Indigenous Methods and Pedagogy: Revisiting Ethics in Community Service-Learning

Swapna Padmanabha

ABSTRACT   This paper looks at the development of a teaching module intended to enhance students' understanding of ethics in a community service-learning (CSL) class. This module, created to meet academic (western) learning outcomes for CSL, is based upon Indigenous pedagogy and methods, and offers a non-western framing of specific community service goals, particularly reciprocity and transformative dissonance. The paper proposes that moving toward Indigenous or other ways of knowing offers students and instructors an entry point into decolonizing practices and into alternate ways of experiencing service, transformative learning, and power dynamics. The paper also includes a discussion of the theory behind the teaching module and focuses on the intertwining of ethical research protocols (from Tri-Council policy, OCAP® principles, and elsewhere), service-learning goals, and Indigenous methods within the context of settler colonial practices and policies. Alongside other traditional service-learning outcomes, the primary goal of the module is to encourage students to become critical thinkers reflecting on the mechanics of power and social inequity as they experience social justice founded upon the ideals of relationship building.

KEYWORDS   ethics; CSL; transformative dissonance; Indigenous methods and pedagogy; decolonization

A few years ago, I was given the opportunity to take an undergraduate, interdisciplinary community service-learning (CSL) course in the capacity of a graduate student, with enhanced readings, assignments, and a teaching component. The course focused on the topic of community engagement in the city of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, located in Treaty 6 territory and Métis homeland. It combined theoretical teachings, weekly service engagements with community-based organizations, and an intensive week-long community service-learning experience during our institution's spring break. Throughout my time in this class, several incidents occurred that highlight some commonly reported problems in CSL, problems which are indicative of how transformative learning fails to happen for many CSL students. Upon conclusion of the course, the professor and I identified that many of the problems the students encountered appeared to be grounded in the students' inability to *sit with discomfort* when faced with acknowledging aspects of others' disenfranchisement or marginalization that simply have not been part of their own everyday experiences. Reflecting on this, we decided that strengthening the ethics portion of the course could alleviate some of the problems

students were facing. Focusing on ethics may seem like an odd solution to these problems, particularly for CSL contexts in which little or no ethical review is generally necessary, as much of the work done is not classified as "research" requiring formalized consent processes. But strengthening this component of the class offered other advantages. By focusing on ethics, we would be able to ensure the inclusion of best practices normally seen in community-based research (CBR) and Tri-Council policy,[1] while also incorporating OCAP® principles (ethics guidelines that are specific to research done in Canada with First Nations populations).[2] Neither Tri-Council policy nor OCAP® principles apply directly to community service-learning, as they more explicitly deal with the ethics of research involving people, but I propose that incorporating their best practices into a CSL classroom, and into the broader ethics governing CSL, can bolster safety for both students and community members while also asking students to acknowledge privilege and power disparities.

This paper examines the theoretical underpinnings of a three-part (six hour) ethics teaching module I built that is grounded in Indigenous pedagogy and methods. I put forward the idea that this inclusion of Indigenous methods and pedagogy offers a new framing for implementing aspects of CSL in the classroom and in community. This framing pushes for CSL to occur in manners not wholly congruent with traditional western framings, and it thereby offers new understandings that can shape students' experiences of service-learning, transformative learning, and the power dynamics at work in classroom and community contexts.

As a mature graduate student, a woman of colour, and a member of the Indigenous Studies department at the University of Saskatchewan, I embrace many different methodologies and ways of knowing. This positionality has informed how I approach service-learning and the module I built to enrich service-learning experiences. The teaching module is intended to help students understand the realities of privilege, the value of other worldviews, and the necessity of viewing situations from positions other than their own, all within the context of settler colonial practices and policies, which indelibly shape our experiences in Saskatoon and in Canada more broadly. The module draws on Indigenous research methodologies— specifically, the principles of relational accountability, respectful representation, rights and regulation, and reciprocal appropriation (Louis, 2007)—to help students negotiate moments of "critical dissonance" by prompting them to reflect on the mechanics of power and social inequities and by encouraging them to become critical thinkers open to social justice founded in relationship building.

In the first section of this paper, I identify commonalities between best practices in CSL, CBR, Tri-Council policy, and OCAP® principles, before moving on to describe Rachel Wendler's (2012) "Human subjects protection: A source for ethical service-learning practice." Building

---

[1] Canada's three federal research agencies (Canadian Institutes of Health Research [CIHR], Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada [NSERC], and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada [SSHRC]) jointly created a panel that develops and interprets the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS). The TCPS has been widely adopted and serves as the basis for many organizations and their research ethics boards.

