Respectful Research: Working with Indigenous Peoples in Psychological, Anthropological and Cross-Cultural Sciences

Gesa Solveig Duden
FernUniversität in Hagen, g.duden@zoho.com

Daniel Bagheri Sarvestani
University of Kansas, dsarvestani@ku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc

Recommended Citation

Respectful Research: Working with Indigenous Peoples in Psychological, Anthropological and Cross-Cultural Sciences

Abstract

Indigenous peoples today face a wide range of constantly evolving political, epistemic and socio-cultural forms of contemporary colonial violence. Modern discourses and research practices both continue to promote Eurocentric narratives while marginalizing non-Western Indigenous perspectives. In our research project focusing on Maya Ch'orti cultural identities in the context of Indigenous peoples' rights movements, we aimed to follow Indigenous Rights guidelines on how to conduct respectful, collaborative research with instead of on or about Indigenous peoples, thereby exploring forms of subjective epistemologies. In the present article, we provide a description of our endeavour and practices as well as of the challenges we faced along the way. We also discuss Indigenous research methods and their role in shaping reconciliatory spaces that can benefit from the inclusion of Indigenous peoples' perspectives in the fields of psychological, anthropological, and cross-cultural inquiries.

Introduction

Who are the Researchers and Samples in Psychological Research?

Up to now, large areas of scholarly work in mainstream psychological science remain based on research by and with people in affluent Western societies (Adams et al., 2015). In recent years, however, there have been a number of critiques and changes in the psychology of that subject matter. For instance, Henrich et al. (2010) coined the term WEIRD to illustrate the fact that a large majority of psychological studies make universal claims, but investigate phenomena on a minority - and particularly weird – group of people: those stemming from Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic countries. The WEIRD acronym has received some critiques, such as that as a "catchy acronym" it might have the power to actually constrain scientific advancement (Syed, 2020). Furthermore, it might be leaving out some important aspects of diversity (e.g., race and ethnicity) while focusing too much on national diversity (Syed & Kathawwall, 2020), and being Western-centric in and of it itself, as it categorizes a small part of the worlds' population into Western and the "rest" into non-Western.

Acronym or not, the Western dominance in psychological research remains a major issue. The Western dominance in psychological research concerns authorship, as well as the choice of study participants. Arnett (2008) showed that 95% of the research published in the top six journals of the American Psychological Association (APA) had been conducted on Usonian or European samples. In 2020, Thalmayer et al. (2021) concluded that the psychological discipline is still far off from truly representing human beings as a science. In their follow-up study of the same journals (2014-2018), the researchers found an increase in authorship and samples from other English-speaking and Western European countries. This led to about 11% of the world's population being represented in the selected journals, while 89% of the world's population were neglected. Authors and samples of the majority world formed a mere 4-5%. The Western dominance also appears in the ways knowledge is produced and exported which is shown particularly by decolonial critiques. Mills (2014), for instance, highlights how the Western exportation of "global mental health" approaches has led to problems related to a psychiatrization of countries in the Global South. In her work, she describes how colonial practices are continuously employed, since research priorities are not decided in collaboration with local communities (Mills, 2014).

Culture influences intellectual thought and affects the way science is conceived, and how studies are conducted and interpreted (Ahearn, 2000; Kirmayer, 2007; Summerfield, 1999, 2008). This becomes problematic if a certain cultural perspective, such as the view of the rationalistic and individualistic self, becomes naturalised. The specific cultural perspective then begins to influence scientific endeavours implicitly (in other words, researchers remain unaware of its influence), while findings are exported as "universal truths", and other forms of knowledge creation become marginalised (Duden, 2021; Smith, 2021; Sousa Santos, 2007).

> "Hidden colonial thinking expresses itself in terms of exclusion or disregard of non-Western psychologies… it is based upon the assumption that Western conceptualizations of mental life are superior and have universal validity" (Teo, 2005, p. 167).

Researchers who envision to move away from colonial practices and conduct studies which integrate more diverse realities and samples are challenged to reflect on their own culturally based beliefs about normality, research, and methods (Adams et al., 2015). This is true for scholars working within their own local communities as well as for those working in cross-cultural settings, and particularly in the work with Indigenous peoples.

Indigenous People

Here, the term "Indigenous" refers to the original inhabitants of specific territories or countries. There are some 476 million Indigenous people around the world accounting for about 6% of the world's population (Amnesty International, 2022; UN, 2022). Indigenous peoples include more than 5,000 distinct groups with over 4,000 languages and spread across more than 90 countries (Amnesty International, 2022; UN, 2022). Most of them – 70% – live in Asia (Amnesty International, 2022; UN, 2022), but there are over 500 federally recognized groups in the United States, and over 400 in Latin America (Brave Heart et al., 2011). Indigenous peoples are vastly diverse in terms of their political and economic situations, cultures, and relationships with colonizing societies (Alfred & Corntassel, 2005). However, there are commonalities in the histories of Indigenous peoples across the world (Kirmayer et al., 2008): most of these populations have been subjected to some form of marginalization (Walls et al., 2014) along with cultural, political, and physical oppression by state and colonial authorities (Alfred & Corntassel, 2005). The growing consensus points to ongoing impacts and traumas of colonisation which have shaped Indigenous peoples' experiences with the advent modernity (Brave Heart et al., 2011). For instance, the rupture of cultural continuity, i.e., the official condemnation of Indigenous culture, criminalisation of religion, prohibition of language, and suspension of the right to educate their own children has been associated with poor mental health outcomes and high suicide rates (Chandler & Lalonde, 1998; Kirmayer et al., 2011). The modern colonial violence faced by Indigenous peoples presents itself across various constantly evolving political, epistemic, socio-cultural, and psychological contexts. For instance, modern discourses and scientific practices still tend to promote both Eurocentric narratives and to marginalize, and invariably diminish, non-Western and Indigenous perspectives and world views (Fanon, 2007).

Indigenous Peoples' Rights Discourses

Since the early 1980s, with the adoption of a variety of Indigenous Peoples' Rights Discourses (IPRD), issues relating to the rights of Indigenous peoples have gained traction in the international arena. The International Labour Organization (ILO) convention 169 and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) are often cited as two capital documents that work together to set the international standards for the

IPRD. The ILO convention 169 was drafted between 1988-1989. However, the legal discourses that led to the development of the convention 169 were in the making since the early 80's (ILO, 2009). The UN body of experts recognizes the unique circumstances that Indigenous peoples face as evidenced by a shared history of colonization and exploitative labor conditions. As such, the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) has deemed it necessary to establish specific sets of measures (as covered by ILO 169 and UNDRIP) to protect the fundamental human rights, including land rights, of Indigenous people (UN, 2007). Land rights is one of the major themes that is underpinning Indigenous peoples' rights laws. The rationale behind this focus is the recognition of Indigenous peoples' unique cultural connection to the land and of the historical land dispossessions that most Indigenous nations have experienced as a result of colonization.

The IPRD discussions have reached the scientific communities with scholars becoming aware of the historical injustices experienced by Indigenous peoples and of the necessity to incorporate Indigenous peoples' rights and perspectives. Such an inclusion yields the potential to challenge modern assumptions and hegemonic narratives across various fields, including, but not limited to, methods of scholarship and knowledge production. In a recent research project conducted on behalf of International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology (IACCP) as part of the Kwok Leung research award, we, that is, Daniel Bagheri Sarvestani and Gesa Solveig Duden, the authors of this article, have investigated cultural identities among the Maya Ch'orti in Copán (Honduras) since before and after the implementation of IPRD in the early 1990s (Bagheri Sarvestani & Duden, under review). In conducting this project, the importance of learning how to incorporate Indigenous and decolonial research methods to gap the cultural and power differences that exists between the Western academic scientific space and local Indigenous communities became apparent. In the present article, we aim to discuss forms of subjective epistemologies embraced by the research project and their role in shaping inclusive and reconciliatory spaces geared toward Indigenous peoples' perspectives within the field psychological, anthropological, and cross-cultural inquiries.

