imploring scholars to consider a broader field of data when engaging with Indigenous populations. Therefore, we chose to focus on the "bright spots" in relationships between traditional social science and indigenous populations.[4] It is the promise of gaining

---

[3] For a broad overview of political voting behavior, see the seminal work: Verba, Sidney, and Norman Nie. *Participation in America*. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

[4] The term "bright spots" is used in Chip and Dan Heath's book "Switch" (2010). The authors refer to the way our brains are wired to focus on weaknesses rather than strengths and encourage people to look for the solutions before we see the problems.

greater insight and understanding from Indigenous communities across the U.S. that led us to pursue this project.

## Literature Review

Characteristically, the non-Native approach to political science dictates that researchers invoke a theory and couch it in the scientific method to develop hypotheses regarding the attitudes and behaviors of a certain grouping of individuals. This methodology is systematic and draws deeply upon what is already known about the population as the researcher enters the environment to collect data from a representative sample (Babbie, 2016). Within this paradigm, there are several popular forms of methods, namely: quantitative methods, qualitative methods, and Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR).

Quantitative information seeks to gain information about a sample that can be generalized to a population; whereas, qualitative studies might focus on fewer subjects and seek to uncover nuance in the attitudes and behaviors of individuals or a relatively small group (Babbie, 2016). While typically a researcher might approach a population with a research question, method, and hypothesis already determined, there are indeed qualitative methodologies that involve the community from the beginning stages. Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) places the community as the driver of the research topic and utilizes both qualitative and quantitative methods that "maximize impact" of research (Stoecker, 2005). CBPR is lauded by some Indigenous researchers as relational approach that places the native community, cultural respect, and ways of knowing in the center of the process (Mertens, Cram, & Chilisa 2013). This collaborative method is possible to utilize when the research is "flexible". However, when the research parameters are predetermined, CBPR is difficult to employ if the researcher is contributing to a larger body of work.

Academics disagree on whether we should discard traditional methods entirely when working with Indigenous populations, or if it is possible to successfully decolonize these methodologies. And while the nature of some research projects may require a prescribed methodology, the researcher does have autonomy in their personal approach to the Indigenous population. Two approaches of note include the Indigenous approach and shared knowledge approach.

Firstly, the Indigenous approach asks scholars to consider research as ceremony, approaching the work from an Indigenous paradigm and adding in helpful tools from other methodologies as necessary (Wilson, 2008). The Indigenous research framework is derived from a quest for understanding and developing ways of knowing from a "holistic transmission of information" (Wilson, 2008). In this way, information is acquired through a circular format of inquiry where story is revered and one's relationship with others and with truth is emphasized. This call to expand an Indigenous method of scholarship notably recognizes the relationship between the natural and the spiritual as it "…illuminates differences in assumptions about knowledge that are at the root of the dominant culture's misunderstanding and subordination of Indigenous knowledge" (Garroutte, 2003). This extension allows for increased flexibility when working with Indigenous populations when necessary.

Alternatively, other scholars believe the complete decolonization of research is imperative to studying indigenous populations. To truly 'decolonize' research, we must reach a point of "shared knowledge." Shared knowledge can be understood as the hybrid of traditional academic knowledge and cultural knowledge (Mutua and Swadener, 2004). This is important, as "some of the assumptions underlying these different approaches need to be challenged, especially the ways they perpetuate racial separation" (Gross, 2005). In her seminal work

Decolonizing Methodologies, L.T. Smith (1999) suggests that a colonized worldview is "…embedded in our political discourses, our humour, poetry, music, storytelling and other common sense ways of passing on both a narrative of history and an attitude about history." Particularly detrimental is the perspective maintained by modern research methods; stories, myths, and traditions are all considered invalid sources of knowledge by the social science paradigm (Smith, 1999). According to this perspective, these ways of knowing are respected and accepted as valid data in a study.