[2] OCAP® is a registered trademark of the First Nations Information Governance Centre (FNIGC).

on the best practices and on Wendler's source, I then discuss how Indigenous epistemologies provide a necessary framework for community service-learning in settler colonial contexts and how Indigenous pedagogies of modelling, listening, and relationship building can be used to instruct CSL students in these ways of knowing.[3] I juxtapose the outlined best practices with four cornerstone teachings of Indigenous methodologies to illuminate how CSL can be strengthened by adapting Indigenous epistemologies and pedagogies. Specifically, I examine how deconstructing accepted understandings of reciprocity, a common concept in both community service-learning and Indigenous contexts, and rethinking how transformative dissonance is achieved can bolster service-learning in terms of project valuation, student reflexivity, relationship building, and cultural acceptance. Following a discussion of the teaching module I designed from the foundations named above,[4] I end by considering future possibilities for the module, particularly as it provides formalized teachings that can be seen as an entry point into decolonization practices.

Best Practices for Community Service-Learning

In this section, I present a synthesis of best practices which have been culled from principles for ethical research established by Tri-Council Policy and OCAP®; guidelines for service-learning classes from Vanderbilt University; key concepts from the Canadian Alliance for Community Service-Learning; and a research article on the elements community partners seek in service-learning collaborations (Tinkler et al., 2014). These best practices are wide-ranging, but I have identified their similarities in order to create the following list of recommended considerations for ethical community service-learning:

- **Concern for welfare**: Faculty, students, and community partners must be aware of the impact of CSL partnerships and practices on individuals, particularly in relation to factors such as physical, spiritual, economic, and mental health or social circumstances.
- **Community voice**: Community members should be involved in every stage of the project and course when possible.
- **Reciprocity**: Service-learning should be reciprocal in nature, benefiting both the community and the university partners.
- **Public dissemination:** Results of CSL projects should be shared with the community organization that is involved, if not a larger audience.
- **Community partner's mission**: Faculty and students must be attentive to the community partner's mission and vision.
- **Shared responsibility**: Faculty, students, and community partners should accept and share responsibility for inefficiencies.

---

[3] Throughout this paper, I use the term "Indigenous" to mean the First Peoples of North America and refer to Indigenous knowledge, methods, research, and pedagogy as foundational practices representative of Indigenous peoples in North America. In the Canadian context, the term "Indigenous" brings together the First Peoples of our lands under a singular umbrella that encompasses many diverse peoples. While there are many different Indigenous groups and types of Indigenous knowledges/methods throughout the world, this paper focuses on knowledges founded and developed by Indigenous peoples of Canada, although there may be some pan-Indigenous commonalities.

[4] An abbreviated version of the module is included in Appendix A to provide context and examples of exercises.

- **Resources**: University representatives must be mindful of the community partner's resources.
- **Long-term consideration**: All stakeholders must consider the legacy of the partnership.

In my synthesis of best practices, I found that the organizations and researchers I list above continually included aspects of respect, community involvement, and reciprocity in their articulations of what should guide the ethics of interaction. These foundational considerations, along with reflexivity, inform Wendler's (2012) guidelines for ethical service-learning, as well as the teaching module I introduce later in this paper.

An Overview of Rachel Wendler's Guidelines for Ethical Service-Learning

Wendler (2012) argues that "[d]espite the potential harm inherent in some aspects of service-learning, the field has established few formalized principles for protecting community members such as those for protecting human research subjects" (p. 29). Wendler suggests that instructors need more "specific conceptual tools to help university service-learning instructors analyze ethical issues in service partnerships" (p. 30). She draws upon the Belmont Report's principles of respect, beneficence, and justice to provide guidelines for ethical service-learning.[5] Wendler's adaptations augment the original principles, creating space for flexibility in interpretation and delivery, while fostering longevity and stronger relational practices. She adapts the first principle of respect by suggesting that, in the service-learning context, respect involves more than just informed consent. When respect is practiced, "[s]takeholders [i.e., community members or organizations] are offered a culturally-responsive and revisable explanation of the [service-learning] project, without coercion. Consent is continually renegotiated—in relationships. Respectful asset-based frameworks guide interactions and representations" (Wendler 2012, p. 31). To adapt the concept of beneficence to the CSL context, she suggests that practitioners consider how benefits might be shared and harms minimized in CSL practice, including minimizing potential dangers related to obtaining and sharing community knowledge (Wendler 2012, p. 33). Wendler's (2012) adaptation of the principle of justice draws upon feminist and participatory research practices to move beyond safeguarding research participant selection: "[Community service-learning] partnerships demonstrate attention to power dynamics and attempt to equalize them, including the micro-dynamics of the partnership as well as the macro-dynamics in society at large" (p. 34). In addition, Wendler (2012) suggests a guideline around reflexivity that speaks to the improbability of achieving objectivity and focusses instead on situated knowledge, or on an "awareness of how who one is shapes one's perception of the service-learning situation, including recognizing that one's viewpoint is not absolute" (p. 35). Informed by these four principles, this paper hopes to show how Indigenous practices and methodologies can augment Wendler's guidelines for ethical community service-learning. Like Wendler, I turn to the principles of ethical research—but in my case, Indigenous research—to advance service-learning guidelines.

---

[5] The Belmont Report, authored in 1978, is the gold standard for human research subjects' protection in the United States, serving as the basis of U.S. Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (Wendler, 2012, p. 30).

