A Method of Sharing Koorie Narratives

Ian Robert Hamilton, HDR postgraduate student, Monash University, Victoria, Australia

Ian.G.Hamilton@monash.edu

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

My professional career started in the field of applied science. My career path continued in the areas of teaching and consultant support. I have also been employed at public libraries.

Personal interests have included food preparation, disability issues, chess and association with various cultures. I am currently studying a Masters in Education by Research and have qualifications in education, librarianship and applied science.

Both my professional and my personal life have often involved a special interest of mine which is the Australian Aboriginal culture.

ABSTRACT

I have had many contacts with people in the Koorie community for more than thirty years. As well as much personal involvement I have had contact as a school teacher and also as part of a public library service staff. Hence, I have established valuable contacts with people in the local Koorie community.

I intend to build on the project which I started as part of a public library service staff. This project involved working with members of the local Koorie community in Gippsland. Stories presented by a range of people were recorded. The Chief Librarian initiated the exercise claiming that valuable information which was presently available would be lost forever if not recorded very soon. The result was a project entitled "Woor-dungin Nambur: Sharing Talk".

There is still much important work that could still be undertaken to extend the "Woor-dungin Nambur" project. The relevant research activity in progress involves developing audio recordings of local Koorie narratives. In this research project, I will be working collaboratively with Indigenous community members to:

- Facilitate the recording of any available narratives of current issues, recent history and dreamtime stories from the Gippsland region,

- Provide information for the general public associated with the analysis of local Gunnai/Kurnai stories,

- Provide the opportunity for participants to join a suitable committee to help find the best direction of the project and also to assist with preferable research methods.

By using Participatory Action Research (PAR) methodology the project attempts to achieve full benefit of available data. The research approach known as Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) is adopted with the aim of including all participants in the research process providing participants with power to select which narratives should be saved. The adoption of PAR also attempts to recognise cultural aspects of the participant group. This method seeks the guidance of the research participants by regular consultations with appropriate people.

This paper explores the general scope of the research before focusing more thoroughly on the specific reasons for selecting PAR as well as some primary ethical issues. Ethical issues associated with payment of participants are looked into and a suggestion proposed about how this issue ought to be managed recognising the topic from an Australian Aboriginal cultural perspective.

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to present an overview of the progress of my indigenous research project with an emphasis on the Participatory Action Research Methodology (PAR) which has been selected to complete this research in the Central Gippsland region of Australia.

The paper has the following format:

- First is an outline of the general scope and the beginning of the project. This section also includes a statement of the research question and the aims of the research.

- Second, a literature review supports the analysis of the major theoretical framework and the choice of PAR.

- Third, some significant ethical issues are explored which includes a consideration of ethical dilemmas and plans for solutions of these problems.

- The ethical discussion is further continued with a focus on the issue of payment to participants.

A. Beginning of the Research

Personal factors were significant in initiating the research project. The valuable time I've spent with the Koorie community in Gippsland has opened my eyes to many stories which include some devastating, much enlightening and also some enthralling information. My long personal interest in Koorie cultural issues has continued during my time working as a school teacher and also as a Public Library Assistant. My role at school included assisting students with various racial difficulties encountered in the school situation. I also had firsthand experience of a range of other Koorie issues. At the public library I organised Koorie storytime sessions and I also collected narratives from local Koories in the Latrobe Valley region. The reasons I had been given these tasks included my long-time association with the local Koorie community and also the obvious need observed by library staff for the preservation of the local Indigenous knowledge.

A project I completed at the public library was entitled 'Woor-dungin Nambur: Sharing Talk' which was commissioned by the Latrobe City Council (Hamilton, 2000). The project involved working with Indigenous community members to record memories, music and stories. The stories involved creative cultural narratives as well as some recent historical perspectives. Various contributors offered a range of narratives covering personal accounts of historical events. Almost everyone who was approached was very pleased to offer information.

My regular conversations many local Koories has convinced me that virtually every local Koorie has a strong belief that much Aboriginal cultural information is neither understood nor valued by the mainstream community in Australia.

B. Research Question

Gunnai/Kurnai narratives have much to offer for someone interested in history because the information apparently backdates some 40,000 years (O'Dea, 1991). Narratives of modern issues are also available and I have had conversations with many people keen to discuss a wide range of topics. Collecting and organising this historical information may well be considered important in the field of education for both educators and learners who desire access to the Australian Indigenous knowledge.

To enable access to Indigenous knowledge the following research question has been devised:

⇔   What does it mean to preserve, explore and share narratives provided by the local Aboriginal community?