Both the Indigenous approach and shared knowledge approach have proven useful and successful when working with Indigenous populations. Rather than dismiss the quantitative methodology as a colonized construct, it may be beneficial to use quantitative tools, but from an Indigenous perspective, to reap positive results in areas such as policy and governance (Walter and Anderson, 2013). This collaboration is central to Paulo Freire's groundbreaking work, The Pedagogy of the Oppressed. In this work, Freire asks: "How can I dialogue if I regard myself as a case apart from the others?" As such, research in this space should consider that all parties are able to contribute to the work in a meaningful way. The researcher's self-awareness of her worldview and its limitations is also necessary for successful work in this space. Mutuality in relationship breaks down perceived power dynamics in the quest for truth and understanding. Most essential is a willingness to not only expand one's worldview to consider a "secondary" worldview, but to "act outside" and embrace the Indigenous perspective where all things are in relationship with one another (Hart, 2010).

Focusing on the marriage between traditional methodological perspectives and varied research approaches can lead to paradigmatic change. We see that when challenged to collaborate with Indigenous researchers, non-Indigenous researchers described the benefits of

co-authorship, community involvement, and shared knowledge (Castleden et al., 2010). Therefore, central to our research and collaboration is "the five R's of research": respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility, and relationships (Styres and Zinga, 2013). Approaching each with a positive framework and established community bonds is essential to hybrid research and comprehensive knowledge (Styres and Zinga, 2013). Our paper seeks to test this collaboration between the two research methodologies by way of working with Native Americans in Nevada to study voter registration and access to polling places.

## Application

In August 2016, we joined a research excursion to Nevada with the Native American Voting Rights Coalition (NAVRC) headed by Dr. Jean Schroedel of Claremont Graduate University. The aim of the work was to gather data via survey about the voting behavior of Native Americans within the state. Despite the expansion of the Voting Rights Act in 1975, Native Americans in Nevada experience numerous barriers to voting. Incredibly poor socioeconomic status, high unemployment rates, and high mortality rates prevent many Native Americans from maintaining a sustainable quality of life, especially those living on reservations (McDonald, 2004/2005). The intolerable satellite voting sites, distance to municipal polling places, and increased discrimination prevent many on reservations from voting (Schroedel and Aslanian, 2014 & Barreto et. al, 2009). Before we left for the trip, the team was briefed on these conditions, including: Nevada voting laws, the state's political climate, and statistics on the history of Native American voting behavior.

Had our intentions only been to conduct the survey on voting behavior, a legal briefing may have sufficed. However, because our intentions were to employ the Indigenous paradigm we were studying, Dr. Schroedel advised us both to consider how we might best engage with the

members of Native American tribes in Nevada. It would be particularly important for us to take our cues from the tribal elders and leaders who are gatekeepers to the community. Entering the communities with a posture of receptivity would be imperative to this work.

After these meetings, we determined our approach to the research. Based off the literature, we learned a key component of the marriage of social science and Indigenous methodologies was active listening. Furthermore, we assessed that active listening was the most important research theme given the history of distrust between the two nations. Active listening demands that researchers participate with the community in such a way that "communication about research is understandable, relevant, and accessible to the members of the communities involved" (Straits et al., 2012).

We designed a survey that would be useful in navigating this space between while emphasizing active listening. In attempting to translate principles of active listening, "The Guiding Principles for Engaging in Research with Native American Communities" was particularly impactful and helped us in designing our survey (see: Straits et al., 2012). Our survey was designed so that we could not only follow notable qualitative variables (e.g. levels of political engagement, partisanship, etc.) but would continuously measure our participation with community members. This daily exercise in listening was aimed not at our colleagues or participants but at ourselves to ensure self-awareness and reflection ("Becoming an Active Listener," 2016).

Over the course of six days, we met Native Americans primarily from the Paiute, Shoshone, and Washoe tribes, both on and off reservations, in Reno, Nixon, Pyramid Lake, Wadsworth, Fallon, and Elko to administer a survey with the NAVRC. Simultaneously, we self-administered an assessment each day to consider our awareness in approaching these

communities. It was our hope that this process would allow us to be more cognizant of our interactions as we carefully chose prompts that would challenge us to place humility at the forefront of our approach. This "self-checking" would not only serve as a mechanism to keep us in line with our intentions, but would also help us to effectively relay our experiences to each other at the end of the day.