Indigenous Methods

The American Indigenous Research Association (2017) describes Indigenous research as flowing from tribal knowledge: "Information is gained through *relationship*—with people in a specific Place, with the culture of Place as understood through our own cultures, with the source of the research data, and with the person who knows or tells the story itself and how it is interpreted by both teller and researcher" (n.p.). This intertwining of relationship, culture, place, and history, along with the complexities of language,[6] means that there will be certain knowledge(s) that cannot be described or understood by all people, or perhaps not even heard/seen at specific times and places. Indigenous knowledges do not claim universality, and they are predicated on the understanding that information is constantly flowing from any given place/moment/person/animal/ceremony to another (Battiste, 2002, p. 12-14).

Outside of this fluidity, the most commonly acknowledged divide between western and Indigenous knowledge lies in the concept of objectivity. Traditionally, western knowledge and research is premised on the idea of the researcher being objective and unbiased. In Indigenous knowledge, the researcher is not objective (Deloria & Wildcat, 2001, p. 3-7). The researcher's goal is to create relationships with the community connected to the research, as well as with their land, worldviews, cultural values, beliefs, understandings, and histories (Evans et al., 2009, p. 3-5).

In her work examining the divide between knowledge systems and research standards, Renee Pualani Louis (2007), a Hawaiian cartographer and academic, identifies four common principles found in the literature on Indigenous methodologies and research (Battiste, 2002; Simpson & Smith, 2014; Tuhiwai Smith, 2012): **relational accountability; respectful representation; rights and regulation;** and **reciprocal appropriation**. Louis (2007) understands the first principle, relational accountability, in much the same manner as the American Indigenous Research Association, stating that all parts of the research process are related, from inspiration to expiration, and that the researcher is not just responsible for nurturing this process but is also accountable to "all [their] relations" (p. 133). While CSL best practices insist on the involvement of the community in CSL partnerships and projects, the Indigenous concept of relational accountability speaks to a deeper and more complex process of relationship building, which should be considered foundational to ethical CSL practices.

The principle of respectful representation speaks to the need for researchers to accept that not all of their ideas will be used in the project, and that not all knowledge is accessible to them. This concept is not readily acknowledged in community service-learning best practices, although many CSL programs stress that students should be attentive to community voice and ensure their projects meet the needs of the community members. This principle speaks to the idea that researchers and service-learners must practice humility and recognize that their perception of the "right" solution may not always be seen by others as an effective measure.

---

[6] Many Indigenous languages in Canada are descriptive in nature, and this richness allows for textural conveyance that is not possible with word-for-word translations. The symbolic and verbal aspects of Indigenous languages, combined with intonation, allows for the use of single words to convey complex concepts. This then adds to the complexity of adequately conveying meaning using the English language (Battiste, 2002, p. 17).

Reiterating to students that projects which build on previous years' work are sustainable and include member voices/ideas, as well as reminding students that not all ideas are good ideas, can help students move away from focusing on how *they* can make a difference to *what kind of intervention* would create a difference. Shifting the emphasis from student strengths to community strengths, previous community endeavors, and community voices can help foster relationship building between community members and students. For many, this shift may represent a relinquishment of innovation and of power or authority (i.e. the ownership over and implementation of a project). However, with proper context and understanding, students can be directed to see the value in being able to adapt, add to, and bolster others' work; sustaining previous projects can therefore be seen, in this light, as an indicator of progress and as a vital means of incorporating thoughts and work from past students, community members, and community organizations. This shift in emphasis increases the likelihood that students will begin to see other worldviews, embrace cultural differences, understand aspects of oppression, adopt greater reflexivity, and experience transformative dissonance.

The principle of rights and regulation refers to the researcher's obligation to ensure that Indigenous peoples' intellectual property rights remain under the control of Indigenous peoples (the community) rather than the researcher (Louis, 2007, p. 133). This is partly echoed in service-learning best practices that focus on respect, as well as in Wendler's principle of justice, which asks CSL practitioners to pay attention to power dynamics. Within CSL, the majority of projects will not have formalized processes with respect to intellectual property, and students will generally be required to follow the community organization's property requirements. In an ideal setting, community members would have a say in project development. For CSL contexts, this means ensuring students understand the need to include community voices as well as recognize the value and knowledge passed to students through such inclusion. For many students, this will come in the form of requesting if community members would like to be acknowledged in their project presentation or paper. In situations where confidentiality is required, even a simple "thank you" to the members of a given organization for their valued insight and ideas can make organizations, academia, and students more aware of the strengths of collaborative work, while offering a respectful nod to the community members.