Since much information is available from the Gunnai/Kurnai Community in the central Gippsland region but not necessarily well utilized by the wider community there is a prominent need to fill this space (Gippsland Area Consultative Committee, 2000, Pepper, 1985). Some literature is currently publicly available (Pepper, 1985, Jones, 2001). However the supply of Australian Aboriginal literature is almost certainly not in abundance (Leonard, 2001). Examples of information not easily located include local dreamtime stories, history resulting from invasions of Australia, stories about artwork and narratives of some more recent indigenous issues.

The research question has been developed as an open question. I propose the question ought to be interpreted as the research participant sees fit. This is important in order to allow research participants to provide information which they personally feel important for a broad audience. Hence, research methodology has been selected in a format known as Participatory Action Research (PAR) which is investigated in the methodology section of this paper.

C.   Purpose of research

The essential aim of the research is to explore, share and preserve Indigenous narratives from the Gippsland region. The information which research participants consider to be important for others is the accessible knowledge for achieving this goal.

For many years, the Koorie cultural information was maintained by the indigenous folk using an oral history technique (Pepper & De Araugo, 1985, Harvey, 2003). The knowledge possessed by the information providers slowly dissipates as the Aboriginal population both decreases and is further assimilated into the mainstream Australian community (Dodson, 2007). I wish to show respect for this method because of the long-time use by the Aboriginal community. Digital audio recordings of information are my choice as an alternative to the oral history method of storing that information for future access. Since the method includes no visual aspect and no live component, the method should be viewed as an alternative and not a replacement. I will address the issue of apparent consensus in the local Koorie community about information which is important but not currently publicly available and the idea that this knowledge is only minimally available.

Another purpose of the research is to locate information that might be useful in the education process. This is a way of possibly assisting with reconciliation because an increased understanding of one culture does seem to assist this process (Gadacz, 1981). I consider education to be a way of reaching a range of people in Australia, or even a wider audience. The importance of Koorie narratives for this research is central to the theoretical theme.

D.   Koorie Narratives

Even with the incomplete nature of Gunnai/Kurnai community literature certain difficulties confronting Koories are mentioned and comparable accounts are also mentioned in other literature (Pepper, 1995, Bowden, 1990). The lives of the son of Phillip Pepper, Percy Pepper and Lucy Thorpe have been outlined in detail by Flagg and Gurciullo (2008). The story does provide some significant points that warrant further investigation because some concerning topics are raised. For example, some obvious lack of family history data as well as the issue of racism which are both also stressed by Bowden (1990). The issue of racism is an issue I know is experienced by many local Koories because I have often noticed Koories confronting this issue. Examples include Koories feeling uncomfortable when alone in a regular township, Koories being verbally abused, Koorie children needing to avoid the mainstream community and Koories having to read derogatory comments.

In personal conversations of my own I have observed many local Koories highlight, often despairingly, the lack of publicly available information regarding Australian Aboriginal issues (Pascoe, 2007). The

artwork by Irene Solomon-Green (2000) is an effort to counter this gap. For example, Solomon-Green's books provide material which allows people of many ages to read about Australian Aboriginal legends. Personal conversations of my own with teachers, librarians, state government ministers of Aboriginal Affairs and the general public have also made this gap in the literature quite evident.

There are, of course, research limitations about the validity of narratives. I will deal with by discussions with various community members assessing the accuracy of recordings, obtaining community members' approval of selected stories and following up doubts with appropriate people. The aims and purpose of this research prompted a literature review which is relevant to the theory of my chosen methodology, Participatory Action Research.

II. THEORY ASSOCIATED WITH PAR

Some general theory concepts which have directed my indigenous narrative research are presented in this section supported by a review of the literature. Comments about the value of Indigenous knowledge and an application of an indigenous theory for this research complete this section.

A. Participatory Action Research

With a Maori feminist agenda Gatenby and Humphries (2000) discuss research with indigenous people using Action Research methods which are relevant to PAR (Walter, 2009, Argyris & Schon, 1989). Examples of issues raised include sensitive topics such as potential future recognition of participants by readers of the research and the challenging of the trustworthiness of the researcher. Gatenby and Humphries present the idea of PAR methodology promoting some kind of social change. Cochrane (2008) describes PAR as a method suitable for indigenous research and has discussed the methodology in detail.

Also discussing the idea of social change as a product of PAR is Maggie Walter's instructive chapter about Participatory Action Research (Walter, 2009). Introductory comments, diagrammatic presentations and method descriptions are all clearly presented in her text. Walter argues that the key to action research is in its name noting that the words participation and action form the basics of the PAR method. The ideas that participation of people involved as well as action regarding the research process are both promoted as important.

