

A First Look at an Indigenous Pacific Ethical System and its Implications for Research

Kabini F. Sanga

The ethical concerns of indigenous peoples about research are better appreciated if we understand their ethical systems. Towards this end, this chapter offers a first look at an indigenous Pacific ethical system and discusses its implications for research.

The chapter has five sections. The first introduces the need for rethinking research as it relates to indigenous peoples, including Pacific Islands peoples. An initial scrutiny of conventional research shows its differences with the ethical systems of indigenous peoples. In the second section, I describe the landscape of ethics as a way of conceptually problematising the challenge of ethics in research. In this way, I justify the need for an examination of an indigenous ethical system and encourage sensitivity to multiple world consciousness. In the third section, I offer a contextual discussion including a statement of the position from which this chapter is written. By doing so, I acknowledge the limits and assume responsibility for the limitations of this work. The fourth section describes an indigenous Malaita ethical system. More specifically, I explore key underlying features of this ethical system based on my membership, knowledge, research, and leadership of a Malaita tribe in Gulalala (East Malaita, Solomon Islands). In addition, I describe the research implications of this ethical system to show the nature and extent of the need for rethinking research ethics for indigenous Pacific peoples. Finally, in the fifth section, I restate the need for rethinking and offer suggestions of key research tasks for Pacific educator-scholars who would dare embark on a journey of shifting the consciousness of people.

Need for rethinking research

In this section, two basic points are made to demonstrate the need for rethinking the research enterprise as this relates to Pacific peoples. First, in recent years, numerous global (CIHR, 2007; Indigenous Peoples' Health Research Centre, 2004; Walters, 2008) and Pacific (Nabobo-Baba, 2006; Prescott, 2008; Sanga, 2011) voices have drawn attention to a mismatch between conventional research and indigenous peoples. The concerns have been wide-ranging and include the non-alignment of research to indigenous peoples' aspirations (Abdullah & Stringer, 1999), philosophical paradigms (Hart, 2010), epistemological worldviews (Geggo, 1998; Geggo & Watson-Geggo, 2001), community values (Cochran et al., 2008), methodologies (Nabobo-Baba, 2006), methods (Aanae, Coxon, Mara, Wende-Samu, & Finau, 2001)

and more. As well, as expressed by Smith (1999), a serious concern relates to the historical unequal power relationships between research and indigenous peoples who are often the subjects of research.

Second, and more specifically, numerous ethical concerns have also been raised. These have included claims of systematic neglect by research ethics committees to collective rights and community consent (Glass & Kaufert, 2007) and privileging of a Western-biased ethical system that assumes individual rights as paramount (Brew, 2001). Moreover, apprehensions have also been expressed over the application of inappropriate ethical codes when researching indigenous knowledge (Castellano, 2004), the disenfranchising of indigenous ethical processes (Worby & Rigney, 2002), and the unethical encroachment on indigenous peoples' knowledge systems (Maddocks, 1992). As concerns from peoples of the Pacific, these have included issues of cultural validity of ethical decisions by university and professional research organizations (Mcrae, 2003), claims of imposition of such ethical principles as autonomy, beneficence, and non-maleficence (Hudson, 2005), and inappropriate-ness of ethical frameworks to capture unstated indigenous knowledge (Sanga, 2011).

These expressed concerns have exposed two immediate challenges. First, indigenous peoples are challenged to reclaim their indigenous knowledge and ethical systems and their rightful places within a global knowledge economy. In the Pacific region, evidence of an up-take of this challenge is seen in the works of Maori (Bishop, 1998; Smith, 1999; and others) and Island (Geggo, 1998; Mani'au, 2009; Nabobo-Baba, 2009; Taufe'ulungaki, 2009; Teacaro, 2009; and others) scholars. Second, Western research institutions are challenged to recognise the value, contributions, and legitimacy of indigenous knowledge systems and to renegotiate an approach to research that is ethically appropriate, dignified, and respectful.