Finally, Louis (2007) identifies reciprocal appropriation, as written about by N. Scott Momaday, as the fourth cornerstone of Indigenous methodologies. While some would contend that this is the same as the principle of reciprocity that is common to CSL best practices, I offer a more nuanced understanding of reciprocal appropriation. The combination of the words "reciprocal" and "appropriation" speaks to the truth that as humans, what we take from the land and environment, be it tangible or intangible, cannot be given back to the land in the same measure. There has been an inequality to our sustenance and an appropriation of what is not necessarily ours. However, the reciprocity portion of this concept speaks to the idea that humans must give back, though this may not be an "equal" return. Reciprocity, in Indigenous terms, does not necessarily mean an equal exchange. For instance, the offering of tobacco in Indigenous ceremony is not meant to be payment of equal value for what is being accepted, but is a symbolic, spiritual, and practical action representing the completion of a cycle, where

the tobacco is used as a means of connecting with the Creator. It is an acknowledgment of the gifts that are given to humans from the Creator, and it is a way of returning what was given to the earth in order to connect with the Creator (Struthers & Hodge, 2004, p. 213-220). In this way, something is returned or offered to acknowledge what is being taken, and it is an appropriation precisely because of the inequality of the exchange: all that humans gain from the earth cannot be commensurate with anything they offer back. While there are other types of offerings made in Indigenous ceremony, and practices that may not be symbolic and may include exchanges that approximate similar values, reciprocity is not contingent upon equality in this way.

This form of reciprocity differs from western conceptualizations of research and work with Indigenous people. In Tri-Council policy and OCAP® principles, for example, the emphasis is on creating a system where the Indigenous/First Nations community will gain or benefit from knowledge and/or own, maintain, or have access to the resulting knowledge. Similarly, in community service-learning, there is the hope that students will give back to the community organizations they are working with (reciprocity), and that the definition of what is valuable or equitable should reside with those who are offering the experience: the community organization and its members (Blosser, 2012; Canadian Alliance for Community Service Learning, 2015; Himley, 2004; Rundstrom & Deur, 1999; Wendler, 2012). Current models of CSL show that students' interactions and projects should be of value to the community organizations with which they interact (Himley, 2004; Tinkler et al., 2014). Because of this, Dostilio et al.'s (2012) concept review of reciprocity in service-learning demonstrates that there still exists a need for an exchange of tangibles for one to say reciprocity has occurred. In contrast, if we examine Willie Ermine's (2007) work on ethical space and Erich Steinman's (2011) collaborations with tribal nations, we begin to see another conceptualization of reciprocity that is predicated on relationships, respect, and humility, but is not reliant upon an exchange of tangibles or "equal" benefit.

Ermine (2007), building on the work of Roger Poole, sets the stage for understanding different ways of knowing by calling the space between two differing cultural views "Ethical Space" (p. 194). Ermine describes how respect and acceptance of different worldviews can open a new space for engagement between differing cultural groups. Within this space, respect is given to the others' understandings, beliefs, and views, even if one does not understand how such beliefs or views arise or are held; respect and value of other worldviews is apparent. It is within this ethical space that reciprocity occurs. Unlike mainstream conceptualizations, Ermine's ethical space places reciprocity as acceptance of views rather than an exchange of ideas, services, or things.

Erich Steinman's (2011) analysis of service-learning describes two tribal nations who did not require or request what would be considered a "reciprocal" relationship within the context of community service-learning. The two tribal nations invited service-learning students into their community, asked that students spend time with and build relationships with tribe members, and did not require students to perform a service. However, the process of just "being" with community members and learning how to listen was shown to be a difficult

and discomfiting task for students (Steinman, 2011, p. 6). In Steinman's interpretation, the intentions behind the tribal nations' resolve to have "an absence of service" were as follows:

> [This dynamic] provides a powerful corrective to the elevated do-gooder—inferior recipient dynamic, as it suggests a set of counter questions directed at the dominant settler society: Why aren't you honoring your treaty? Why are your people so uninformed about our rights? Do you individually understand our status and rights, and if not, why is that? We are a sovereign nation – what is your relationship to us? (Steinman, 2011, p. 9)

Steinman (2011) acknowledges that the tribal nations never state the reasoning behind their decisions (p. 9, 11) and that his own observations and conclusions are based upon the relationships he has cultivated.

But Steinman fails to observe that listening, observing, and learning without instruction or intervention is an Indigenous pedagogy (Battiste, 2002, p.15). What Steinman and academia deem an absence of service may in fact be the tribal nations' way of imparting knowledge, based upon Indigenous pedagogies, using an Indigenous methodology of having the students begin to develop relationships with the people, the place, and the culture of that community. Within Indigenous pedagogy, transferring knowledge is often dependent upon service, and service is understood as a form of reciprocity. For example, you may spend time with your grandmother peeling potatoes while she prepares the rest of the evening meal. During that time, she might tell you stories. In that setting, the stories your grandmother is telling you constitute knowledge being transferred. Your spending time with her and peeling the potatoes is a service and form of reciprocity.

Even the tribal nations' choice not to tell Steinman specifically why they made certain decisions might have been part of Indigenous pedagogy. Steinman's ongoing relationship with the tribal nations—his understandings based on what he saw, what he learned historically, even what he experienced in earlier encounters—serves as knowledge gained through Indigenous methodologies. Within Indigenous pedagogy, one is allowed the time to learn at their own pace, and knowledge is not forced or imparted solely for the sake of learning, as it often is in classroom settings, but is instead tied to intent, need, use, time, place, daily observation, and ceremony. Indigenous knowledge, conveyed traditionally through oral history, practice, animation, and modelling, allows for a person's daily observations and practices to become integral to their learning process (Battiste, 2002, p. 2, 14). Learning becomes something that happens continually and daily, rather than something that unfolds in an institution. So why did the practice of observing and being present prove difficult for students? Why did the removal of service from the equation make students uncomfortable? To me, Steinman is describing transformative dissonance, a process through which students are confronted with cultural differences and differing worldviews but find this difficult because they do not have a task or title to retreat behind while they try to understand or negotiate differences.