The fact that Walter's as well as Gatenby and Humphries' articles both refer to social change shows that this concept was significant to several researchers. Studies applying PAR have had the dual aim of making the research both useful to a particular group of people and also offering some kind of power or control to a group of people in an effort to promote some kind of social change (Edmonson Bell, 2001). PAR has often been applied when pursuing indigenous research (Contos, 2000, Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Kildea (2009) and White (2004) both underline the point that passing power from the researcher to the researched is an important factor in PAR methodology.

B. Indigenous research

In a significant paper Erik et al (2008) relate PAR specifically to Australian indigenous groups for research about health. Advantages of PAR as well as difficulties are described. Difficulties discussed include necessary perseverance, the overcoming of the leadership role of the researcher, peer contact, inconveniences when discussing sensitive issues and the need to offer workshop assistance for anyone seeking help.

When working with indigenous people, Giles (2006) claims to have found PAR methodology useful in the field of health research. Others also have claimed that the PAR method is valuable for research with Australian indigenous groups (Varcoe, 2006, Mason and Noble, 2000, de Ishtar, 2005). Varcoe's work addresses the issue of racism and suggests that PAR is a way of dealing with some of the racism issues. One example is the involvement of an affected person in the research project. Varcoe argues that this can overcome the problem of the participant not being allowed to feel significant. de Ishtar (2005) draws a

parallel between white feminist methods and methods suitable for indigenous research. de Ishtar notes the significance of PAR for the involvement of the researcher with the participants to plan the path of the research.

A problem, noted by many authors, for many colonised groups in the world and especially in Australia is the removal of all power from the colonized group and the introduction of a controlling paternalistic attitude (Allimadi, 2002, Sangster, 1999, Sartre, 2003). With this in mind the application of PAR is applicable in my research because the method is necessarily an attempt to shift power from the researcher to the researched (Walter, 2009, Varcoe, 2006).

C. The Value of Koorie Knowledge

When comparing Western and Indigenous research paradigms, Getty (2009) points out that Indigenous knowledge has often been dismissed as folklore. Getty goes on to point out that this has resulted in harm due to not recognising the value of the knowledge.

My own personal conversations have helped me to learn that there is much valuable knowledge to be accessed by taking note of information provided by modern indigenous Australians. To help appreciate the extent to which Aboriginal culture has been ignored in the recent history of Australia consider the following question:

> "How much different would Australia look today if that instead of immediately denying everything that native people said the Westerners had asked for help and tried to find out how to live in this land, as the natives had been doing successfully for some 40,000,000 years?"

I suggest that Australians might now have a completely different view of the need for irrigation, general farming techniques and the value of indigenous art such as basket weaving to a general lifestyle.

By involving indigenous participants in the research, as in PAR, the kind of information alluded to in the above question is possibly made available. PAR is my attempt to address the issue of ignoring indigenous Australians.

D. Ganma and Indigenous Research

To complete Indigenous research, techniques are usually used which can recognise indigenous ideas and practice (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Ganma is an Australian Indigenous concept which I believe is quite relevant to my research.

Maggie Walter (2010) illustrates that an indigenous research paradigm must recognise what is valued as knowledge from the indigenous perspective and is therefore directly challenging much traditional Western thinking about social research. Walter (2010) claims that the research framework of Participatory Action Research is often selected. Walter (2010) also states that this method is also often used to complete ethnographies. This is also relevant to this particular paper since this research involves aspects of cross-cultural research (Miller, 2003). Note that, I have lived much of my life in a Western cultural environment and I am now completing research regarding the Australian Indigenous community.

To illustrate value of indigenous knowledge I present the quote from Pyrch and Castillo (2001) in a thought provoking philosophical paper analysing the combining of indigenous and western knowledge:

> "For Ganma (the foam represented by connecting sea – Western knowledge and land – Aboriginal knowledge) to exist there has to exist the possibility, the desire for connectedness to be penetrated, not just in our heads, but also in our hearts." (Pyrch and Castillo, 2001, p.468)

The authors point out that if we try to capture this foam in a rough manner it evaporates therefore we must be gentle to allow the foam to linger and reveal itself to us. The model is also used by other authors

realising that problems exist if we try to be too harsh and abrupt when connecting indigenous and Western knowledge (Pyrch and Castillo, 2001).

The Ganma concept started as a synergy between language groups Yorgtharngba and Ya'idmidtung but was clearly extended for describing the interface between Western and Aboriginal Australian knowledge (Westby and Hwa-Froelich, 2003). Yunkaporta and McGinty (2009) point out that Ganma had a clear political focus according to many authors but was valued as an opportunity for creative progression by others. For example, the validity of this concept for a research report, the relevance to general population and the actual reality of the idea could all be debated.