To ascertain the nature of these two challenges requires a brief exploration of the landscape of ethics.

The landscape of ethics

This section describes the landscape of ethics as a way of conceptually problematising the challenge of ethics in research. This description takes the form of (1), a discussion on the major categories of ethics, and (2) a brief introduction of the types of approaches to ethics. By showing the complex nature of ethics as a subject matter, this invites indigenous Pacific peoples' consciousness to matters of indigenous ethics in research.

The subject matter of ethics is complex and to the vast majority of people, including myself, the discipline of ethics has an unfamiliar language. However, rather than shy away from this unfamiliar territory, I shall attempt to provide a brief overview of this discipline of study. In doing so, I am borrowing from many scholars (such as Kagan, 1998; Knight, 1980; Rae, 2000; and more) including ideas I have learnt over the years and teachings on the subject of ethics by my mentor (Professor Keith Walker). As

caveats, I say the following: This discussion is not a historical or theoretical account of the discipline. As well, neither the ideas shared nor the ways of expressing these ideas are the most clear, comprehensive, or authoritative. However, these ideas and conceptualisations are presented as a starting point for Pacific educator-scholars to begin a *talanoa* – a conversation on indigenous ethics in Pacific research.

Categories of ethics

First, there are three major categories of ethics: descriptive ethics, normative ethics, and prescriptive ethics. Descriptive ethics is the discipline of ethics that attempts to show the morals of a people or group (Rae, 2000). Descriptive ethics describes what is good or right and what is bad or wrong. For instance, a family might say that certain actions or behaviours are morally right or good, while others are wrong or bad. A cultural group will make certain moral claims and assert particular moral norms, which might be totally different from the moral claims of another culture. A university research committee will say which research practices or protocols are good and which are bad. A parliament might pass laws to mandate what is good or right or a court system might arbitrate the beliefs and behaviours of right or wrong, for people. These are examples of descriptive ethics because they are about what a group (and not others) considers good or bad, right or wrong.

To restate, from the perspective of descriptive ethics, what is considered right, wrong, good, or bad is all relative. In other words, an ethical action or behaviour is deemed to differ in different contexts, at different times, and for different peoples. Consequently, what is considered right or wrong is multiple in nature and not universal. Of course none of these views of ethics is beyond critique; however, as I have restricted this overview to a general description, space does not permit the incorporation of a critical input.

A descriptive view of ethics has three obvious implications, as follows: Firstly, because ethics is seen as relative, this requires some acceptance of the idea of diverse ethical systems. Secondly, with diverse systems, comparative examination of the different systems of right and wrong or good and bad can be made. Thirdly, a view of ethics as relative permits an observer to see the moral claims of people against the actual standards by which they live.

The second category, normative ethics, refers to the grounds, warrants, or justifications of right or wrong and good or bad. According to Kagan (1998), normative ethics is the discipline of ethics which produces moral norms as its end product. In other words, in normative ethics, we ask, "what is right or wrong?" or "what should our moral values be?" In this way we are trying to figure out the right moral choice or the good moral action either on the basis of principles or in light of their consequences.

To restate, when we use certain moral standards and argue over which ones are justifiable and which are not, this is normative ethics. The complex societal debates over abortion, civil union, and euthanasia are examples of normative ethics. Where

these debates are good, diverse views might start with their own morally standards (descriptive ethics). As a good debate progresses, the debaters will then work through the bases, justifications, and warrants for supporting particular interpretations of what is good, right or proper (normative ethics). In other words, normative ethics prescribes certain norms (often as principles) which are then applied generally or specifically to particular moral situations.

Within normative ethics, there are three main ways of establishing moral standards, as follows: When we assume that what is right or good is principle-based, this is referred to as deontological ethics. However, when we argue that rightness and goodness of certain actions are due to their consequences, this is called teleological ethics. Finally, when we think that having good virtues (such as kindness or generosity) will make people morally good, this is called virtue ethics.