Transformative Learning and Dissonance

Within community service-learning scholarship, the experience of discomfort is viewed as a time for students to experience transformative learning:

> The process by which we transform problematic frames of reference (mindsets, habits of mind, meaning perspectives)—sets of assumption and expectation—to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, reflective and emotionally able to change. Such frames are better because they are more likely to generate beliefs and opinions that will prove more true or justified to guide action. (Mezirow, 2009, p. 92)

This form of learning is often augmented by reflective practices such as journaling, online discussion forums, group classroom discussions, and discussions with professors or advisors (Mitchell et al., 2015, p. 53). But even when these reflective practices are carried out in productive ways, there is the possibility that, as transformative theory acknowledges, if there is too much dissonance, the learner will simply shut down. Hollyce Giles (2014) writes of her own experiences with transformative learning: "as I experienced in my teaching, these ways of knowing are unpredictable and come with the risk of potentially disrupting rather than enhancing learning" (p. 65). As with Giles, my experience with community service-learning saw times when the dissonance appeared to interfere with rather than facilitate student learning. I wondered at what point student discomfort tips from being a place of learning to a place of avoidance, and whether the push is first to avoidance and then to learning, or if avoidance could completely obscure learning.

Kiely's (2005) foundational work on dissonance, particularly his categorization of high-intensity and low-level dissonance, can help distinguish the tipping point for students. In his longitudinal case study of service-learning in Nicaragua, Kiely (2005) categorizes low-level dissonance as the type of discomfort that is easily negotiated by the student—e.g., wearing sunscreen to avoid sunburns or taking pills to avoid malaria. High-intensity dissonance, "such as witnessing extreme forms of poverty, hunger, scarcity, and disease," he writes, is "much more ambiguous and complex" (p. 11-15). Kiely's work demonstrates that high-intensity dissonance is what is required for transformative learning; however, his study was an examination of students removed from their home locations and put in unfamiliar settings from which they could not escape. In contrast, in my initial experience with high-intensity dissonance, students seemed able to disassociate themselves from situations of discomfort perhaps in part because their service-learning experience took place in a relatively familiar context—the city in which they lived. Coryell et al.'s (2016) work with international service-learning highlights this problem as it delves into specific aspects of transformative learning that separate the idea of a commitment to social justice from changes in perspective. Based upon work by Eyler and Giles (1999) and Ogden (2007), Coryell et al. (2016) conclude that the kind of transformative service-learning that truly alters perception is rare because "students may resist challenging their own worldview and lifestyle" (p. 425). While these authors find transformative learning to be beneficial in service-learning, they are unable to explain how to ensure the translation

of dissonance or discomfort into transformative learning rather than avoidance. Significantly, however, each of them obliquely or directly refers to the incorporation of other worldviews as seminal to the process, as in Mezirow's (2009) explanation here:

> "Transformative criticism," as conceptualized [by O'Sullivan and Taylor (2004)], posits a critique of the dominant culture's 'formative appropriateness' and provides a vision of an alternative form of culture and concrete indications of how to abandon inappropriate elements and to create more appropriate new cultural forms. They suggest these elements should form a new type of integral education. (Mezirow, 2009, p. 98)

This excerpt speaks to how including other ways of knowing is central to the process of transformative learning.

Negotiating Dissonance

Community service-learning allows for experiential learning, but negotiating that experience in the face of distress or conflict appears to go beyond many students' abilities. For this reason, I began to look for methods to simulate such experiences and ensure students were given the tools to negotiate dissonance in a manner that would foster transformative learning rather than avoidance. While simulation is not the same as actual experience, I believed that incorporating aspects of storytelling and modelling, predicated on Indigenous pedagogy, would allow me to straddle both western and Indigenous teaching paradigms.

When we include Indigenous pedagogies that are based on the importance of developing relationships, students have a much greater chance of being exposed to different worldviews and of creating bonds that allow them to see "service" as vehicle for societal change, rather than as a personal achievement. Indigenous pedagogy fosters students' learning and growth by having them experience daily practices, rather than having them complete projects or service as stand-alone goals.

Today, many community service-learning educators try to emphasize the role of students as "learners" versus "saviors" and encourage students to allow their work to be driven by community members rather than by the students' own perceptions of what is a necessary intervention (Himley, 2004; Wendler, 2012). As Blosser (2012) has written, "[s]tudents become active learners, taking what they experience in the community and using it to push the classroom material and conversations in directions that faculty never imagined. Education becomes less about an individual's comprehension of facts and more about an individual as part of a community that works together to solve challenges" (p. 200). However, these practices are moot when students have trouble negotiating the new environments they find themselves in and fail to step outside of placing themselves as the creator of a project to "help," rather than positioning themselves as part of a community endeavor.