The concept of Ganma is the appropriate model which is selected as an indigenous guide for the methods used in this research project and is a preparation for interaction with research community by using PAR. In considering a suitable for indigenous research, I have chosen to use the methodology of Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR), aiming to include the research community in the research process including important aspects such as ethical considerations (Henry, 2004, Ferreira, 2006).

III. Ethics

Supporting the view of Punch (1994) that "sound ethics and sound methodology go hand in hand" (p.94) I will explain ethical issues which I find significant for my research. There are specific issues associated with the PAR methodology which are often even more refined when analysing indigenous research (Ermine et al, 2004).

A. Guiding Principles

As pointed out by Babbie (1999) no-one is perfect and our own mistakes are not always apparent to us. Therefore, for my research, decisions will be discussed with any relevant individuals who, of course, include research participants. This idea has justified the choice of using the methodological approach known as Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR), used by a range of researchers involved in indigenous research (Dick, 2009, Singleton et al, 2009, Fletcher et al, 2008). However, I recognise that many questions of ethics effectively start and finish with the researcher (Neuman, 2003).

CBPR involves the process of consultation with community, meetings discussing previous actions and community discussions planning future actions (Walter, 2010). CBPR is adopted with the aim of including all participants in the research process (Walter, 2010). For my research methods participants will be consulted about methodology, data collection, ethics decisions and data analysis.

Another ethics principle which I consider important is Wiersma and Jur's (1995) common sense principle. This acknowledges the belief that, ultimately, even the choice of whether or not to consider an issue is usually the decision of the researcher. Ideally, I would like to have all issues discussed but issues are bound to arise of which time, resources and people are unavailable for assistance.

Some other concepts are also useful since there is generally a consensus in the literature noting some common principles for qualitative research methods (Cohen et al, 2000, Punch, 1994). Informed consent of participants, the right to privacy for all involved and protection from harm are all thoughts which are important. Using information from previous research these issues will be handled by presenting forms with suitable instructions and also with the community discussion as provided for with PAR (Clark, 1980, Ford & Fasoli, 2001). I anticipate some ethical dilemmas and I have made some plans for solution.

B. Ethical Dilemmas and Planned solutions

This section approaches some of the ethical dilemmas which I have confronted whilst accepting the PAR methodology as suitable technique for indigenous research. I have planned to use a community consultation approach to solve some of these problems.

I confronted one major difficulty of the traditional ethics process when completing the Ethics Application Form (Monash University Human Ethics Committee (MUHREC), 2009). This is supporting

the argument by Flicker (2007), with four other authors that traditional ethics systems do not particularly correspond with PAR. For example, the Guidelines to Application Forms (MUHREC, 2007, p.1) clearly states that "Recruitment of participants or collection of data must not start without written approval from MUHREC". Ideally, with a PAR approach collaboration with participants should happen to help guide the selection of research aims, specific methods and even the ethical ideas (Gatenby and Humphries, 2000). If practice with research is not able to begin until approval is achieved then the requirements of the application cannot easily include research aims, scope and general summaries. These are all necessary parts of the application but I would appreciate including participants when using PAR.

The national ethics document (Australian Government & Vice Chancellors Committee, 2007) referred to in the relevant ethics application, insists that cultural needs of the researched community are addressed. The Participatory Action Research methodology will help to ensure that cultural needs will be dealt with according to the requirements of the research participant group. Ford and Fasoli (2001) suggest establishing a reference group within the researched community. Consultation with the participant group helps provide for cultural needs as well as individual needs. For my research project views will be sought from a range of people who are affected.

Who actually owns the research data is another issue which a range of authors have discussed in depth and I also consider significant for the indigenous research ethics (Jacklin & Kinoshameg, 2005, Lundy and McGovern, 2006, Kildea, 2009, Klaebe, 2006). Kelly Bannister (2005) discusses this issue referring to a range of disciplines. Bannister argues that traditional research ethics processes may foster, hinder or even impede indigenous ownership protection. A discussion with the research community will hopefully reach a consensus about the ownership of data.

PAR methodology involves participants and passes some research power to participants in an attempt to minimise risks (Kaufert, 2004). Examples of risks include participants changing their mind during interviews, embarrassment of individuals and various stressful situations. Transferral of power in research relates to organising data collection and distributing data after collection, preparing interviews and general rules (Boog, 2003). Further to the dilemmas of traditional ethical processes, unforeseen circumstances and ownership of data, the issue of payment to participants also required consideration during my ethics preparation.

IV. PAYMENT

An examination of the literature debate regarding the process of payment to participants is followed by consideration of the issue with a Koorie perspective.