The Maya Ch'orti

The historical trajectory of land dispossession, colonization and marginalization is very present among Indigenous Maya Ch'orti peoples. The Maya Ch'orti peoples are one of the major Indigenous populations occupying the bordering regions of Honduras and Guatemala. Like many other Mayan and Indigenous communities in the region, the Maya Ch'orti peoples have had a turbulent history marred by episodes of colonization, forced displacement, civil war and armed conflict (Metz, 2010). The European colonization of mainland Americas arguably started in Mesoamerica when the first groups of Spanish Conquistadors began making headway into the former Aztec Empire and Mayan territories. In its wake, Spanish colonization brought the plunder of most major Aztec and Mayan settlements and set in motion the ethnocide (and selective genocide) of the local populations (Metz, 2010). Many of the Mayans who survived the initial wave of the Europeans soon found themselves in forced-labor camps extracting precious metals and other vital resources intended for

European markets. More recently, with the consequences of the Guatemalan civil war in particular, government oppression and the ongoing criminal activities of narco-traffickers have resulted in the displacement and unanswered violent death of thousands of Maya Ch'orti people. Likewise, the process of land dispossession has continued, first as a result of Spanish colonization, and latter due to state sponsored land expropriations (Metz, 2010). This loss of access to traditional lands has jeopardized the food security and subsistence of many Maya Ch'orti communities. Yet, Maya Ch'orti claims to their traditional territories and rights to land ownership have largely been ignored by various government institutions as well as by the wealthy private landowners who now occupy vest swaths of traditional Maya Ch'orti territories (Metz, 2010).

The UN Special Rapporteur on the rights of Indigenous peoples also highlights the increasing poverty and systematic marginalization faced by the Maya Ch'orti and other Indigenous peoples across Central America (OHCHR, n.d.). The lack of economic opportunities and of access to political outlets has sustained unequal power relationships between the Maya Ch'orti communities and the rest of the population, which tends to be Ladino or of mixed Hispanic descent. This sense of inequality and the dichotomy between Ladino and "Indio" (a derogatory term meaning Indian or Native) are all too pervasive in the cultural, social and political make-up of local communities and of State structures (Metz, 2010). As a result, systematic violence and inequalities against Indigenous peoples are perpetuated by deeply ingrained stigmas and prejudices that inform political and economic systems at all levels of society. In Honduras, such prejudices often manifest themselves in the form of discriminatory policies that tend to deprive the Maya Ch'orti communities of basic access to justice, health care, education and infrastructure. Not surprisingly, the Indigenous nations in Honduras, including the Maya Ch'orti people, tend to experience violence and malnutrition far more disproportionately than the rest of society (Tauli-Corpuz, 2018).

These examples of Maya Ch'orti marginalization are linked to, and parallel to the historical dispossession and exile of these people from their traditional lands, to which they share a close cultural connection. Not only do the Maya Ch'orti people traditionally rely on the land for their subsistence farming practices, but their cultural rituals and social systems are also closely shaped by their proximity to their ancestral land (Metz, 1998). As such, the issue of land dispossession and of its ties to historical traumas and culture loss was of particular interest to our empirical study.

Research with People who Have Experienced Marginalization

The historical and ongoing context of colonial violence requires a specialized awareness and sensitivity on the part of scholars when working with Indigenous nations. Such an awareness can be nourished in part by theory. One of the theoretical pillars for our research project was Liberation Psychology – a set of theories and applied psychological approaches emerging from work with people experiencing structural violence, poverty, and oppression. Liberation psychology aims to illuminate the connections between an individual's psychological suffering and their social, economic, and political contexts. It emphasises that conventional representations of everyday events are neither the neutral reflection of an

objective truth nor a natural reality. Rather, they represent particular constructions of reality that may reflect and serve the interests of the powerful. The most commonly cited formulations of liberation psychology is the work of Martín-Baró (1996). He emphasised a way of knowing that gives preference to the epistemological position of people who find themselves in a context of marginalisation, deliberately attempting to understand reality from the perspectives of these people. Liberation psychology furthermore embraces a participatory research ethos that prioritises practice over theory. Rather than dismissing the academic world as a hopelessly detached activity of the powerful, liberation psychologists use empirical methods to de-ideologise daily realities and show the everyday truth of people's experiences.

Research with Indigenous Peoples

The history of research on or about Indigenous peoples has traditionally been marred with tendencies to racism, structural violence, orientalism, and discrimination (Sullivan, 2020). Particularly, anthropology looks back to disciplinary history of research that objectified Indigenous people as subjects to be studied, contributing to a further exoticization and romanization of the image of the "noble savage" who lives in a "natural state" (Faust-Scalisi, 2020, November 27). Harmful, disrespectful, and abusive research practices involved, and still involve parachuting research, i.e., research that lacks reciprocity and accountability with researchers going "in the field", collecting their data, and immediately leaving without giving anything in return (Tobias et al., 2013). Furthermore, a deficit-oriented research perspective has prevailed in many studies with Indigenous peoples. For instance, Walter and Andersen (2013) found that data collected by national governments tend to frame Indigenous lives in "five Ds": disparity, deprivation, disadvantage, dysfunction, and difference. Certainly, these aspects form part of the experience of many Indigenous peoples with material poverty remaining a major issue (Hossain & Lamb, 2019). However, focusing purely on such issues is far from providing a complete picture of the everyday realities of Indigenous peoples. This makes the availability of almost exclusively deficit-oriented data problematic (Foxworth & Ellenwood, 2022). For instance, the research on school outcomes of Indigenous students who consistently seem to "underperform" ignores that the modern Western educational context is a culture-laden entity that suits some people, but not everyone (Fryberg et al., 2013). Finally, Indigenous critics have argued that Western research is exclusively rooted in Western interests and ways of knowing, justifying Indigenous marginalization, and colonization (Foxworth & Ellenwood, 2022; Walter & Andersen, 2013; Wilson, 2008).

In response to these harmful research practices, Indigenous people representatives have increasingly brought forward research principles, methodologies, and policies that help address colonial legacy in Western scholarship (Foxworth & Ellenwood, 2022). Guidelines such as those of the Association of American Geographers Indigenous Peoples Specialty Group promote the building of ethical research partnerships with Indigenous peoples as an opportunity to avoid past injustices (Louis & Grossman, 2009). Furthermore, there has been a surge in Indigenous research methodologies brought forward by Indigenous scholars

themselves (Foxworth & Ellenwood, 2022). For example, Pe-Pua (2006) published an account of Philippine Indigenous research methods, and also provides five guiding principles for Indigenous research. In what follows, we describe how we, as non-Indigenous researchers, aimed to integrate guidelines like these into our own research project, and what challenges we encountered along the way.

Aiming for Respectful Research and Meeting Research Quality Criteria

Research Design

Aiming to approach our project with Indigenous peoples' rights in mind, we chose our research methods with a focus on their appropriateness to the local setting. We opted for qualitative method as we were interested in a deeper understanding of the context (De Jong & Van Ommeren, 2002). Even though qualitative methods are common in anthropology and in psychology the "qualitative-quantitative paradigm wars" (Noblit, 2018, p. 35) are slowly coming to an end, choosing qualitative methods still comes with challenges. For instance, it does limit the choice of journals, since many editors continue to focus on quantifiable and seemingly generalizable results in psychology, or because word limits make it hard to produce meaningful qualitative reports (Duden, 2021; Finlay, 2002). These internal academic struggles set aside, qualitative methods bring many advantages when working with vulnerable or marginalised groups as well as in intercultural settings. In fact, scholars have highlighted how various Indigenous methods that rely on connections and conversations with individuals would be labelled qualitative research methods in Western contexts (Foxworth & Ellenwood, 2022).