**Researcher Self-Assessment.** The five questions/prompts we chose are as follows:

1. Am I actively listening? Am I choosing not to talk to give community members a chance to speak?

2. How am I demonstrating that I am fully present with this person/community?

3. Am I coming from a positive or negative framework in how I perceive the community? Am I actively searching for positive qualities or strength in the community?

4. Am I taking the time to reflect on the information and how it translates to Native thought? Am I giving the community time to translate in their own Native worldview?

5. List anything else interesting here: (i.e. perception of individual's political knowledge, distractions, individual engagement level, etc.)

Although these questions are certainly not a panacea for any lack of understanding we may have, engaging in this process is a positive first step in becoming more self-aware and improving our cultural competency as researchers.

## Findings

Over the course of our research, we found that the self-assessment allowed for additional involvement and engagement with community members on a topic of their choosing. In this way, giving the community time to respond and translate information as it pertained to their Native worldview lead us to receive profound answers to questions we did not know to ask. As a result

of employing the self-assessment, we gained insight into important sub-themes, including indigenous ways of listening, presence, time, and positive framing or "bright spots" (Heath and Heath, 2010). The following examples of our interactions in Nevada will help to illustrate these experiences.

**Being Present**

Demonstrating continued presence was not always an easy task simply as a product of the survey locations. During the final days of conducting research in Nevada with the NAVRC, the team was posted at a gas station/tobacco shop in Elko. There were very few supplies, and even fewer chairs. The team was quick to make sure that that the available chairs and shade were offered to the community members. But, we could not overcome inherent environmental difficulties. The constant flow of store traffic, the summer heat, and insufficient resources left participants feeling extremely uncomfortable. And the curious stares of local non-Natives in search of tobacco left participants feeling altogether anxious. As a result, people were less likely to take part in the NAVRC survey, and less likely to engage in active conversation. Rather than stay posted at the gas station, we followed participants to areas they would be more comfortable taking the survey; sometimes this meant we sat on street corners and car bumpers waiting for them to fill out the papers.

Where the Elko location worked to hinder presence, the blessing of tribal elders in Nixon worked to set the tone for the afternoon and create space for the research to happen. When we arrived at the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribal Offices, we were introduced to a Paiute spiritual leader who was also responsible for work preserving the Northern Paiute language. We quickly set up our survey materials and then asked the elder if we could sit with him. While we waited for survey participants, the elder gave us a lesson, teaching us to say "thank you", and "see you next

time"[5] in the Northern Paiute language. He shared that the language was now being taught in the high school on the reservation, as most of the youth spoke only English and the elders were concerned their language would otherwise die with their generation. Later, when the room began to fill and we were ready to start, the elder stood and offered a prayer of blessing over the survey taking and voting rights work. Even after he completed his own survey, the elder stayed with us and gestured to others that peered into the room, encouraging them to participate as well. The language lessons, the blessing, and his presence in the room indicated to the other tribe members circulating in and out of the space that their participation was encouraged.

**Time**

Awareness of time became key to us, as we quickly realized that may be operating on a different schedule than the Native American communities. For example, on one day the scheduled survey time was within a few minutes of ending, but we noticed an uptick of people filing into the room. Several people told us they heard about the survey from a family member or friend, and raced over after work to participate. Although we already had a great response, we knew that more would be finishing work and we did not want to pack up and leave before they had the chance to participate as well. At this time, a few research team members began stacking chairs and gathering supplies to load up. We gestured to one another that we should stop packing up, realizing the signals we were sending. Our body language was telling those coming in that their survey responses were not as important as those that came in "on time". The respondents already in the room might feel rushed or disrespected if the clanking of chairs and shuffling of papers continued. We motioned to the other team members to cease packing up as folks continued to stream into the doors. While this meant that we collected more surveys than

---

[5] We learned there is no word for "hell" or "goodbye" in Northern Paiute. They will only refer to the "good place" and say "see you later" when bidding farewell to someone.

anticipated, we also could avoid a pitfall of showing disrespect for the effort people were making to get to the offices. The next day, in a different location on the reservation, we had several people come to take the survey because they heard we were there the day before and people recommended they participate. Later, we wondered if we had shut the surveying down at precisely five o'clock, how many important responses we would have missed. It is likely that our changed position encouraged increased participation in the coming days.