Harkening back to Steinman's (2011) article, where the tribal nations did not require a service component, we see that students had difficulties when they were placed in unfamiliar

situations and had no "role" to retreat behind. The act of simply observing and being a learner appears foreign within the community service-learning framework, where the notion of "service" as the provision of something tangible in response to community need has superseded learning as being in relationship. Inclusion of Indigenous pedagogy in these settings gives the student the ability to negotiate varied perceptions of reciprocity, alternate worldviews, and other knowledges. The instructor, too, has the opportunity of moving beyond the need for "tangible" service to the inclusion of intangible and experience-driven learning in manners not always fostered when using western Eurocentric framings of service-learning.

The Ethics Teaching Module
The ethics teaching module is a three-part module to be delivered over the course of two to three days. The module was designed to help students find a way to achieve transformative dissonance by negotiating difficult situations rather than retreating behind privilege, and to be inclusive of both western and Indigenous methods with an emphasis on Indigenous pedagogy. Each module prompts students to consider ethical issues and conduct. Ethics here is very broadly defined to include human behaviour research ethics, as well as ethical practices that might more often be viewed in terms of morals or just behaviour.

The first module allows students to think of the moral and ethical implications of their actions and was created by drawing upon Indigenous pedagogies based on learning from daily observation, acceptance of differing worldviews (perspectives), and respectful representations (i.e., what appears to be a positive intervention may not be the best solution when viewed from other perspectives). The second module brings together Indigenous and western teachings. The module fosters critical thinking, which is foundational to both types of knowledge, and demonstrates how western knowledge, without acceptance of other knowledges, can reify colonial, patriarchal, and imperialistic practices. In this module, the instructor has the opportunity to draw upon Indigenous and feminist theories to show students how to develop CSL projects that are more in line with community inclusion and community perspective. The third and final module again brings Indigenous and western practices together by asking students to be reflexive. The module creates space for everyone's voice to be heard and includes an inversion of power by asking the facilitator to demonstrate how they have learned from the students' contributions, actions, and growth. All three modules are informed by Louis' (2007) principles of relational accountability, respectful representation, rights and regulation, and reciprocal appropriation: students are asked to consider relationship building as central to their CSL practice; to acknowledge that their own views are not primary or central in collaborative, community-based work; to respect the rights of community members and organizations; and to approach the experience with humility and the recognition that they have been given much more than they can return. Listed below are more detailed explanations of the exercises included in each module.

Module 1 focuses on bringing students together and providing a platform for them to begin to think about commonalities between themselves and the community members they are about to meet, as well as differences that might exist because of societal structures. This

module consists of a series of 20 scenarios. Students break into small groups and discuss whether ethical dilemmas exist in each of the scenarios and how to negotiate the dilemmas. After a specified time, the groups come together to report back to each other and to have further dialogue surrounding each scenario. As students examine the scenarios from differing perspectives, they will begin to see how ethical issues can arise or recede based on perspective. Similarly, students will begin to reflect upon their own privileges as they recognize that their perceptions come from specific vantage points. Each of the scenarios is also designed to remind students that they should not be working on projects (or at their community organizations) in isolation. There are support systems in place for students, and the scenarios encourage students to seek out these supports. Finally, bringing students together in small groups to brainstorm each scenario reminds students of the benefits of collaboration and offers them opportunities to acknowledge other perspectives, think proactively about the consequence of their actions, and recognize how their own actions or beliefs might be viewed by others.

Module 2 focuses on academic rigor within community service-learning while fostering students' acceptance of other worldviews. This module provides examples of positive and negative service-learning practices to allow students to think critically about what and how they are being taught. This module focuses on two readings given to the students: Rachel Wendler's (2012) "Human subjects protection: A source for ethical service-learning practice" and Jan Hammill's (2001) "The culture of masculinity in an Australian Aboriginal community." Wendler's article helps reiterate the strengths of good ethical practice in service-learning and provides a solid foundation for students' work on critical thinking. As the theoretical foundation for the development of the ethics module, the article helps ground the students in what the module is trying to achieve. The Hammill (2001) article is included as an example of what appears as western Eurocentrism, bias, power imbalances, stereotyping, promotion of the savior mentality, poor research techniques, and lack of community voice (or the inclusion of community voice in a deceptive manner). In the article, Hammill reports on her intervention in an Australian Aboriginal community, presenting the men in the community as lazy, drunk, gambling wife beaters who are uninterested in fostering family relationships. Along with women in the community, Hammill organizes two events meant to bring the men back into the community fold; however, the intervention depends on non-Aboriginal men from a wealthy car manufacturing company coming to the community to help the children build billy-carts for a billy-cart race. Hammill's imposition of western-Eurocentric values, her inclusion of non-Aboriginal men as "father figures" for the Aboriginal children, and her failure to understand why the men of the community may have chosen to avoid the event speaks to an inability to see beyond one's own perceptions.