Being an outsider – emic and etic perspectives in research with indigenous peoples

We approached our research process with an attempt to combine emic-etic perspectives. The distinction between emic and etic research stems in large part from the work of Kenneth Pike (1954). In etic research, the scholar faces the research context from an outsider perspective and often aims to connect human behaviour from one setting to a universal human condition. In emic research, on the other hand, concerns are the particulars of human behaviour within a cultural setting. Pike thought that the two perspectives could best complement one another. However, he also argued that all researchers enter the culture of participants with their own emic perspective, which must be reflected upon because it can distort the emic story of the cultural setting under research. Nowadays emic-etic perspectives are often understood to be in tension rather than complementary, and the etic perspective is often framed as a colonial point of view that is imposed upon the specific (Beals et al., 2020). For instance, researchers in the past are perceived to have entered Indigenous communities from an etic point of view with pre-established agendas and methods (Louis, 2007; Smith, 2021). In our own research project, we were "outsiders" to the Maya Ch'orti community, and we chose an etic concept, cultural identity, and predefined the broad research question: "How did notions of cultural identity evolve among the Maya Ch'orti people of Honduras with the implementation of the Indigenous Peoples' Rights Discourses and the advent of the Indigenous rights movement?" However, we tried to integrate emic

perspectives through our pre-established connections with the community as well as by aiming to involve the community as much as possible in the research process. In fact, Smith (2021) argues that researchers can have multiple positions in the research process and thus disrupt the emic-etic binary if they have a connection to the community in which they conduct their research.

Datasets

As we were interested in Maya Ch'orti cultural identities over time, we used datasets from three different points in time, mainly relying on secondary data. The first two datasets (1990s and early 2000s) were made available by Daniel Bagheri Sarvestani's PhD supervisor Prof. Brent Metz, who had been working among the Maya Ch'orti since the early 2000s. The last dataset was obtained by Daniel himself in 2018-2019. At the core of all three datasets were transformations of culture and ethnic identity. All datasets consisted of open to semi-structured interviews, meaning that there was a list of topics to cover, but that it was largely up to the interviewees to decide the trajectory of the conversation. For instance, in the most recent dataset, Daniel opened a space for participants through a very broad and general question, and then refrained for the most part of the interview from interjecting to allow for the participants to express their own perspectives. Similarly, the interviews from 1993-96 were built around the broad overall questions of: "How have conditions for the Maya Ch'orti been changing, and how do you see the future?" The questions for 2003-04 revolved around the issue of community history, and ultimately spiraled into ethnic identity. Interviews for all datasets lasted between 20 minutes and 2.5 hours, with an average of one hour, and were conducted in Spanish - the language that participants and researchers spoke fluently.

During the peer review process in psychological journals, this rather flexible and open methodical approach raised concerns about the comparability of our datasets (since not exactly the same questions were asked). Certainly, the quest for comparability of data yields value, but such a method conflicted with our goals. Our aim was not to build generalizable, comparable data, but to analyse each of the participants' perspectives as unique and specific, and to provide insights into what Maya Ch'orti themselves had to say about their cultural identities.

Researchers' reflexivity

Throughout our research process, we engaged in critical reflection about our positions, goals, assumptions, and responsibilities. Reflexivity is an important tool in qualitative research (Newton et al., 2012) and can have a powerful impact on research quality and outcomes when it helps investigators explore their world views, assumptions and value judgments (Dowling, 2005). Yet, there have also been critical voices within academia regarding the increasing practise of including positionality statements in scientific articles (Savolainen et al., 2023). The critique questions for one thing the ability of positionality declarations to serve their intended function as whatever researchers will write about their positionality is likely to be restricted by their very own positionality. Furthermore, Savolainen et al., (2023, p.2) posit that by focusing on individual characteristics of researchers, the statements fail to address the real causes of bias in research, i.e., "the field's collective

failure to adhere to the scientific ethos". Finally, positionality statements might even subvert practices that protect the scientific integrity in research, such as leading to bias in the peer review process. We understand these important concerns and partially agree with them, particularly if positionality statements turn into pure declarations of identity categories that are not necessarily linked to a study's content. However, when it comes to research with Indigenous peoples, we highly recommend transparently engaging in researchers' reflexivity due to two main reasons:

1. The exoticising history of Western research on Indigenous peoples as subjects to be studied (Faust-Scalisi, 2020; Foxworth & Ellenwood, 2022; Walter & Andersen, 2013; Wilson, 2008), calls for a very sensitive and careful reflection on researchers' intentions, and relationships with Indigenous communities. Thus, researchers being aware of their own background, communicating objectives and addressing potential power relationships turns into an ethical obligation when working with Indigenous people. Indeed, Indigenous research emphasises researcher reflexivity strongly, demanding personal transparency and vulnerability of researchers throughout the entire research process (Snow et al., 2016).

2. In light of the marginalization (Walls et al., 2014) and vast oppression by state and colonial authorities of Indigenous populations (Alfred & Corntassel, 2005), it might be particularly challenging, and maybe not even desirable for researchers, to maintain a neutral stance when coming in contact with the communities. Reflecting on how the interactive process with Indigenous populations might influence one's own position, world view etc. becomes thus essential, to enhance transparency and credibility of findings. This parallels research with other marginalised groups such as refugees. For instance, for many scholars working with refugees, positions other than open solidarity are even seen as ethically inappropriate (Block et al., 2013).

In our work, reflexivity or seeking for a positioning in relation to our project and the participants was a complex process. While Daniel's main goal was making the voices of Maya Ch'orti heard within academia and showing the importance of the Indigenous Rights movement, Gesa's main concern revolved around our right to even conduct such research. Neither of us belongs to an Indigenous group. Daniel is a Canadian citizen from a minority background, and Gesa is of German origin and nationality. We were both educated within the dominant Western science paradigm. Our perspectives, however, have particularly been forged by our experiences of having lived and conducted research in diverse countries, including countries of the Global South. For both of us, the years spent in these countries have been lessons for a greater sensitivity to the diversity of cultural specifics and nuances. While both of us have met and interacted with Indigenous peoples, only Daniel has had extended contact to the Maya Ch'orti communities. Still, he was not born, did not grow up and does not belong to the Maya Ch'orti population. Both of us therefore remain outsiders in the eyes of Indigenous community members, and, as academics, we belong to institutions that have not always shown ethical and respectful approaches in their investigations among/with/for/on Indigenous communities. Our outsider status could have been a reason

to desist from the project, and we seriously discussed such a possibility. However, Daniel's contacts within numerous members of the community reassured us that they wanted our project to advance. Our ethical solution then was to involve the community as much as possible in the research process and adhering to a "microethics", or 'ethics in practice' process, in which we adopted a continuous reflection and critical scrutiny with regards to our research process and ourselves (Block et al., 2013). These reflections were shared with the community and were certainly of use for ourselves. For instance, they made us aware of the need to engage in more participatory methods than we were able to. Furthermore, through these reflections we became very aware of the tension inherent in aiming for an integration of Non-Western perspectives and ways of knowing in mainstream academia. In the scientific realm, however, we are still unsure on how to integrate these reflections in empirical articles in order to turn them into something useful for other scholars.

Recruitment of Participants, and Their Relationships With Researchers

Daniel Bagheri Sarvestani had been working as an Indigenous rights activist with the Maya Ch'orti for some years before collecting the data. The deepened relationship between him and the participants who already knew him and his works positively impacted the quality of the data we managed to obtain (Pe-Pua, 2006). Over months, Daniel had established contacts with community leaders and gained the trust of the locals. He had also been introduced to the communities by other researchers and human rights activists who were already known to the communities. The situation was similar for the other two datasets obtained from Brent Metz, who had been working with the communities for over 20 years.