Relatedly, it was important to the Paiute Tribe that we spent our time learning about the community. Before and after conducting the NAVRC surveys, community members guided us through the beautiful reservation. Sites visited include: the tribal education center, tribal offices, senior center, homeless shelter, fire department, and movie theater. Not only was this important insight into the strengths of the community itself, but also the community values. We each felt the tension of time often, especially because our stay in Nevada was limited by the work we were there to conduct. When we were kindly invited to visit a tribal museum in Wadsworth before we left the area, we had to decline because we were expected to be at another site. Consistently, the giving of our time reflected our flexibility and readiness to work with the Paiute community, resulting in positive communication and space for overwhelming participation.

**Actively Listening**

On the first day with the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, the research team was split into groups to cover the diverse reservation. At a community center in Fallon, community members were eager to share their stories and voting experiences -- and we were eager to listen. Unfortunately, these sacred stories were often met with casual conversation. The simple "Oh, really!" or "How is that?" was enough to stop the conversation entirely. After each blunder, the conversation completely shifted; Native participants and leaders ended their train of thought and

did not begin again. These seemingly small mannerisms, often an accepted part of active listening, were perceived as disrespect. Interruptions or off-the-cuff remarks can be regarded as condescending and insensitive. Considering the history of the interactions between the two communities, we realized how important it was to be slow to speak and quick to listen.

This greater history and culture is one that several members of the Paiute Tribe were eager to share with us. In Pyramid Lake, a tribal administrator opened a community center for us and stayed to facilitate as we conducted surveys.[6] In between helping folks get started on their surveys, the administrator taught us lessons in segments as the she pulled out copies of slides and books from presentations. Over several hours, we learned about tribal education for entrepreneurs, the quest to protect and reinvigorate tribal youth with cultural practices, Native values, the educational experience of tribal youth, and historical trauma. Further, the administrator told us that Native youth often feel caught between two worlds culturally. The tribe is encouraging cultural practices such as burying a baby's umbilical cord after the child's first birthday, thereby grounding the child with the earth. She pointed to the abandonment of this practice as one of the reasons the tribal youth were at times disconnected from their cultural heritage and tribal activity. Our understanding of the disconnect often felt between tribe members and the Federal government grew as she gave examples of the messages of interference and domination that continue to pervade interactions of the two entities. The contemporary outreach of the non-tribal government to foster "democratic citizenship" amongst tribe members often translates to Native Americans as messages of "assimilation through coercion" (John and Shaw, n.d.). These perspectives were integral in helping us to understand the political behavior of Native Americans in Nevada.

---

[6] Although we met briefly the day before, we had more opportunity for interaction on the second day.

The challenge to partake in active listening acted primarily as personal accountability on long days when it might have otherwise been easier to check out and grab a smartphone or chat with a member of our research team during a lull in action. But more importantly, the demonstration that we were fully present resulted in a permanent intention to approach the Native community with humility and understanding. We believe that the lessons and insights we gained were a product of the openness of our hosts and the spirit of our intention.

**Bright Spots**

Finally, we found it beneficial to approach the Native American communities in a positive framework while actively searching for strengths or "bright spots." On our second day in Reno, we visited the Reno Sparks Tribal Health Center to gather surveys from clients and staff members. Immediately, we were impressed by the staff's holistic approach to care of the clients. The center is full of tribal artwork and cultural messaging, including directional signs featuring English, two tribal languages, and culturally relevant pictures. Our team was set up near a wall of windows underneath a stunning metal sculpture of a tree with birds flying overhead. A community educational gathering was happening down the hall, and lively conversation streamed out of the room. The strength of the community was evident as we witnessed the conviviality of the people meeting each other in this space with hugs and kind greetings.