A. Primary Arguments Against Payment

A common belief in traditional research is that payment is an unethical way to conduct research (Festinger, 2004). There are those who argue that payment is simply a "token gesture" and cannot be maintained at a professional rate (Gilley, 1990). The answer to this is that surely some payment is more acknowledging of one's effort than zero payment, at least an indication of thank you to the participant. Drawing a conclusion is not easy about whether or not payment is actually coerces participants to join the research.

Avoiding coercion of participants (Festinger, 2005) is one strong argument against paying participants. Researchers have stated that payment presents coercion and therefore negates exercises such as random sampling and treating all participants as equal because it could draw in participants who would otherwise not be involved in the research (Festinger, 2005). However, since all participants are different and therefore all have at least a slightly different relationship with the researcher as well as a different reason for being involved. I argue that total randomness is usually very difficult anyway. Unmitigated randomness is almost certainly not readily achieved in an action research project in which the researcher has had previous personal contact with most participants.

Funding difficulty is another reason why payment might be avoided because budgets are usually limited to some degree. Funds do seem to be found for things that someone decides is important enough to be funded. Examples are new buildings, reemploying staff, rebuilding rooms, repairs to equipment and the list goes on. Hence, if participant payment is considered important enough then surely funds will be found somewhere. Maybe even at the cost of delaying funds somewhere else.

B. Some Reasons for Offering Payment?

"Members were paid $30 on the basis they were making personal and professional contribution to a body of research about family services." (Gilley, 1990, p.94)

Gilley's text has a methodology section which begins with the above quote. Clearly, significant points for Gilley are the facts that the contribution is professional, personal and also significant to research. Taking these comments seriously I have concluded that offering payment to participants should be a realistic consideration.

The current economic climate in Australia has effectively imposed the beliefs about payment onto indigenous Australians that any personal or professional contribution is worth money (Gilley, 1990). Therefore payment for research, as noted above, could be considered seriously because a contribution is made. However, the answer here is that research maybe does not fit into the realm of activities that require payment. Indeed, we need to note that people are paid money for a wide range of activities (Conn, 2009). Participants in a research project are not usually the people who have requested that this research is done. These people have merely agreed to provide their time, knowledge and skills to support the research process. Therefore, there is an indication that in an Anglo-Saxon capitalist view that payment should be offered for the amount of work which is provided.

The research participant is offering a favour (Roberts & Indermaur, 2003). The idea that the effort made by the research participant is a favour is a view taken by a range of authors and seems to be a sensible line. I haven't found many who disagree with this including researchers as well as people who have participated in research. Therefore, maybe this favour should be reimbursed. One might argue that the favour is simply a concept of one's perspective and therefore cannot have a specific cost associated.

In contrast, some ethics debates judge payment as a reward (Finkel, 2007). Whether this is a good or a bad factor is up to the individual to decide. Should we be rewarding a person for something as valuable as a favour which has been provided? I point out here that in most cases this favour cannot possibly be duplicated. Duplication is not possible since time frame, memories, outside influences and many other factors all change even if the same person is contacted again. On the other hand a reward is viewed by some researchers as providing outside influence which affect results (Toumbourou et al, 2004). Arguments are even presented suggesting that maybe participants should pay a cost for a reward (Finkel, 2007).

I suggest that probably the strongest argument supporting some form of payment for participants is that some people involved in this research could be in a difficult financial position and monetary support will be invaluable. Of course, others will be in a much different position and this kind of support will not be needed. My selection of participants is definitely not with regard to the participant's financial position because, as is explained in the methodology chapter about participant selection, so many other factors affect participation. These can include, experience, willingness to cooperate, ability to provide information, time availability, accessibility and respect within the local community. To add to this discussion some pertinent literature has been investigated.

C. Significant Ideas in the Literature

White et al (2004) argue that some form of advance payment should be made to participants to cover costs such as travel and time. This seems a reasonable consideration although White does not follow up this discussion with anything about exactly how rigorous researcher should be with measuring costs. Do we need to observe official receipts? Is each participant's time worth the same amount of payment? In the

current economic environment in Australia these kinds of questions are often considered important when someone claims money for providing something (Liamputtong, 2007). Anyone opposing payment might present the argument that it is not possible to judge exactly how the advance payment is used.

The National Statement on Ethical Conduct for Human Research (2007) in Australia states that payment to participants may reimburse costs but "payment that is disproportionate to the time involved, or any other inducement that is likely to encourage participants to take risks, is ethically unacceptable" (Australian Government, 2007, p.20). This document also notes that decisions about payment should take into account customs and practices of the relevant research community.