Seen as a necessary condition by many Indigenous scholars (e.g., Pe-Pua, 2006), a personal connection and clear political stance on the part of the researcher might be seen as a weakness from a more positivistic position which calls for the unbiased, neutral and objective researcher. However, within academic disciplines such as psychology, there is a growing acknowledgement that there is no value-free research and that the person of the researcher always influences the research outcomes – be it by choosing the research question, methodology and methods or due to their positionality and relationship with research participants (Crowe & Sheppard, 2010; Holmes, 2020). For instance, many qualitative research approaches have highlighted the relationship between participants and researchers as being core to the quality of the data (Crowe & Sheppard, 2010; Duden, 2021; Holmes, 2020; Williams & Morrow, 2009).

Furthermore, in some intercultural settings, the importance of the "knowing and being known" factor has been emphasised as crucial for the recruitment process (Eide & Allen, 2005, p. 45). Valid reasons exist why Indigenous communities would be mistrustful of unknown, outsider researchers, and interested in keeping them away (Sullivan, 2020). The "knowing and being known" approach allows for the trust between participant and researcher to be (pre-)established through having a mutual connection as a community leader, a friend, a colleague or a family member. This is, for instance, the case while using a "gatekeeper" approach, i.e., counting on the help of a person within the community who functions as an intermediary between researchers and potential research participants, and actively encourages participation in the study (Robinson, 2014). In our study, we particularly counted

on the help of local leaders of the organization "Consejo Nacional Indigena Maya Ch'orti de Honduras" (CONIMCHH, website: http://en.conimchh.org/) to help us access the communities and gain community consent.

In addition, we relied on snowball sampling, a form of convenience sampling that is common in studies involving hard-to-reach research populations (De Jong & Van Ommeren, 2002). These populations can be groups that are low in numbers, stigmatised or looking for anonymity, those that are geographically dispersed or find themselves in a particularly sensitive and vulnerable situation, and require trust through a mutual connection in order to be willing to participate in a research project (Parker et al., 2019). In snowball sampling, we ask a research participant to list other people that share his or her characteristic. We then randomly select further research participants from this list who again will be asked to list potential participants. This process is repeated until we complete our data collection. Snowball sampling has been applied in a variety of research projects, including studies involving specific immigrant groups (Maticka-Tyndale et al., 2007), psychological counsellors working with refugees (Duden & Martins-Borges, 2021) or traditional healers (Maluleka & Ngoepe, 2018).

All the interviews with Maya Ch'orti participants were conducted in Spanish. Since before the colonial period, the Copan region has always been home to a dispersed and decentralized mixed populations of Lenca, Chipchan, and Maya ethnicities who populated the area in small settlements or semi-nomadic communities. Although a wide range of languages were spoken in the area, proto-Ch'orti' Maya and Lenca were the dominant idioms until the colonial period. The Ch'orti' language system itself incorporated many Chipchan and Lenca words and features. In short, there has never been any ethnic and/or linguistic homogeneity in Copán, and today's Ch'orti' people are most likely descended from a mixed ethnic and linguistic heritage that corresponded to the historical and cultural conditions that prevailed before the colonial period (Metz 2021). As result of ethnic erosion and the steady process of Mestizaje throughout the 18th, 19th, and 20th century, most Ch'orti communities stopped practising the Ch'orti languages. There have been some efforts in reviving the Ch'orti language in Copan through the implementation of the ILO convention, including introduction of new school curriculums taught in Ch'orti. However, the result of these effort has been mixed and Ch'orti is still not widely spoken by community members. The Maya Ch'orti mainly use Spanish in their daily interactions and currently Spanish remains to be the lingua franca of the region.

Collaborative Research Methods

Collaborative research includes a variety of diverse research practices (Gallagher, 2008; Phillips et al., 2013), that now gain new momentum with the focus on "citizen science" (Moedas, 2018). In participatory-action research, the process of co-production of knowledge is part of the research methodology (Baum et al., 2006; Gibbs, 2001; Lund et al., 2016; Richardson, 2015). Particularly for research involving Indigenous participants, participatory and community focused approaches have become a guiding principle. The international

IPRD standards enshrined by the ILO 169 posit that consultation and participation are central to work that in any form impacts Indigenous peoples and their community. Honduras, the country where we conducted our research, ratified the ILO 169, and incorporating the basic standards of Indigenous peoples' rights was crucial to our project. The notion of consultation and participation is particularly essential as it provides Indigenous peoples with space to define their own goals, outcomes, and perspectives on matters that impact them. Although collaboration may seem simple on paper, in the reality of a research process, it is complex and fraught with tensions. While conducting our collaborative research, many questions arose, including, for example:

1. At what stages of the process do we involve whom? For instance, do community members contribute to the research question, to the choice of methods, to the analysis of data, to the writing of the paper, etc.?
2. How can we ensure the methodological quality criteria when involving participants?
3. Whom do we involve? Selected community members? The community as a whole?
4. How do we deal with discrepancies of opinions between researchers and participants, or among participants themselves?
5. How do we put the collaborative work in practice? Do we set up meetings? How do we fund these meetings?

Fortunately, there exist some accounts on how to address questions like these in collaborative, community-based, and participatory-action projects (Baum et al., 2006; Gibbs, 2001; Lund et al., 2016; Richardson, 2015). In our research project, our team included local collaborators and research assistants. We involved the community particularly in the phase of data analysis. While it would have been ideal to clearly identify the wishes of the community prior to the start of the project and engage in a process of co-creation of research questions (San Pedro & Kinloch, 2017), due to the way our research project sprouted, this was not possible. Our project developed during the Summer School of the IACCP, where we were asked to write a project proposal. Daniel had been working among the Maya Ch'orti for some time. Being familiar with their struggles for rights and recognition as well as having special access to the community, he saw this as an opportunity to create a space within academia where Maya Ch'orti voices could be heard. Thus, when we embarked on our project, the research questions had already been formulated. However, in all that followed, we actively engaged participants, telling them about our research idea and asking them to change anything that did not make sense to them.

After we analysed the interview data in a first round, we set up meetings with the Maya Ch'orti' assembly on several occasions to discuss the analysed data and themes we had created. These meetings took place in the office of CONIMCHH (see picture 2) and each of them lasted around three hours. CONIMCHH provides a space where Ch'orti Maya community members can meet on a regular basis to discuss issues of importance to their communities. The meetings led to several important results for our research findings. For instance, a consensus emerged that participants should be labeled as Maya Ch'orti (rather than   Ch'orti'

Picture 1.
Ch'orti Maya in Copán Gathering to Show Support for Right to Communal Land

or Ch'orti' Maya). Participants also highlighted the need to re-consider the term poor, an adjective they thought of as derogatory when used in connection with the Maya Ch'orti. That parallels the criticisms of the deficit perspective-oriented research with Indigenous peoples (Foxworth & Ellenwood, 2022; Walter & Andersen, 2013). Instead of having the word poor in the results of our analysis, the community members emphasised the distinction between the very real economic poverty of many Maya Ch'orti, but their wealth in terms of culture, nobility, and traditions. Finally, the community members asked our team to use the research project as a means of making their struggles against injustice visible in the world. They asked for our support in mobilizing resources for their community's quest for rights. As a response, we acknowledged solidarity with the Indigenous rights movement. However, we also admitted that we were unable to guarantee that the research project would contribute to an

improvement of the community situation. Still, we received the community's support for the continuation of the project. Through these meetings, we hope to have embodied the spirit of a collaborative community-based research in line with the guidelines of international Indigenous peoples' rights (Lassiter, 2005).