The third category, prescriptive ethics, is the "ought to" or the "should be" of what is right, good and ethically proper (Walker, 2011). Prescriptive ethics prescribes what is good or right, based on the grounds, warrants, and justifications of normative ethics. In prescriptive ethics, the moral choice is made, based on the theoretical justifications of that choice. In other words, prescriptive ethics guides us towards what is considered as morally desirable. This is achieved by (a) establishing the standard or morality of goodness or rightness, and (b) identifying the principles for adoption if we are to attain our moral goodness or rightness. Prescriptive ethics assumes that all rational people can be ethical. Hence, prescriptive ethics subscribes to the idea that universal morality is possible.

Approaches to ethics

Within the broad categories described above, ethics is commonly approached in three ways, as follows: retrospective ethics, introspective ethics, and prospective ethics. In the following paragraphs, these three approaches are briefly described.

First, a retrospective approach to ethics is the realm of obligations and duties such as laws or rules. In other words, this approach to ethics is rule-based. For instance, unethical past conduct such as warfare, genocide, or murder is "made right" retrospectively, using appropriate laws. To restate, retrospective ethics deals with moral wrongs that have already been committed (such as sexual conduct, not obtaining informed consent, war crimes, historical injustices to people, groups etc.).

Second, an introspective approach to ethics is the realm of virtues and character. This is an inside-out view of ethics. This view of ethics focuses on the virtues from within the hearts of people, together with the tendencies of people to be dependable, over time. An introspective approach to ethics focuses on the moral agent (the virtuous person) and not the moral action of the person. This is an ethic of character and not duty.

Third, a prospective approach to ethics is the realm of consequences and ends. The concept of consequence refers to the morality of an action being contingent on the action's consequences. Hence, if the outcomes of an action are bad, then that action is deemed morally bad. The principle of ends requires that people are treated, not as mere means but as an end in themselves.

In concluding this section, it is obvious that even with a surface exploration of the landscape of ethics, the discipline is complex. In the applied field of research within indigenous Pacific contexts, the importance of ethics cannot be overstated. As seen in the concerns expressed earlier in the chapter, moral authority in research is a contested field which is not likely to be reconciled or subside soon. With the advancement of science and technological innovations, the ethical tensions in research and their associated bewilderment appear to be more challenging than previously. If indigenous Pacific Islands scholars are to participate in wrestling with issues of ethics in research, we must be exposed to a foundational understanding of ethics. What better place to start than an exploration of the underlying understandings of indigenous Pacific Islands ethical systems?

The context and my position within

In this section, I describe the context of the indigenous ethical system discussed and my own positioning within this setting. The backdrop for this discussion is Malá'ia Island, Solomon Islands, where I was born and grew up as a Gula'ala speaking member of the Gwailao tribe in East Malá'ia.

Malá'ia, in the central part of the archipelago of the Solomon Islands, is the most populated of the islands that make up the modern state of Solomon Islands. Linguistically, Malá'ia has the following groups: Sà'a, A'e'are, Kwarekwarco, Langalanga, Kwara'ae, Kwa'ala, Baeleka, Baegu, Tobelea, Baeleka and Lau. Spread unevenly within these linguistic communities is 100 or more tribal groups. Among the Gula'ala linguistic group, for instance, there are seven distinct tribes living in fewer than a dozen villages and hamlets.

As indigenous societies, Malá'ia tribes are theocratic and are thus ruled by priests. The tribes' indigenous religious system involves paying homage to the spirits of ancestors. Like other Melanesian societies, Malá'ia tribes are socially egalitarian, without an obvious hierarchical chiefly system. Instead, it is the *finatubu binita* (high priest) who oversees the affairs of the tribe. While there are other spiritual (*uame foa*), civic (*sofialagi*) and war (*umo*) leaders in Malá'ia tribal settings, among the Gula'ala, it is the *finatubu* who holds the most power over certain things and people. Today, due to the influence of Christianity, the majority of Malá'ia tribes do not have practising *finatubu* except for pocket communities in Kwalo, Baegu, and the Lau regions. The absence of *finatubu* rule, however, has not relegated indigenous Malá'ia ethics to the named communities only.