An important article I perused about participant payment is by Elizabeth Ripley (2006) who presents an informative review showing that there are definitely two sides to this debate. The point is made that a standard payment cannot even be considered the same for each participant. Ripley notes here that each participant is in a different position and has a different personal perception of the costs and benefits of the research activity. Ripley points out that both risks and benefits of payment should be considered.

The perception by researchers in various parts of the world may differ. Toumbourou et al (2004) discuss this particular view in depth after pointing out that payment to research participants is less tolerated by ethics committees in Australia than in America.

D. A Koorie Perspective

The decision made for this research project depends on my interpretation of the local Koorie community perspective. This is because the research approach chosen is Community Based Participatory Research involving the community from which participants have been selected in the research process.

The literature review explains that the literature specific to the Gunnai/Kurnai community is limited. However, literature referring to Australian Indigenous culture in a more general scale does indicate that sharing is an accepted and often expected practice (Johnston, 2008, Peterson, 2009). Indeed, my own perception is that being asked for some form of material gift is often viewed as a complement within the community. Whenever responding positively to a request I have usually had little doubt about appreciation for responding positively.

E. A Final Decision for this Project

My aim is that the research is to be presented to a much broader audience than the local Koorie community. Therefore to satisfy the Ethics guide to complete this research payment has been viewed as not acceptable in a manner which coerces participants to take part (Australian Government, 2007, p.20). I will adopt a Community Based Participatory Research approach as well as follow the National Statement on Ethical Conduct which advises that the customs and practices of the relevant research community are considered (Australian Government, 2007, p.20).

My final decision is based on my own understanding and discussions within the relevant participant community. If someone claims at the completion of an interview that there is need for help with money or some other material benefit, such as food for example, this need should be fulfilled. Provided I have the necessary capacity to help out I will be glad to do so.

V. CONCLUSION

The information presented in this report has provided a discussion of why this research started and has stated the purpose of my research. A short literature review was presented which is directly related to the theory of the research. The literature investigated supports the choice of PAR methodology as appropriate for indigenous research. Aspects of PAR theory were highlighted that were crucial to my study. This refers to including participants in preparing, reviewing and organising the research process.

Ethical dilemmas were explored. These included combining CBPR with traditional ethical systems, ownership of research data, participants altering their views during research and the payment of

participants. The CBPR approach is a realistic attempt to solve ethical problems. I have judged that the PAR and CBPR methodologies are supported by a common sense approach. Thus, opinions of participants and other relevant people will be carefully considered.

Given that the scope and sequence of the study in question has been thoroughly explored, I look forward to establishing a reference group within the researched community to thoroughly consider their views and perspectives about ethical issues and about their Gunnai/Kurnai knowledge.

REFERENCES

Allimadi, M. (2002). The hearts of darkness: How white writers created the racist image of Africa. New York: Black Star Books.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1989). Participatory action research and action science compared: A commentary. [journal]. The American Behavioural Scientist, 32(5), 612.

Australian Government, & Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee. (2007). National statement on ethical conduct in human research. Canberra: Australian Government.

Babbie, E. (1999). The basics of social research. 473.

Bannister, K. (2005). Use of traditional knowledge for university research: Conflicts between research ethics intelectual property ownership. In J. T. Arnason, P. M. Catling, E. Small & e. al (Eds.), Biodiversity & health: Focusing research to poicy. Proceedings of the international symposium, held in Canada, October 25-28, 2003 (pp. 122-129). Ottawa, Ontario: NRC Research Press.

Boog, B. W. (2003). The emancipatory character of action research, its history and the present state of the art. [journal]. Journal of Comunity Applied Social Psychology, 13(not stated), 426-438.

Bowden, R. (1990). Being Aboriginal. Crow's Nest, NSW: Australian Broadcasting Corporation.

Clark, A., W. (1980). Action research: Theory, practice, and values. [journal]. Journal of Occupational Behavour, 1(2), 151-157.

Cochrane, P. A. L. e. a. (2008). Indigenous ways of knowing: Implications for participatory research and community. [journal]. American Journal of Public Health., 98(1), 22-27.

Cohen, L., Manion, L and Morrison, K. (2000). Research Methods In Education. New York (and London): Routledge Falmer.

Conn, S. (2009). Labour costs. Economic & Labour Market Review, 3(2), 47-54.

Contos, N. (2000). The Pinjarra Massacre Site Project: From doctoral student to community consultant. [Review]. Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 19(2), 13-19.

de Ishtar, Z. (2005). Striving for a common language: A white feminist parallel to indigenous ways of knowing and researching. [Journal]. Women's Studies International Forum, 28, 357-368.