Picture 2.
Ch'orti Maya Community Members Gather for a Meeting at CONIMCHH

Ethical Concerns

All research protocols were approved of by the University of Kansas Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. We only included data for which informed oral consent had been obtained. While, it is the common ethical research practice to obtain written consent from research participants in psychological research projects, in studies involving people belonging to marginalised groups, consent in writing might prove difficult or even unethical to ask for (Coram, 2011). That is the case, for instance, for some Indigenous participants, since "written consent itself represents a breach of anonymity as the name of the participant is recorded in the research file" (Coram, 2011, p.43). This again parallels a common dilemma in research with refugees. Refugees as study participants might be reluctant to sign documents, since they often do not know whom to trust with their signature or they have

been instructed not to sign anything in order to prevent them being taken advantage of (Block et al., 2013; Ellis et al., 2007; Mackenzie et al., 2007). Furthermore, some researchers avoid written consent to not place participants in a potentially uncomfortable situation of having to admit illiteracy (Müller-Funk, 2021).

Picture 3.
Daniel Attending the Meeting With the Ch'orti Maya Community Members in Copán Ruinas

Many Maya Ch'orti are weary of providing signatures or written information that could associate their personal name with a particular initiative. Given the history of abuse in the region, this desire for anonymity is understandable. We therefore orally asked for the consent of our participants abiding by the principles of "Free, Prior, and Informed, Consent" (FPIC) as stipulated by the ILO Convention 169. In other words, we clearly explained the objective of our project to the leaders and the CONIMCHH assembly, and asked permission to participants well ahead of interviews with them. To further protect interviewees, the names of participants and other personal identification was replaced with number identification. Interview recordings and transcripts were kept in a secure digital file.

Picture 4.
Fabric Used by Maya Chorti in Copan

A local research assistant was additionally hired to support the project and maintain communication with community members in our absence. She met on various occasion with the CONIMCHH assembly to go over the progress of our project and ask for the community members' own interpretation and perspectives. We used the communications of our local research assistant to modify our analysis and procedures to make them more culturally responsive and participatory in every aspect. Finally, our assistant reviewed the article we had written about the project but did not take an active part in the writing process due to other commitments. Copies of this article were shared with community collaborators, and each person was given a chance to comment on its content. Those who chose to provide feedback considered the analysis and presentation in this article "good".

Lessons Learned From our Project

Funding and Relationship Building

Ethnographic and Indigenous research methodologies call for extensive cultural emersion and continued collaborative approaches throughout the research process. Often, financial and timely restrictions, as well as academic structures, such as temporary contracts for researchers, do not allow for such an emersion and render prolonged cooperation difficult. This was certainly the case with our project. It made us aware that if you plan a study with Indigenous peoples, you need to make sure to have funding for at least a couple of years. If not, it is very easy to fall into the pitfall of parachuting research (Tobias et al., 2013). For our continued collaboration with the communities, we will need to apply more resources in the future. We do aim to expand our collaboration with the Maya Ch'orti communities through continued follow-up and longitudinal studies in the region. Ideally, we would be able to return to the area of Copan to reengage with the community and directly gage their perspectives on the methodological reflections presented in the present article. During the course of our project, we were able to return to the communities to discuss empirical results and adopt them accordingly. In the present moment we are left without funding, and it has become unfeasible to repeat this procedure for the present article. We strongly suggest that future researchers reflect in a collaborative form with Indigenous groups on their research methods.

The bases of any research in line with Indigenous people's rights are necessarily rooted in relationships based on trust and respect towards the cultural attitudes and paradigms of the community. More time and efforts than we had available should be spent on continuing to build on the relationship developed with the community members in the process of the research endeavour. Secure funding is certainly always important for successful research projects. In the research process with Indigenous peoples, lack of funding might serve as an external stressor and impact your capacity for relationship building raising ethical concerns about your project as well as impact the quality of your data.

Ethical Responsibility and Objective Scholarship

Furthermore, with our research project we also assumed a responsibility to "give back" to the community, and to use the research in a way that would be beneficial to the community. A central question is of how this goal can be achieved. How can we make sure that the results of our research can help bring attention to issues concerning the Maya Ch'orti community and utilize our positions as privileged scholars to return something to the community and provide advocacy in line with Indigenous people's rights? At the same time, how can we assume such a clear positionality and still stay within ethical principles of psychological and anthropological scholarship, having our findings not invalided by claims of lacking objectivity? We acknowledge that for us, this is a work in progress and as the research continues to grow, we hope to learn means to help balance need for advocacy with scholarship.

Early Involvement of Active Participants

Another important lesson we learned is that you should start thinking early about how to engage Indigenous participants as active partners in the research process. If we had to reapproach our research from the scratch, we would start by developing the research questions in conjunction with Maya Ch'orti, instead of approaching their communities with our questions in mind, that may or may not have actual relevance to their lives (San Pedro & Kinloch, 2017). When we were already fully involved in our project, we heard about the "Two-Eyed Seeing" a framework for research introduced by Mi'kmaq Elders, Albert, and Murdena Marshall, from Unama'ki (Cape Breton), Canada, in 2004. This approach highlights the importance of viewing the world through both mainstream/Western and Indigenous worldviews (Bartlett et al., 2012) and could provide a useful guide for scholars wishing to pursue projects with Indigenous communities. Furthermore, participatory action research (e.g. Baum et al., 2006), as well as citizen science approaches (e.g. Moedas, 2018) might be helpful framework that prepare scholars for bottom-up, participatory research.

The Importance of Gatekeepers

Finally, in the work with Maya Ch'orti, and this may apply to the work with many marginalized communities, the importance of gatekeepers cannot be understated. In our case, gatekeepers were community leaders, but most importantly the local research assistant we had hired, and who helped us, not only with reviewing our article, but who was a central facilitator for our connection with the Maya Ch'orti. She met on various occasion with the community, explained our intentions, built trust, and asked for community members' opinions. The importance of gatekeepers has been stressed by others (e.g., Sullivan, 2020). For future research, we would strongly recommend identifying potential gatekeepers and facilitators with good contacts with the groups of interest from an early stage on, and engage in intense cooperations with these people – explaining the aims of your project and integrating their advice on procedures and relationship building.

Overcoming Discipline-Centric Thinking in Interdisciplinary Work

A final point we wish to make here is that our research project as well as the current article emerged as a co-operation between an anthropologist and a psychologist. In academia, the label "interdisciplinary" has become a trend aiming at overcoming challenges from multidisciplinary work by integrating theory and/or methods of various disciplines (Gunawardena et al., 2010; Robinson, 2008). We believe that our project, as well as ourselves have benefited from our different academic fields in a number of ways. For instance, while the anthropological background could offer an in-depth understanding of context and culture as well as a more emic approach to research, the psychological part contributed to the attention to systematic rigidity in data analysis, and to the integration of psychological concepts such as cultural identity.

However, bringing together these different disciplines also came with several challenges. First of all, it demanded from us as scholars to remain flexible and adaptive – listening to each other's perspectives without discarding them as "non-scientific" because they were different from our own way of doing science. We as researchers from a certain scientific tradition with its methodology, methods and discourse, are explicitly and implicitly guided by assumptions about the nature of correct science (Duden, 2021) and may reject any style that differs from our own as representing bad science (Bennett, 2010). Both of us were educated within a certain academic discipline in a very specific way of thinking about and doing science (Duden, 2021). There are cross-cultural differences in intellectual traditions and epistemology, but cross-disciplinary differences too (Galtung, 1981; Vassileva, 2001). For instance, the Anglophone discourse in psychology encodes to a large extent the principles of positivism and empiricism, which also translates into specific writing styles such as brevity and concision (Bennett, 2010; Rennie et al., 2000). In anthropological writing context plays a central role, and texts tend to be longer and richer in detail to represent the everyday experience of people. As academics, we are bound to the practices that surround us. When aiming at distributing our research findings, we learned how interdisciplinary research – although highly demanded form all sides – is not the easiest to get published. Academic journals, by focusing on a selected readership of a singular discipline, reproduce disciplinary boundaries. In that sense, our research project was not anthropological enough for an anthropological journal, and not psychological enough for a psychological journal. Editors and reviewer criticized either our writing for focusing too much on context and not enough on methodological rigidity, or for not including enough context and applying psychologizing, positivistic language.