Malá'ia tribes are also socio-economic-political units. This is to say that each tribe is an integrated community, with daily living primarily revolving around the tribal theocratic belief system.

The indigenous Malá'ia ethical system is a living system; it is not a prehistoric ethical system. Malá'ia society, both tribally and as contemporary communities, has complex sets of *magi* (Gula'ala for a system of morality) which are categories and levels of conventions, laws, benchmarks, and associated processes that distinguish right from wrong, define good from bad, and reward and punish. Malá'ia society has clear dispositions, with tendencies to influence members to behave in certain ways. Tribal groups in Malá'ia have specific character traits for resolving moral dilemmas and cultivating virtue. Today, this ethical system operates daily with and beyond the systems of Westminster democracy as well as Christian churches.

In writing this chapter, I have drawn on my background, cultural upbringing, and in the last decade and a half, research of Malá'ia and its people. The linguistic terms I use are in Gula'ala. While similar concepts exist in other parts of Malá'ia, the words are not necessarily shared. Because this is a first piece, I am speaking generally about Malá'ia in the hope that in future times, more specific scholarships can be done on the different people or groups in Malá'ia, the Solomon Islands, and in the wider Pacific region.

In considering this topic, I was mindful of the collective guardianship of indigenous Malá'ia knowledge; hence I initially hesitated to delve into a public discussion on the subject matter of this paper. Yet, being fully cognisant of the need to confront concerns of ethics in Pacific Islands contexts, I chose to engage in this task. However, I caution that the descriptive knowledge that I share, together with any interpretations I make, are personal views, for which I assume responsibility.

An indigenous ethical system

This section focuses on two issues. First, I explore an indigenous Malá'ia ethical system, highlighting a number of key underpinning features of this system. Inspired by Rae (2000), this is a first exploration, a starting point for conversations on indigenous Pacific Islands ethical systems. Second, I discuss the implications of this ethical system for research in, of, and for Malá'ia. This exploration of implications is not intended to be comprehensive. Rather, as earlier stated, this discussion is to show the need for rethinking research ethics in Pacific Islands contexts.

The first underlying feature of the indigenous Malá'ia ethical system is this: the indigenous Malá'ia ethical system is tribal. At one level this means that the ethical system belongs to a linguistic region (e.g. A'e'are, Kwalo, Baeleka). At another level, this means that the ethical system overlaps with the (blood) tribe. In this latter sense, each Malá'ia tribal group has its own indigenous ethical system. While there are parallels and similarities between the ethical systems, each is distinct. Often, the

nature and extent of overlaps are explained by regularity of contact, linguistic connections, heritage relationships, and historical factors.

As stated, *Malá'ita* tribes are theocracies. Each tribal unit is engulfed by its religious system. Consequently, the socio-economic-political-ethical worlds of tribes are integrated with their religious worlds. These worlds overlap into a single whole. For these *Malá'itians*, being good or bad and doing well or not has potential to result in the survival or death of the tribe. Morality is directly linked to *Malá'ita* belief systems which, according to Sanga and Walker (2012), are not just human and physical but spirit, spiritual, and metaphysical as well. Consequently, unethical conduct by a member of a tribe can be fatal for the entire tribe. To restate, the indigenous *Malá'ita* ethical system is interwoven into its tribal religious system, around which people live their daily lives.

Given a tribally-bound ethical system, what are some implications for research? In answer to this question, a number of observations are made. In the first instance, any interpretation of research ethics must correspond with an indigenous *Malá'ita* ethical system. As pointed out by Wax (1991), conventional research is unlikely to be commensurate with indigenous contexts primarily because of differences of value systems, worldviews, and ethical systems. To heed this warning, externally-instigated research ethics cannot assume homogeneity, relevance, monopoly, or authority in indigenous *Malá'ita*.