The deep reverence for and importance of elders in Native American culture was also striking. Many of our longer conversations were with folks over 60 years of age. Aside from some of the interactions we discussed above, a few profound and humorous moments occurred. During survey taking, we noticed that elders would make a joke, just loud enough to be heard by the people in the room, and usually at the expense of then-presidential candidate Donald Trump. Later, a tribal leader shared with us that the elders jokes served a unique purpose. When they

sensed the mood was getting too heavy, they would make a joke to lift the spirits of others in the room. One of the leaders would drop life advice into communications while we were conducting simple undertakings such as making a poster or delivering supplies. In the kitchen at a community center, he stopped his task to teach us about the Medicine Wheel. Life is too fast-paced, he admonished. We miss important details as we rush through. As researchers, it is often our inclination to be critical, to look for inconsistencies, and to note shortcomings or failings in any population studied. However, if we learned that if we enter an Indigenous community with this perspective, we may miss significant opportunities to connect and might rush past consequential details.

## Discussion

When the two of us were initially approached to join the NAVRC team in Nevada, we were focused solely on voting behavior amongst Native Americans. And as social scientists, this narrow focus is in accordance with our training in qualitative methodology. However, voting behavior is a direct result of cultural and demographic factors. We found that traditional methods simply were insufficient at explaining our experiences with the Paiute Tribe. Rather, our experience in conducting a researcher self-assessment shows the need for active self-awareness when researching Indigenous populations. Because of this methodological perspective, we encourage researchers to consider the following when working with historically vulnerable populations, especially Indigenous peoples.

Groundwork in the months leading up to this research helped us to acknowledge other epistemological perspectives in concert with our traditional methods training. We were fortunate to be students in a course on Indigenous research methods in a previous semester, allowing us to consider the contrast of social science methods and Indigenous methods in advance. Of course,

we realize this will not be every researcher's experience.[7] Assembling an effective team based on methods training, cultural competency, and legal knowledge is imperative. However, intellectual capacity is not enough; we also submit that emotional intelligence is an essential component of any effective team.

Emotional Intelligence was made famous by psychologist Daniel Goleman, who wrote a book of the same title in 1995. Also referred to as EQ, Emotional Intelligence is the concept that a person is aware of their own emotions as well as the emotions of others, and can "read the room" for important cues.[8] Those with high EQ display self-regulation, self-awareness, social skills, empathy, and motivation. Including team members that are competent in EQ will enable the team to capture the depth of their experiences while guarding against the pitfalls that accompany disregard of research participants, perceived or real.

In addition, time and budget often do not permit researchers to spend months or years building trust in relationships. Social scientists have largely earned a reputation for "helicoptering" in and out of communities to gather data -- never to be seen again. When at all possible, working alongside a respected "gatekeeper" will help build a bridge as you enter an Indigenous community.[9] However, we find this role to be more comprehensive than simply providing entrée into a community. Gatekeepers should be considered as stakeholders in the research. They not only know who to talk to, but their presence also signals to potential participants that the research is worthy of their involvement.

Finally, background training, emotional intelligence, and personal connections all

---

[7] Researchers expressly interested in a broad approach to Indigenous research methods should see Shawn Wilson's "Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods" and the work of Native American scholars, such as Dr. Lawrence Gross.

[8] Goleman, D. (2005). *Emotional intelligence* (10th anniversary trade pbk. ed.). New York: Bantam Books.

[9] Gatekeeper is defined in the SAGE Dictionary of Social Research Methods as "the person who controls research access" (Jupp 2006).

function to promote the active listening framework. Whereas failed attempts to bridge the gap only perpetuate a sordid history, positive encounters promote a constructive bond between the two communities. In addition to coming prepared, respecting local history, and understanding the Indigenous circular model, we recommend a researcher self-assessment. Researchers should consider composing and conducting a self-assessment while conducting research amongst Indigenous populations to maintain a constant, favorable relationship with Native community.