On a very practical level, as authors, we both found a way to work with our differences by setting up structured writing sessions in which we would write together and discuss our different approaches to text production. Although we encountered some epistemological differences, particularly when it came to data analysis, we both managed to reflect upon, and discuss them. While we are of the opinion that it can be very fruitful to have people with diverse underlying scientific assumptions, opinions and approaches work together, we acknowledge that interdisciplinary work might be harder if it involves scientists of more opposing academic backgrounds than our own. The beauty and strength of interdisciplinary works comes in if we dare to challenge our assumptions about the correct science. If we do so, we are provided with the opportunity to challenge a single manner of constructing knowledge. Particularly if our aim is to include the perspectives of groups whose realities and voices remain underrepresented, the interdisciplinary lens that assists us in interrogating our basic assumptions can be extremely helpful. The reflexive approach of qualitative research might come as a useful tool in this endeavour as it forces us to reflect on how our positionality, previous knowledge, and context may impact the research and its findings (Duden, 2021).

Conclusion

In this article, we have discussed the complex nature of research being carried out within Indigenous communities, namely the issues of access, recruitment, relationships, and IPRD that are the crux of ethical research and practice among Indigenous communities. Working in such a milieu presents specific challenges related to coloniality and production of power that must be addressed by researchers before, while, and after any given project is carried out. Prevailing accounts of history portraying the modern global order as being the result of cultural progress rather than colonial violence fail to take into account the continued dispossession and systematic repression of Indigenous peoples' ways of being. Portraying WEIRD societies as vanguards of human development rather than accomplices in the ongoing marginalization of Indigenous peoples and refraining from labelling any WEIRD society as being abnormal both are attitudes that contribute to the use of colonial approaches in research with Indigenous peoples.

We have reflected on such issues as part of our own experiences of working among Maya Ch'orti communities. Our awareness of colonial violence and institutional marginalization brought us to emphasize the importance of contextually appropriate methods, ethical concerns and humility, and the need to involve community members personally in the interpretation of historical memory. We have also emphasized free, prior, informed, and oral consent along with consultation and participatory approaches in line with international Indigenous Peoples rights standards in the research project. Such initiatives are necessary when working with Indigenous communities in order to comply with standard in Indigenous peoples' rights and to provide space for local voices. We also believe that these steps are necessary to counteract institutional denial or collective forgetting of historical violence and raise awareness of viable alternatives to the colonial narratives of the modern global order. Consequently, while by no means being perfect, our research project has attempted to bridge the gap between scholarship and Indigenous peoples' rights through an interdisciplinary approach. We dare to hope that this will pave the way for the development of further collaborative research projects being carried out from the points of view of Indigenous nations themselves.

Discussion Questions

1. How can we insurance collaborative methods in our research, i.e. the participation of the communities in which we conduct research? What could be potential difficulties?

2. What do you see as "left-overs" from colonial thinking in the science of psychology?

3. How can we contribute to a greater plurality in cultural psychological research designs and methodologies?

References

Adams, G., Dobles, I., Gómez, L. H., Kurtis, T., & Molina, L. E. (2015). Decolonizing psychological science: Introduction to the special thematic section. *Journal Social Political Psychology*, *3*(1), 213–238. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v3i1.564

Ahearn, F. L. (2000). Psychosocial Wellness - Methodological approaches to the study of refugees. In J. Frederick & L. Ahearn (Eds.), *Psychosocial wellness of refugees: Issues in qualitative and quantitative research* (Studies in Forced Migration, Vol. 7, pp. 3–23). Berghahn Books. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781782388043-006

Amnesty International (2022). *Indigenous Peoples.* https://www.amnesty.org/en/what-we-do/indigenous-peoples/

Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%: why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist 63*(7), 602–614. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.602

Bartlett, C., Marshall, M., & Marshall, A. (2012). Two-eyed seeing and other lessons learned within a co-learning journey of bringing together indigenous and mainstream knowledges and ways of knowing. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, *2*, 331-340. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13412-012-0086-8

Baum, F., MacDougall, C., & Smith, D. (2006). Participatory action research. *Journal Of Epidemiology and Community Health*, *60*(10), 854. http://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2004.028662

Beals, F., Kidman, J., & Funaki, H. (2020). Insider and outsider research: Negotiating self at the edge of the emic/etic divide. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *26*(6), 593–601. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800419843950

Bennett, K. (2010). Academic discourse in Portugal: A whole different ballgame? *Journal English Academic Purposes*, *9*(1), 21–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2009.11.002

Block, K., Warr, D., Gibbs, L., & Riggs, E. (2013). Addressing ethical and methodological challenges in research with refugee-background young people: Reflections from the field. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 26*(1), 69–87. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fes002

Brave Heart, M. Y. H., Chase, J., Elkins, J., & Altschul, D. B. (2011). Historical trauma among indigenous peoples of the Americas: Concepts, research, and clinical considerations. *Journal Psychoactive Drugs*, *43*(4), 282–290. https://doi.org/10.1080/02791072.2011.628913

Chandler, M. J., & Lalonde, C. (1998). Cultural continuity as a hedge against suicide in Canada's First Nations. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, *35*(2), 191–219. https://doi.org/10.1177/136346159803500202

Coram, S. (2011). Rethinking Indigenous Research Approval-The Perspective of a 'Stranger. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *11*(2), 38-47. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ1102038

Crowe, M., & Sheppard, L. (2010). Qualitative and quantitative research designs are more similar than different. *Internet Journal Allied Health Sciences Practice*, *8*(4), 5.

De Jong, J. T., & Van Ommeren, M. (2002). Toward a culture-informed epidemiology: Combining qualitative and quantitative research in transcultural contexts. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, *39*(4), 422–433. https://doi.org/10.1177/136346150203900402

Dowling, R. (2005). Power, subjectivity and ethics in qualitative research. In I. Hay (Ed.), *Qualitative research methods in human geography* (pp. 19–29). Oxford University Press.

Duden, G. S. (2021). Challenges to Qualitative Evidence Synthesis – Aiming for diversity and abstracting without losing meaning. *Methods in Psychology 5.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metip.2021.100070

Duden, G. S., & Martins-Borges, L. (2021). Psychologists' Perspectives on Providing Psychological Care for Refugees in Brazil. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 35*(3), 605-633. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2021.1933909

Eide, P., & Allen, C. B. (2005). Recruiting transcultural qualitative research participants: A conceptual model. *International Journal Qualitative Methods*, *4*(2), 44–56. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690500400204

Ellis, B. H., Kia-Keating, M., Yusuf, S. A., Lincoln, A., & Nur, A. (2007). Ethical research in refugee communities and the use of community participatory methods. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, *44*(3), 459-481. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363461507081642 .

Fanon, F. (2007). *The wretched of the earth.* Grove/Atlantic, Inc.

Faust-Scalisi, M. (2020, November 27). *Rassismus gegenüber Indigenen.* Eine Herausforderung Zivilgesellschaftlicher Kooperation. Institut für Sozialstrategie. https://institut-fuer-sozialstrategie.de/2020/11/27/rassismus-gegenuber-indigenen/

Finlay, L. (2002). "Outing" the researcher: The provenance, process, and practice of reflexivity. *Qualitative Health Research*, *12*(4), 531–545. https://doi.org/10.1177/104973202129120052

Foxworth, R., & Ellenwood, C. (2022). Indigenous Peoples and Third Sector Research: Indigenous Data Sovereignty as a Framework to Improve Research Practices. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal Of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations*, *34*(1), 100-1007. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-022-00458-7

Fryberg, S. A., Troop-Gordon, W., D'Arrisso, A., Flores, H., Ponizovskiy, V., Ranney, J. D., Mandour, T., Tootoosis, C., Robinson, S., Russo, N., & Burack, J. A. (2013). Cultural mismatch and the education of Aboriginal youths: The interplay of cultural identities and teacher ratings. *Developmental Psychology*, *49*(1), 72. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029056

Gallagher, K. (2008). *The art of methodology: A collaborative science. In The methodological dilemma* (pp. 83–98). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203927175-12

Galtung, J. (1981). Structure, culture, and intellectual style: An essay comparing saxonic, teutonic, gallic and nipponic approaches. *Information (International Social Science Council)*, *20*(6), 817–856. https://doi.org/10.1177/053901848102000601

Gibbs, M. (2001). Toward a strategy for undertaking cross-cultural collaborative research. *Society & Natural Resources*, *14*(8), 673–687. https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920120547

Gunawardena, S., Weber, R., & Agosto, D. E. (2010). Finding that special someone: Interdisciplinary collaboration in an academic context. *Journal Education Library Information Science*, 210–221.