As well, research on, of, and in *Malá'ita* requires a prior knowledge and an accurate understanding of the different *Malá'ita* tribal and clan groups as well as their ethical systems. Researchers of indigenous *Malá'ita* knowledge also need to take cognisance of the fact that *Malá'ita* ethics is managed by *Malá'ita* tribal communities according to their own knowledge management rules, processes, and legitimisation criteria. Such implications demand recognition by universities, research agencies, and governments and a preparedness on their part to negotiate more equal power relationships with tribal knowledge communities prior to undertaking research. On the part of tribal groups, they need to mobilise themselves as partners in what is now a new global knowledge economy. Tribal knowledge holders cannot afford to sit back in disinterest or apathy. They must now fully engage in the new knowledge economy.

A second underlying feature for noting is this: in *Malá'ita* society, there is an overlapping relationship between personal and societal ethics. In other words, the distinctions of private morality and communal morality are blurred. That is to say, there is little distinction between what is good or right for an individual as against what is right and good for the tribe. More often than not, communal tribal ethics will mandate and oblige individual ethics. To understand such privileging of the group requires appreciations of *Malá'ita* ontological, epistemological, cosmological, and axiological assumptions of nature (Sanga & Walker, 2012). A key insight in this understanding is that the *Malá'ita* individual is a principal vehicle of representation for the tribe; one is not dialectically opposed to the other.

What does such an understanding of personal-communal ethical fusion mean for research? A number of methodology-related observations are made, as follows: as noted by the Canadian Indigenous Peoples Council on Biocolonialism (2000), where tribal ethics defines and advances communal identity, research notions such as respect for human dignity, consent, and representation will look differently at how conventional research defines these. Moreover, according to Peterson (1982), in societies where communal ownership of knowledge is advanced, this means no ownership. Additionally, in societies where there are overlapping individual-communal ethics, research practices of anonymity and confidentiality are either suspect or cannot be unilaterally applied.

In practical terms, what this means is that where conventional research ethics privileges the individual (in matters of attention, consent, confidentiality) without due regard for the group (possibly via appropriate normative ethics), this is ethically inappropriate in indigenous *Malá'ita* context. Appropriate care is therefore needed. On the part of researchers, the care needed relates to the commitment to refrain from hasty action while seeking to insightfully understand the nuances of *Malá'ita* descriptive ethics before and when undertaking research. On the part of *Malá'ita* tribal people, the care needed relates to the protection of individual tribal members, particularly weaker ones (children, women, uneducated, disabled etc.), to ensure their individual dignities are protected and maintained when communal morality is applied.

A third underlying noteworthy point of indigenous *Malá'ita* morality is this: in indigenous *Malá'ita* ethical system, *abu* (holiness or *tapu* in Māori and other Polynesian societies) is a unifying principle. In other words, *abu* is the principal glue that binds the indigenous *Malá'ita* ethical system. According to Sanga and Walker (2012), *abu* is the culmination of integrity and a central normative aspect of *Malá'ita* ethics.

To briefly explain the concept of *abu*, I say the following: in *Malá'ita* society, *abu* is part of *Malá'ita* metaphysical cosmology. Anthropologically, *abu* influences *Malá'ita jilagala* (*kastom* and worldviews) on a daily basis. To the *Malá'ita* mind (Sanga & Walker, 2012), *abu* refers to being set apart in behaviour, action, and worship. *Abu* reflects goodness, rightness, and credibility to honour horizontally and vertically. *Abu* mediates and gauges what is deemed right, fair, just, or otherwise. *Abu* explains relationships, protocols, and spaces of purpose, connection, and separation between members and nature-neighbours. *Abu* limits and constrains humans from being "bad" and from assuming absolute power or abusing power. By restraining people, *abu* points people to spirit-gods or God. In this way, in *Malá'ita* cosmology, *abu* compels people to relate to other humans as co-dependents in a wider complex universe.