## Conclusion

As political scientists, we see the inherent value of approaching our research with a strong agenda and careful execution of an appropriate methodology. However, when engaging in cross-cultural research, it is also critical to be open to the epistemology of the population studied. If the researcher can choose a methodology, it is best to consider working alongside the community to develop an agenda for gathering data while simultaneously considering cultural notions of time, presence, and mindfulness. If the methodology is prescribed, (as is often the case in work involving other research organizations, legal entities, or granting institutions) the researcher nevertheless has autonomy in determining the approach to the community. It is in this case that we find a self-assessment to act as an accountability tool for self-awareness. This slight addendum to any research project can greatly enhance the experience of social scientist and community member alike.

# References

Babbie, E. (2016). The practice of social research. Boston: Cengage Learning.

Barreto, M. A., Cohen-Marks, M., & Woods, N.D. (2009, September). Are all precincts created
    equal? The prevalence of low-quality precincts in low-income and minority communities.
    *Political Research Quarterly*, *62*(3), 445-458.

Castleden H., Morgan V. S., & Neimanis, A. (2010). Researchers' perspectives on
    collective/community co-authorship in Community-Based Participatory Indigenous
    Research. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, *5*(4), 23-32.
    doi:10.1525/jer.2010.5.4.23

Ferguson, Kennan. "Why does political science hate American Indians?" *Reflections Symposium*
    14, no. 4 (December 2016).

Freire, P. (2000). Pedagogy of the Oppressed (30th anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum.

Fryer, Paul. "Why aren't political scientists interested in Native American politics?" *Reflections*
    *Symposium* 14, no. 4 (December 2016).

Garroutte, E. M. (2003). Real Indians: Identity and the survival of Native America. Berkeley:
    University of California Press.
    http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=224770

Gross, L. W. (2005). Teaching American Indian studies to reflect American Indian ways of
    knowing and to interrupt cycles of genocide. *Wicazo Sa Review*, *20*(2), 121-145.

Harding, A., Harper, B., Stone, D., O'Neill, C., Berger, P., Harris, S., & Donatuto, J. (2012).
    Conducting research with tribal communities: Sovereignty, ethics, and data-sharing
    issues. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, *120*(1), 6–10.
    http://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1103904

Hart, M. A. (2010). Indigenous worldviews, knowledge, and research: The development of an indigenous research paradigm. *Journal of Indigenous Voices in Social Work*, 1(1). http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/15117/1/v1i1_04hart.pdf

Heath, C., & Heath, D. (2011). *Switch: How to change things when change is hard*. Waterville, Me.: Thorndike Press.

John, D. and Shaw, K. (n.d.) "The protection power of culture". [Powerpoint slides].

Jupp, V. (2006). *The SAGE dictionary of social research methods*: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9780857020116

Mertens, D. M., Cram, F., & Chilisa, B. (2013). Indigenous pathways into social research: Voices of a new generation. Walnut Creek, Calif.: Left Coast Press. http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=1180079

Mutua, K., & Swadener, B. B. (2004). Decolonizing research in cross-cultural contexts: Critical personal narratives. Albany: State University of New York Press. http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&local_base=BVB01&doc_number=0 12876933&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA

Peterson, Geoff. "Native American turnout in the 1990 and 1992 elections." *American Indian Quarterly* 21, no. 2 (Spring 1997).

Schroedel, J., & Aslanian, A. (2015). Native American vote suppression: The case of South Dakota. *Race, Gender, & Class*, *22*(1), 308-323.

Smith, L. T. (1999). Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples. London: Zed Books. http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/toc/hol052/98030387.html

Steinman, E. (2011). "Making Space": Lessons from collaborations with tribal nations. Ann

    Arbor, MI: Michigablishing, University of Michigan Library.

    http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0018.101

Stoecker, R. (2005). Research methods for community change: A project-based approach.

    Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Styres, S. D., & Zinga, D. M. (2013). The Community-First Land-Centered Theoretical

    Framework: Bringing a "good mind" to Indigenous education research? *Canadian*

    *Journal of Education*, *36*(2), 284-313.

Walter, M., & Andersen, C. (2013). Indigenous statistics: A quantitative research methodology.

    Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

    http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=1418425

Wilson, S. (2008). Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods. Black Point, N.S.:
Fernwood Pub.. http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/toc/fy1002/2008431436.html