Dick, B. (Producer). (2009, 20/7/10) Action research literature. 2006-2008. Action Research. Review retrieved from www.sagepublications.com

Dodson, P. (2007). Keynote address - Australia fair. Impact, 2007(Summer), 8-11.

Edmonson Bell, E. (2006). Infusing race into the US discourse on action research. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), Handbook of concise action research. (Concise Paperback Edition ed., pp. 362). London: Sage.

Erik, M.-S., Akee and Maher. (2008). Resilence to blood-borne and sexually transmitted infections: The development of a participatory action research project with young Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in Townsville. [journal]. Aboriginal Health and Islander Journal, 32(6), 5-8.

Ermine, W., Sinclair, R., & Jeffrey, B. (2004). The ethics of research involving indigenous people. Report of the Indigenous People's Health Research Centre to Interagency Advisory Panel on research ethics. Saskatoon: Indigenous People's Health Research Centre.

Ferreira, G. A. (2006). Participatory video for policy development in remote Aboriginal communities. Unpublished Text, Guelph, Guelph.

Festinger, D. S., Marlowe, D. B., Croft, J. R., Dugosh, K. l., Mastro, N. K., Lee, P. A., et al. (2005). Do research payments precipitate drug use or coerce participation? [journal]. Drug and Alchohol Dependence, 78(2005), 275-281.

Finkel, E. J., Eastick, P. W., & Mattews, J. (2007). Speed-dating as an invaluable tool for studying romantic attraction: A methodological primer. [journal]. Personal Relationships, 14, 149-166.

Flagg, S., & Gurciullo, S. (2008). Footprints: The journey of Lucy & Percy Pepper. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia and State of Victoria.

Fletcher, F., McKennitt, D., & Baydala, L. (2008). Community capacity building: An Aboriginal exploratory case study. [journal]. Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health, 5(2), 9-31.

Flicker, S., Travers, R., Guta, A., McDonald, S., & Meagher, A. (2007). Ethical dilemmas in community-based participatory research: Recommendations for institutional review boards. [journal]. Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 84(4), 478-493.

Ford, M., & Fasoli, L. (2001). Indigenous early childhood educators' narratives: Some methodological considerations. [journal]. Australian Journal of Early Childhood, 26(3), 12-17.

Gadacz, R. R. (1981). Understanding and Interpretation in Historical Ethnology. [journal]. Anthropologica, New Series 23(2), 181-189.

Gatenby, B., & Humphries, M. (2000). Feminist participatory action research: Methodological and ethical issues. [journal article]. Women's studies International forum, 23(1), 89-105.

Getty, G. A. (2010). The journey between and Western and Indigenous research paradigms. [journal]. Journal of Transactional Nursing, 21(5), 5-14.

Giles, G. (2006). Participatory action research for Aboriginal community health research. [Journal]. Aboriginal and Health Worker Journal, 30(5), 16-.

Gilley, T. (1990). Empowering poor people : a consumer view of the Family Centre Project Melbourne: Brotherhood of St. Laurence.

Gippsland Area Consultative Committee. (2000). Barriers to Aboriginal employment in Gippsland. Morwell: Commonwealth Government of Australia.

Hamilton, I. R. (2000). Woor-dungin nambur.

Harvey, K. p. w. (2003). Aboriginal Elders' voices: stories of the "Tide of History": Victorian Indigenous Elders' life stories & oral histories. East Brunswick, Vic: Aboriginal Community Elders Service. ACES.

Henry, J., Dunbar, T., Arnott, A., Scrimgeour, M., & Murakami-Gold, L. (2004). Indigenous research reform agenda: A review of the literature., Links Monograph Series (Vol. 5,

Jacklin, K., & Kinoshameg, P. (2008). Developing a participatory Aboriginal health research project: "Only if it's going to mean something". [journal]. Journal of empirical research on Human Ethics, 3(2), 53-67.

Johnston, V., & Thomas, D. P. (2008). Smoking behaviours in a remote Australian indigenous community: The influence of family and other factors. [journal]. Social Science and Medicine, 67(11), 1708-1716.

Jones, C. (Artist). (2001). Lake Victoria [Contemporay music].

Kaufert, J., M, Cranley Glass, K., Freeman, W., & LaBine, L. (2004). Background working paper on issues of group, community or first nation consent., 20 Jul, from http://www.ahmrc.org.au/Downloads/CRIAH%20Tools%20for%20Collaboration%20ver1%20December2007/1%20Background/Background%20paper%20on%20issues%20of%20group,%20community%20or%20first%20nation%20consent%20in%20health%20research.pdf

Kildea, S., Barclay, L., Wardaguga, M., & Dawumai, M. (2009). Participative in remote Australia. Action Research, 7(2), 143-163.