Given the centrality of *abu* in *Malá'ita* ethics, what are the implications for research ethics in *Malá'ita*? A few observations are offered, as follows: at a philosophical level

of consideration, given the centrality of *abu* to the Malá'ia mind (Sanga & Walker, 2012), any conceptualisations of Malá'ia research that assume an objectivist framing are deemed incommensurable and ethically suspect. As it relates to principles, *anabu*-held ethical system negates the freedom of researchers to access or disseminate certain knowledge. In other words, as observed by Maddocks (1992), such an ethical system stops outside researchers from unwarranted research encroachment into indigenous peoples' intellectual spaces.

At a practical level, appreciations of *abu* will require researchers to carefully consider issues of timing and duration of research, whom to contact and how and who or what the knowledge sources are. As well, embracing *abu* should commit researchers to seriously include the spiritual dimensions of knowledge and to accept, as Malá'ia people do, that knowledge is also inspired, is metaphysical and spiritual, and not merely created or discovered. On the part of Malá'ia tribes, it is critical to know that conventional research capacities (such as researchers, universities, and agencies) cannot deal with an *abu*-held knowledge system. Consequently, Malá'ia tribes must develop their own capacities to ethically manage their knowledge systems, especially to engage with outside researchers.

The fourth underlying feature of the indigenous Malá'ia ethical system is this: indigenous Malá'ia ethical system privileges the principle of *rō lā* (obedience) more than other important values. To elaborate on this point, it is worth noting that in their descriptive ethics, people or groups would normally privilege certain values (more precisely, principles) over others. In theocratic Malá'ia, *rō lā* or obedience is an act of worship, a means of submission and a way of demonstrating loyalty to the other, particularly to authority. In Malá'ia religious understanding, to be obedient is right-doing. Particularly when loyalty to spirit-gods is at stake, the obedient action by an adherent clan member is considered an ethical action.

By contrast, the indigenous Malá'ia ethical system does not privilege certain other important principles. For example, if obedience to tribal interest is weighed against fairness, then the Malá'ia mind easily leans towards obedience (as loyalty) over fairness. Or, if autonomy of the individual is weighed against obedience, a Malá'ia person is likely to give up autonomy and uphold obedience. Or, as an extreme example, if life (or dignity of an individual or group) is balanced against obedience, then the Malá'ia mind will lean towards obedience (as a form of worship or ultimate surrender to higher authority). It is this privileging of obedience that explains the old *kawon* (cultural) "random" killing of individuals, the powerful conversions to Christianity, or the desecration of tribal shrines by former tribal members who have become Christians.

Given this emphasis on the principle of obedience in Malá'ia ethical system, how does this impact research? Briefly, the following may be stated. First, sensitivity to a more insightful reading of Malá'ia context is needed by all. In this way, institutional ethics committees, researchers, and scholars can also begin to appreciate

the complexities of Malá'ia descriptive ethics, including its prioritised and down-played values. Second, because *rō lā* or obedience is also a religious action in Malá'ia context, a view of research ethics which integrates the spirit and spiritual realities is essential. Third, at the level of application, the credibility of knowledge gathered in Malá'ia research is linked to a myriad of variables as people juxtapose value tensions and priorities. Until understandings of the indigenous Malá'ia ethical system are established within the research community, Malá'ia tribes must be alert to ensure that they play active roles as research partners in all Malá'ia research. Much opportunity abounds for innovative work in this area by Malá'ia scholars.

In summary, an indigenous Malá'ia ethics is an integrated social-economic-political-religious system. Because Malá'ia is theocratic, indigenous ethics is fundamentally linked to the tribal religion. The underpinning understandings of this system of ethics seem to suggest that Malá'ia ethics is predominantly deontological, with aspects of teleological and virtue-based ethics as well.