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral Brain Sciences*, *33*(2-3), 61–83. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X

Holmes, A. G. D. (2020). Researcher Positionality–A Consideration of Its Influence and Place in Qualitative Research–A New Researcher Guide. *Shanlax International Journal Education*, *8*(4), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v8i4.3232

Hossain, B., & Lamb, L. (2019). Economic insecurity and psychological distress among indigenous Canadians. *The Journal Developing Areas*, *53*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1353/jda.2019.0007

ILO (2009). *Indigenous and Tribal People's Rights in Practice: A guide to ILO Convention No. 169.* Geneva, Switzerland: International Labor Organization.

Kirmayer, L. J. (2007). Psychotherapy and the cultural concept of the person. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, *44*(2), 232–257. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363461506070794

Kirmayer, L. J., Dandeneau, S., Marshall, E., Phillips, M. K., & Williamson, K. J. (2011). Rethinking resilience from indigenous perspectives. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, *56*(2), 84–91. https://doi.org/10.1177/070674371105600203

Lassiter, L. E. (2005). Investigating culture: an experiential introduction to anthropology. *Journal Royal Anthropological Institute*, *11*(1), 163–165.

Louis, R. P. (2007). Can you hear us now? Voices from the margin: Using indigenous methodologies in geographic research. *Geographical Research*, *45*(2), 130–139. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-5871.2007.00443.x

Louis, R. P., & Grossman, Z. (2009). Discussion paper on research and Indigenous peoples. *Association American Geographers*.

Lund, R., Panda, S. M., & Dhal, M. P. (2016). Narrating spaces of inclusion and exclusion in research collaboration–researcher-gatekeeper dialogue. *Qualitative Research*, *16*(3), 280–292. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794115611208

Mackenzie, C., McDowell, C., & Pittaway, E. (2007). Beyond 'do no harm': The challenge of constructing ethical relationships in refugee research. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *20*(2), 299-319. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fem008

Maluleka, J. R., & Ngoepe, M. (2018). Accumulation of cultural capital: The acquisition of indigenous knowledge by traditional healers in the Limpopo province of South Africa. *International Journal Knowledge Management Studies*, *9*(3), 278–292. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJKMS.2018.094215

Martín-Baró, I. (1996). *Writings for a liberation psychology* (edited by A. Aron & S. Corne). Harvard University Press.

Maticka-Tyndale, E., Refaie Shirpak, K., & Chinichian, M. (2007). Providing for the sexual health needs of Canadian immigrants. *Canadian Journal Public Health*, *98*(3), 183–186. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03403709

Metz, B. (1998). Without nation, without community: The growth of Maya nationalism among Ch'orti's of Eastern Guatemala. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, *54*(3), 325–350. https://doi.org/10.1086/jar.54.3.3630651

Metz, B. (2010). Questions of indigeneity and the (re)-emergent Ch'orti' Maya of Honduras. *The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology*, *15*(2), 289–316. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1935-4940.2010.01087.x

Mills, C. (2014). Decolonizing global mental health: The psychiatrization of the majority world. *London New York: Routledge.* https://doi.org/10.1086/682012

Moedas, C. (2018). Citizen science: innovation in open science, society and policy. UCL Press.

Müller-Funk, L. (2021). Research with refugees in fragile political contexts: How ethical reflections impact methodological choices. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *34*(2), 2308-2332. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/feaa013

Newton, B. J., Rothlingova, Z., Gutteridge, R., LeMarchand, K., & Raphael, J. H. (2012). No room for reflexivity? Critical reflections following a systematic review of qualitative research. *Journal Health Psychology*, *17*(6), 866–885. https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105311427615

Noblit, G. (2018). Meta-ethnography: Adaptation and return. *Culturalconstructions identity: Meta-ethnography and Theory*, 34–50. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190676087.003.0002

OHCHR (n.d.) *Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples.* Retrieved from https://www.ohchr.org/en/issues/ipeoples/srindigenouspeoples/pages/sripeoplesindex.aspx

Parker, C., Scott, S., & Geddes, A. (2019). Snowball sampling. *SAGE Research Methods Foundations.*

Pe-Pua, R. (2006). From decolonizing psychology to the development of a cross-indigenous perspective in methodology. In U. Kim, K-S. Yang & K.-K. Hwang (Eds.), *Indigenous and cultural psychology* (pp. 109–137). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-28662-4_5

Phillips, L., Kristiansen, M., Vehviläinen, M., & Gunnarsson, E. (2013). *Knowledge and power in collaborative research: A reflexive approach.* Routledge.

Pike, K. L. (1954). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior.* (Vol. 24). Walter de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111657158

Rennie, D. L., Watson, K. D., & Monteiro, A., (2000). Qualitative research in Canadian psychology. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum Qualitative Social Research*, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-1.2.1098

Richardson, T. A. (2015). Indigenous methodologies and educational research for meaningful change: Parsing postpositivist philosophy of science and mixed methods in collaborative research settings. *Journal American Indian Education*, *54*(1), 33–62. https://doi.org/10.1353/jaie.2015.a835530

Robinson, J. (2008). Being undisciplined: Transgressions and intersections in academia and beyond. *Futures, 40*(1), 70–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2007.06.007

Robinson, O. C. (2014). Sampling in Interview-Based Qualitative Research: A Theoretical and Practical Guide. *Qualitative Research Psychology, 11*(1), 25–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2013.801543

San Pedro, T., & Kinloch, V. (2017). Toward projects in humanization: Research on co-creating and sustaining dialogic relationships. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(1_suppl), 373S–394S. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216671210

Savolainen, J., Casey, P. J., McBrayer, J. P., & Schwerdtle, P. N. (2023). Positionality and its problems: Questioning the value of reflexivity statements in research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 18*(6), 1331-1338. https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916221144988

Smith, L. T. (2021). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples.* Bloomsbury Publishing. https://doi.org/10.2307/2653993

Snow, K. C., Hays, D. G., Caliwagan, G., Ford Jr, D. J., Mariotti, D., Mwendwa, J. M., & Scott, W. E. (2016). Guiding principles for indigenous research practices. *Action Research, 14*(4), 357–375. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750315622542

Sousa Santos, B. de. (2007). *Another knowledge is possible: Beyond northern epistemologies* (Reinventing Social Emancipation: Toward New Manifestos, Vol. 3). Verso. https://doi.org/10.1177/030981680809500117

Sullivan, C. T. (2020). Who holds the key? Negotiating gatekeepers, community politics, and the "right" to research in indigenous spaces. *Geographical Research, 58*(4), 344–354. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-5871.12415

Summerfield, D. (1999). A critique of seven assumptions behind psychological trauma programmes in war-affected areas. *Social Science & Medicine, 48*(10), 1449–1462. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0277-9536(98)00450-x

Summerfield, D. (2008). How scientifically valid is the knowledge base of global mental health? *BMJ British Medical Journal, 336*(7651), 992–994. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39513.441030.AD

Syed (2020). *Acronym absurdity constrains psychological science.* PsyArXiv. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/293wx

Syed, M., & Kathawalla, U. (2020). Cultural psychology, diversity, and representation in open science. *Cultural Methods in Psychology: Describing and Transforming Cultures, 427*–454. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/t7hp2

Tauli-Corpuz, V. (2018). Report of the special rapporteur of the Human Rights Council on the rights of indigenous peoples. *UN General Assembly, A/73/176,* 3–22.