Klaebe, H. (2005). Sharing stories: Collaboration, community, creativity and copyright. [journal]. Oral History Association of Australia Journal, (27), 44-47.

Leornard, B. (2001). Documenting Indigenous knowledge and languages: Research planning & protocol. Sharing Our Pathways, 6(5), 1-5.

Lundy, P., & McGovern, M. (2006). Participation, truth and partiality: Participatory action research, community, based truth telling and post conflict transition in Northern Ireland. Sociology, 40(1), 71-88.

Mason, J., & Noble, C. (2000). Reflecting of focus group research: Women working with violence. [journal]. Women Against Violence: An Australian Feminist Journal, Dec(9), 52-60.

Miller, R. L., & Brewer, J. D. (Eds.). (2003). The A-Z of social research: A dictionary of social science concepts. London: Sage.

Monash University. (2009). Written consent. [Melbourne]: Monash University.

Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee (MUHREC). (2007). Guidelines to MUHREC application forms. [Melbourne]: Monash University.

Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee (MUHREC). (2009). Application for ethical approval of a research project involving humans (MUHREC is the primary HREC). [Melbourne]: Monash University.

Neuman, L. W. (2003). Social research methods. Boston: Pearson Education.

O'Dea, K., Jewewll, P. A., Whiten, A., Altmann, S. A., Strickland, S. S., & Oftedal, O. T. (1991). Traditional diet and food preferences of Australian Aboriginal hunter-gatherers [and discussion]. [journal]. Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences, 334(1270), 233-241.

Pepper, P., & De Araugo, T. (1985). The Kurnai of Gippsland. Sth Yarra, Vic: Hyland House.

Peterson, N. (2009). Demand Sharing: Reciprocity and the Pressure for Generosity among Foragers. [journal]. American Anthropologist, 95(4), 860-874.

Ponder, M. (2008). Genetic research on rare familial disorders: consent and the blurred boundaries between and research. [Research ethics]. Journal of Medical Ethics, 34(9), 690.

Punch, M. (1994). Politics and Ethics in Qualitative Research. In N. Denzin, K. & Y. Lincolon, S. (Eds.), Handbook of Qualitative Research (pp. 83-95). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Pyrch, T., & Castillo, T. (2001). The sights and sounds of indigenous knowledge. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice. (pp. 468). London: Sage.

Ripley, E. (Producer). (2006) A review of paying research participants: It's time to move beyond the ethical debate. Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics. journal retrieved from WWW.UCPRESS.JOURNALS/RIGHTS/HTM

Roberts, L., & Indermaur, D. (2003). Signed consent forms in criminological research: Protection for researchers and ethics committees but a threat to research participants? Paper presented at the Evaluation in Crime and Justice: Trends and Methods Conference, 24-25 March 2003.

Sangster, J. (1999). Criminalizing the Colonized: Ontario Native Women Confront the Criminal Justice System, 1920-60. [journal]. Canadian Historical Review, 80(1), 32-60.

Sartre, J.-P. (2003). The colonizer and the colonized. London: Earthscan Publications.

Sasson, D. (2006). The culture of the Europeans: From 1800 to the present. London: Harper Press.

Singleton, G., Rola-Rubzen, M. F., Muir, K., Muir, D., & McGregor, M. (2009). Youth empowerment and information and communication technologies: a case study of a remote Australian Aboriginal community. [journal]. GeoJournal, 74, 403-413.

Toumbourou, J. W., McMorris, B. J., Mathers, M., & Catalano, R. F. (2004). Ethical guidelines for the payment of research participants should be clarified: Reflections from cross-national research. . [Journal]. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 28(6), 584-585.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples. London: Zed Books.

Varcoe, C. (2006). Doing Participatory Action Research in a Racist World. . [journal article]. Journal of Nursing Research, 28(5), 525-540.

Walter, M. (Ed.). (2010). Social research methods. Sydney: Oxford University Press.

Westby, C., & Hwa-Froelich, D. (2003). Considerations in participatory action research when working cross-culturally. [journal]. Folia Phoniatr Logop, 55, 300-305.

White, G. W., Suchowierska, M., & Campbell, M. (2004). Developing and systematically implementing participatory action research. [Archive]. Arch Phys Med Rehab, 85(2), S3-12.

Wiersma, W. & Jurs, S. (1995). Research methods in education: An introduction. Boston, USA: Allyn and Bacon.

Yunkaporta, T., & McGinty, S. (2009). Reclaiming Aboriginal knowledge at the cultural interface. [journal]. The Australian Educational Researcher, 36(2), 55-72.