Using the two readings, students have an opportunity to question the veracity of knowledge being presented and to offer differing understandings of the results of the research examples. This module highlights power imbalances, asking students to think about how we might give credence to something we might otherwise be skeptical of simply because of the "authority" attached to the author and/or the instructor who has assigned the reading. It also serves as a reminder of how differing worldviews can be interpreted, how stereotypes can be perpetuated,

and how positive intentions can prove to be negative if one is not being critically mindful about what they are reading and experiencing.

Module 3 focuses on students being able to have an open dialogue expressing how they have incorporated what they have learned into their projects or practices. It includes an interactive portion for the facilitator to demonstrate their own practices of observation and relationship building. During this piece, students gather in a circle and the facilitator begins by addressing each student individually. The facilitator identifies how she/he has seen growth in the students during the course or identifies a specific action that she/he finds commendable. Giving the facilitator an opportunity to praise each student creates a positive setting and allows each student to enter into the final activity knowing that their actions have been recognized. Once the facilitator has concluded their comments, each student is given an opportunity to reflect on their time in the course. Once all students have commented, the facilitator thanks the students, asks for any last comments, and the activity is concluded.

Initially, this module was conceived as a means for students to culminate their experience through dialogue. Shortly after I incorporated the interactive portion, I realized that, as a facilitator who consistently reminded students about other worldviews, questioned western Eurocentric practices, and reiterated aspects of privilege, I came to be seen as someone who always brings up "negative" topics. Through the inclusion of the interactive portion, I hoped to create an activity that encourages the facilitator to be mindful and present, and also affords them the opportunity to practice Indigenous pedagogies, particularly those predicated on relationship building. This final piece also allows for the facilitator to practice humility, acknowledge limitations, and express gratitude for the opportunity to learn from students.

Decolonization and Future Directions

The ethics module cannot replace lived experiences, and while the module and its delivery are predicated on Indigenous pedagogies and best practices in community service-learning, it was still created to meet specific academic objectives that are embedded in western frameworks. Also, while I consider this module and its implementation to be an entry point for introducing decolonization, I also acknowledge that without the specific aim of ensuring Indigenous sovereignty, the value of calling this a decolonizing method can be questioned. Despite this, I stand by this module as a means to enter into decolonizing practices. From my perspective (specifically as a non-Indigenous person), our most difficult challenge is in recognizing when we are reinforcing and participating in ongoing colonizing practices. It is in those moments when I believe students, and others like myself, will feel discomfort: we will know something is wrong, and if we can sit with that wrongness—sit with the recognition of our complicity in social inequality, recognize our unhappiness, shame, fear, anger, guilt, and/or privilege, and refuse to retreat from those feelings—then we will move beyond the dissonance and into transformation. As further iterations of the originating class occur, I anticipate the ethics module will continue to be modified and strengthened. My hope is that future CSL practitioners will build upon my work and continue to use Indigenous pedagogies as a way to expand and grow community service-learning.

About the Author

Swapna Padmanabha, a University of Saskatchewan Indigenous Studies PhD student, is examining Indigenous gendered activism in India and Canada. Her other research interests include CSL, Ethics, Race, and Indigenous Pedagogy. She has received several honours, including a 2015 Internship at IIT Gandhinagar, India, and the 2016-2017 Dean's Special University Graduate Scholarship. Email: swapna.padmanabha@usask.ca

References

American Indigenous Research Association. (2017). Retrieved from http://americanindigenousresearchassociation.org/

Battiste, M. (2002). Indigenous knowledge and pedagogy in First Nations education: A literature review with recommendations. Apawumek Institute, Department of Indian Affairs Canada. Ottawa: Department of Indian Affairs Canada.

Blosser, J. (2012). Beyond moral development: Re-theorizing ethical practices in service learning. *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory*, *12*(2), 196-214.

Braun, K. L., Brown, C. V., Ka'opua, L. S., Kim, B. J., & Noreen Mokuau. (2013). Research on Indigenous Elders: From positivistic to decolonizing Methodologies. *The Gerontologist*, *54*(1), 117-126.

Canadian Alliance for Community Service Learning. (2015, January). What is community service-learning? Retrieved from http://www.communityservicelearning.ca/en/welcome_what_is.htm

Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (2014). *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*.

Coryell, J. E., Wubbena, Z. C., Stewart, T., Valverde-Poenie, T. C., & Spencer, B. (2016). International service-learning: Study abroad and global citizenship development in a post-disaster locale. In D. M. Velliaris, & D. Coleman-George (Eds.), *Handbook of research on study abroad programs and outbound mobility* (pp. 421-446). Hershey, PA: Information Science.

Deloria, V. J., & Wildcat, D. (2001). Power and place: Indian education in America. Goldon, CO: Fulcrum Resources.

Dostilio, L. D., Brackmann, S. M., Edwards, K. E., Harrison, B., Kliewer, B. W., & Clayton, P. H. (2012). Reciprocity: Saying what we mean and meaning what we say. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *19*(1), 17-32.

Doxtater, M. (2004). Indigenous knowledge in the decolonial era. *American Indian Quarterly*, *28*(3-4), 618-633.