Concluding observations

In this final section, the need for rethinking ethics in Pacific research is restated. This is followed by suggestions on possible opportunities of doing so through further research.

When a closer scrutiny is made of Pacific region research, the resultant picture mirrors indigenous global research (Indigenous Peoples Health Research Centre, 2004) as follows: first, where Pacific governments offer research contracts, these are not generally accompanied with clear ethical guidelines. Second, where international donors and lenders fund or undertake research, these are always silent on matters of ethics. Third, where national, regional, and other universities undertake research, these often include institutional ethical guidelines but without monitoring of how research is undertaken in Pacific contexts. Fourth, where non-state actors (including Churches) and Pacific regional organisations are commissioning research, these are often silent on ethical requirements. Fifth, where professional research associations undertake research, the guidelines for members may be included but often without monitoring. On the basis of this picture, attention to rethink ethics in Pacific research is needed.

For Pacific educator-scholars who would dare embark on a journey of shifting consciousness, what might the key research tasks be for them? More specifically, if the goal of rethinking involves research, what opportunities exist for Pacific educator-scholars?

Here are four suggestions:

- Establish indigenous Pacific ethical systems as a field of study. Undertake research to find out what theories might emerge from this field of study. Also,

find out what unique conceptual frameworks for ethics might arise from this field of study.

- Undertake research on different indigenous Pacific ethical systems. In the first instance, find out what empirical evidence exists of these ethical systems.
- Undertake research on the ethical and methodological behaviours of research in indigenous Pacific knowledge systems. What has been experienced? Why? How? By whom? To what effects?
- Undertake research to improve indigenous Pacific knowledge communities and on the enhancement of their ethical systems and research capacities.

Finally, in summing up, I restate that in this chapter I have presented the underpinning features of the indigenous Malaita ethical system. As seen, this system is different from the one upon which conventional research ethics is based. Consequently, one set of criteria and processes of research ethics cannot be universally applied. The task implications are two-fold: in the longer term, much work is needed to be done by Pacific educator-scholars. Through *talanoa* (Prescott, 2008), and the creation of ethical spaces (Poole, 1972), together with using strategies as the middle ground (White, 1991), collaborative initiatives might be jointly explored by researchers, policy-makers, legislators, and tribal leaders. In the shorter term, Pacific educator-scholars must provide leadership to shift peoples' consciousness not just from Western thinking but to indigenous Pacific knowledge forms as well. A first step to take is through a focused research agenda as suggested herewith.