Teo, T. (2005). *The critique of psychology: From Kant to Postcolonial theory,* (pp. 155–180). Springer.

Thalmayer, A. G., Toscanelli, C., & Arnett, J. J. (2021). The neglected 95% revisited: Is American psychology becoming less American? *American Psychologist, 76,* 116–129. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000622

Tobias, J. K., Richmond, C. A., & Luginaah, I. (2013). Community-based participatory research (CBPR) with indigenous communities: producing respectful and reciprocal

research. *Journal of Empirical Research Human Research Ethics*, *8*(2), 129–140. https://doi.org/10.1525/jer.2013.8.2.129

UN (2007). *United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues: Handbook for Participants.* New York: United Nations. https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/guide_participants_en.pdf

UN (2022). *Indigenous Peoples* (United Nations). https://www.un.org/en/fight-racism/vulnerable-groups/indigenous-peoples

Vassileva, I. (2001). Commitment and detachment in English and Bulgarian academic writing. *English Specific Purposes*, *20*(1), 83–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(99)00029-0

Walter, M., & Andersen, C. (2013). *Indigenous statistics: A quantitative research methodology*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315426570

Williams, E. N., & Morrow, S. L. (2009). Achieving trustworthiness in qualitative research: A pan-paradigmatic perspective. *Psychotherapy Research*, *19*(4-5), 576–582. https://doi.org/10.1080/10503300802702113

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony. Indigenous research method*s. Fernwood Publishing.

Further Engagement and Teaching Materials

Reading on Indigenous Peoples Rights Discourses

ILO (2003). ILO Convention on indigenous and tribal peoples,1989. Geneva: International Labour Organization. https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:55:0::NO::P55_TYPE,P55_LANG,P55_DOCUMENT,P55_NODE:REV,en,C169,/Document

UN (2013). Indigenous Peoples and the United Nations Human Rights System. New York: The UN Office Of the High Commisionar. https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Publications/fs9Rev.2.pdf

Background Information on the Maya Ch'orti

Online Resource with Information on Political Situation and History of Maya Ch'orti: https://sites.google.com/view/in-soliderity-with-conichh/home

Metz, B. (1998). Without Nation, without Community: The Growth of Maya Nationalism among Ch'orti's of Eastern Guatemala. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, *54*(3), 325–350.

Metz, B. (2010). Questions of Indigeneity and the (Re)-Emergent Ch'orti' Maya of Honduras. *The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology*, *15*(2), 289–316. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1935-4940.2010.01087.x

Training Resources for Research with Indigenous peoples

Open online training for Indigenous Community Research Partnerships with Inuit, Métis and First Nations from Queen's University: https://www.queensu.ca/indigenous/decolonizing-and-indigenizing/community-research-partnerships-training

McGill Summer Program on Transcultural Psychiatry – Indigenous Mental Health Research: https://www.mcgill.ca/tcpsych/training/summer#INDIGENOUS

Ethical guidelines, protocols for research and resources on research with Indigenous peoples

Resources for *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research (Ethical guidelines, information on history, languages etc.) published by the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS):* https://aiatsis.gov.au/research/ethical-research

Compilation of Ethical Research Protocol for Working with Indigenous Peoples form Trent University: https://www.trentu.ca/indigenousstudiesphd/current-students/dissertation/dissertation-proposal/research-ethics

American Association of Geographers – Specialty Group Indigenous Peoples: https://www.aag.org/groups/indigenous-peoples/

Network for Aboriginal Mental Health research: http://www.namhr.ca/about/overview/

Web guides relating to Indigenous peoples and Indigenous education: https://teachers-ab.libguides.com/indigenousresources

Brown University - Native American and Indigenous Studies: A compilation of Library and other resources related to the history and experiences of Native and Indigenous peoples in North America and around the world: https://libguides.brown.edu/NAIS

Citing Indigenous Elders and Knowledge Keepers: https://news.library.ualberta.ca/blog/2022/01/27/citing-indigenous-elders-and-knowledge-keepers/

Some Journals from Indigenous Perspectives

AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples an internationally peer-reviewed interdisciplinary journal that publishes research on Indigenous worldviews and experiences of decolonization from Indigenous perspectives: https://journals.sagepub.com/home/aln

The International Indigenous Policy Journal: https://ojs.lib.uwo.ca/index.php/iipj/issue/view/1498

Journal of Global Indigeneity: https://www.journalofglobalindigeneity.com/

On Decolonising Psychology and Anthropology

Journal of Social Issues (2022). Special Issue: Decolonial Approaches to the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Installment 2: Psychology as a Site for Decolonial Analysis https://spssi.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/toc/15404560/2022/78/2

Journal of Social and Political Psychology (2015). Special Thematic Section on "Decolonizing Psychological Science": https://jspp.psychopen.eu/index.php/jspp/issue/view/223

Reflecting on Positionality

Dowling, R. (2005). Power, subjectivity and ethics in qualitative research. In *Qualitative research methods in human geography* (pp. 19-29). Oxford University Press.

Francett-Hermes, M., & Pennanen, H. (2019). Relational ethics in indigenous research: A reflexive navigation of whiteness and ally positionality. https://oulurepo.oulu.fi/handle/10024/32703

Liebert, R. J., & Thompson, L. (2015). I. Recognition & reflexivity: Editorial introduction to the special feature. *Feminism & Psychology*, *25*(1), 3-10. http://10.1177/0959353514565364

Newton, B. J., Rothlingova, Z., Gutteridge, R., LeMarchand, K., & Raphael, J. H. (2012). No room for reflexivity? Critical reflections following a systematic review of qualitative research. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *17*(6), 866-885. http://doi.org/10.1177/1359105311427615

Savolainen, J., Casey, P. J., McBrayer, J. P., & Schwerdtle, P. N. (2023). Positionality and its problems: Questioning the value of reflexivity statements in research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *18*(6), 1331-1338. http://10.1177/17456916221144988.

Snow, K. C., Hays, D. G., Caliwagan, G., Ford Jr, D. J., Mariotti, D., Mwendwa, J. M., & Scott, W. E. (2016). Guiding principles for indigenous research practices. *Action Research, 14*(4), 357–375. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750315622542

Uluğ, Ö. M., Acar, Y. G., & Kanık, B. (2021). Reflecting on research: Researcher identity in conflict studies from the perspectives of participants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*., *51*(6), 847-861. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ejsp.2776

About the Authors

Gesa Solveig Duden is a post-doctoral researcher and lecturer in intercultural and community psychology at the University of Hagen (Fern Universität in Hagen). She received her doctoral degree from the Osnabrück Germany, in cooperation with the Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil, her MSc in Intercultural Psychology from the University of Osnabrueck and her BA in Psychology from the University College Dublin, Ireland. She

was a visiting PhD researcher at the division of Transcultural Psychiatry of the McGill University, Canada, and has received specific training in systemic counselling and therapy. Her research interests lie in the systemic and cultural embeddedness of the human psyche, in sense of belonging and identity, and in urbanity and mental health.

Email: g.duden@zoho.com

Daniel Bagheri Sarvestani, is a PhD candidate in Cultural Anthropology at the University of Kansas, and a Canadian Human Rights advisor. He has been volunteering and working internationally for the better part of the past 7 years. Through his field work, Daniel has developed connections with tribal indigenous communities in Western Asia (Iran), Central America (Costa Rica, Panama, and Honduras) and North America (Canada). His work currently focuses on the application of Indigenous Peoples Rights Discourses in the context of the Maya Ch'orti communities of North-Western Honduras, under the supervision of Professor Brent Metz (University of Kansas).

Email: dsarvestani@ku.edu