References

- Abdullah, J., & Surlinger, R. (1999). Indigenous knowledge, indigenous learning, indigenous research. In L. M. Sennell & S. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *What is indigenous knowledge? Voices from the academy*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Anae, M., Coxon, R., Mara, D., Wendt-Samu, T., & Finau, C. (2001). *Pacific education research guidelines*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Bishop, R. (1998). Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: A Maori approach to creating knowledge. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(2), 199 - 219.
- Brew, A. (2001). The nature of research: Inquiry into academic contexts. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Canadian Institute for Health Research. (2007). *CIHR Guidelines for health research involving Aboriginal peoples*. Saskatoon, Canada: Author.
- Castellano, M. (2004). Ethics of Aboriginal Research. *Journal of Aboriginal Health*, 98 - 114.
- Cochran, P., Marshall, C., Garcia-Downing, C., Kendall, E., Cook, D., McCubbin, L., et al. (2008). Inland ways of knowing: Implications for participatory research and community. *American Journal of Public Health*, 98(1), 22 - 27.
- Gegen, D. W. (1998). Indigenous knowledge and empowerment: Rural development examined from within. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 10, 289 - 315.
- Glass, K., & Kaufert, J. (2007). Research ethics review and Aboriginal community values: Can the two be reconciled? *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 2(2), 25 - 40.
- 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), 1 - 16.
- Hudson, M. (2005). *A Maori perspective on ethical review in health*. Paper presented at the Traditional Knowledge and Research Ethics Conference, Ngā Pac O re Maramatanga, University of Auckland.
- Indigenous Peoples' Council on Biocolonialism. (2000). Indigenous Research Protection Act, from <http://www.ipcb.org/publications/policy/files/irpa.html>
- Indigenous Peoples Health Research Centre. (2004). *The ethics of research involving indigenous peoples* Paper presented at the Interagency Advisory Panel on Research Ethics Region, Saskatchewan.
- Kagan, S. (1998). *Normative ethics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Knight, G. (1980). *Philosophy and education*. Michigan: Andrews University Press.
- Maddols, L. (1992). Ethics in Aboriginal Research: A model for minorities or for all? *Medical Journal of Australia*, 157(8), 553 - 555.
- Mamiani, L. (2009). Pacific processes and pedagogies In K. F. Sanga & K. H. Thaman (Eds.), *Re-thinking education curricula in the Pacific: Challenges and prospects* (pp. 172 - 182). Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Mead, H. M. (2003). *Tikanga Maori: Living by Maori values*. Wellington: Huia.
- Nabobo-Baba, U. (2006). *Knowing and learning: An indigenous Fijian approach: An indigenous Fijian approach* Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific.
- Nabobo-Baba, U. (2009). Fijian epistemology: Examining aspects of Vagalei cultural pedagogies processes and possible futures. In K. F. Sanga & K. H. Thaman (Eds.), *Re-thinking education curricula in the Pacific: Challenges and prospects* (pp. 137 - 158). Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Peterson, R. (1982). Some ethical questions in connection with research activity in an asymmetrical ethnic situation In H. Rahim (Ed.), *Indigenous anthropology in non-Western countries* (pp. 223 - 241). Durham: Carolina Academic Press.
- Poole, R. (1972). *Towards deep subjectivity*. London: The Penguin Press.
- Prescott, S. (2008). Using talanoa in Pacific business research in New Zealand experiences with Tongan entrepreneurs. *AlterNative*, 4(1), 127 - 147.
- Rae, S. (2000). *Mani choices*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

- Sanga, K. (2011). The ethics of researching unstated contextual knowledge. In O. A. I. Bajunaid, M. Babur & R. Kumari (Eds.), *Are theories universal?* Kuala Lumpur: Yayasan Ilmuan.
- Sanga, K., & Walker, K. (2012). The Mal'ian mind and teamwork: Implications of indigenous knowledge for team development and performance. *The International Journal of Knowledge, Culture & Change Management*, 11(6), 223 - 235.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples. Dunedin: Otago University Press.
- Tauf'ulungaki, A. M. (2009). Tongan values in education: Some issues and questions. In K. F. Sanga & K. H. Thaman (Eds.), *Re-thinking education curricula in the Pacific: Challenges and prospects* (pp. 125 - 136). Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Teaero, T. (2009). Curriculum policies and framework in the context of Pacific values: A view from Kiribati. In K. F. Sanga & K. H. Thaman (Eds.), *Re-thinking education curricula in the Pacific: Challenges and Prospects* (pp. 159 - 171). Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Walker, K. (2008, December, 2008). *Research issues for indigenous populations*. Paper presented at the 9th Conference of the Global Forum on Bioethics in Research, Auckland.
- Wax, M. L. (1991). The ethics of research in American Indian Communities. *American Indian Quarterly* 15(4), 431 - 457.
- White, R. (1991). The middle ground: Indians, empires and republics in the Great Lakes Region (pp. 1650 - 1815). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Worby, G., & Rigney, D. (2002). Approaching critical issues: Institutional management of indigenous research. *Australian University Review*, 45, 24 - 33

FROM:

Otunuku, M., Nabo-Baba, U. &

Fua, S. (Eds.) "Of Waves, Winds
and Wonderful Things,"

Suva: MSP Press. 2014.