Ermine, W. (2007). The ethical space of engagement. *Indigenous Law Journal*, *6*(1), 193-203.

Evans, M., Hole, R., Berg, L. D., Hutchinson, P., & Sookraj, D. (2009). Common insights, differing methodologies: Towards a fusion of Indigenous methodologies, participatory action research, and white studies in an urban Aboriginal research agenda. *Aboriginal Policy Research Consortium International* (APRCi), *174*, 1-26.

Giles, H. (2014). Risky epistemology: Connecting with others and dissonance in community- based research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*, 20(2), 65-78.

Hammill, J. (2001). The culture of masculinity in an Australian Aboriginal community. *Development (The Society for International Development), 44*(3), 21-24.

Himley, M. (2004). Facing (up to) "The Stranger" in community service learning. *College Composition and Communication*, *55*(3), 416-438.

Kiely, R. (2005). A transformative learning model for service-learning: A longitudinal case study. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 12,* 5-22.

Louis, R. P. (2007). Can you hear us now? Voices from the margin: Using Indigenous methodologies in geographic research. *Aboriginal Policy Research Consortium International* (APRCi), *175*, 129-139.

Mezirow, J. (2009). An overview on transformative learning. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists...in their own words* (pp. 90-105). New York, NY: Routledge.

Mitchell, T. D., Richard, F. D., Battistoni, R. M., Rost-Banik, C., Netz, R., & Zakoske, C. (2015). Reflective practice that persists: Connections between reflection in service-learning programs and in current life. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 21*(2), 49-63.

O'Sullivan, E. V., & Taylor, M. M. (Eds.). (2004). Learning towards an ecological consciousness. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Pulitano, E. (2003). Toward a Native American critical theory. Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Ross, L. (2015). The politics of TEK in oil and gas: Knowledge (re)constructions and assimilations. Masters Thesis. Toronto, Ontario: York University.

Rundstrom, R., & Deur, D. (1999). Reciprocal appropriation: Towards an ethics of cross-cultural research. In J. D. Proctor, & D. M. Smith (Eds.), *Geography and ethics: Journeys in a moral terrain* (pp. 237-251). New York, NY: Routledge.

Simpson, A., & Smith, A. (Eds.). (2014). *Theorizing Native Studies*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Steinman, E. (2011). "Making space": Lessons from collaborations with Tribal Nations. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, *18*(1), 5-18.

Struthers, R., & Hodge, F. S. (2004). Sacred tobacco use in Ojibwe communities. *Journal of Holistic Nursing, 22*(3), 209-225.

Tinkler, A., Tinkler, B., Hausman, E., & Strouse, G. T. (2014). Key elements of effective service-learning partnerships from the perspective of community partners. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning & Civic Engagement*, *5*(2), 137-152.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2012). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Zed Books.

Vanderbilt University. (2017). Best practices in community engaged teaching.

Wendler, R. (2012). Human subjects protection: A source for ethical service-learning practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 18*(2), 29-39.

APPENDIX A – Excerpts from the ethics teaching module
Module 1
The students are asked to determine the following for each of the scenarios:
- a) Does an ethical dilemma exist here?
- b) If it does not, why not?
- c) If one does, what is the dilemma?
    - a. What are some possible negative consequences of such a situation?
    - b. How can negative consequences be mitigated?
    - c. Are there specific actions that should be taken?

*Note: not all scenarios are considered "ethical" dilemmas according to Research Ethics Boards (REBs), but all will include situations that question morality/perspectives/worldviews.

Sample Scenario 1:
You have been working at an organization that provides an open space for youth to come and engage in art projects. The organization is constantly looking for ways to raise funds, particularly since their art supplies are sorely lacking. You decide to hold a team building art event next week. You ask one of the staff members if you can do a lunchtime project that creates faux stained glass. You also mention that you want to call it a brown bag art event and so you will ask everyone to bring their lunch. The staff member likes your project but reminds you that they do not have money for extra materials. The project involves sprinkling crayon shavings over leaves on waxed paper. Then a second sheet of wax paper is placed over the shavings and leaves and pressed together. Finally, a cloth overlay is spread over the waxed paper sheets and you iron the cloth, thereby melting the wax. The resulting material is then placed on a black construction paper cut-out and your project is done. You think 12 youth will attend and feel you have enough art supplies, but you worry about time, as there is only one iron at the center. You decide to bring your own iron from home as well as some old crayons and wax paper that are lying around. You are donating your crayons and waxed paper.

Answers/Discussion: This scenario focuses on details of the art project to draw students into the experience of the activity. Focusing on the activity, as in real life, often makes us forget about whether there is value in the activity and if the potential negative outcomes of the activity outweigh the potential positives. Donating items to an organization can also be seen as a means of displaying power/privilege. Recognizing inequality within the community membership is important.

What if someone cannot afford to bring lunch or forgot to bring lunch?	Have you thought of what will happen to the CBO if someone is injured? How will you feel?

Donating items approved by the organization is okay. Be cognizant of your own privilege in being able to donate items. If others learn you have donated items, think about whether you have used this as a means to demonstrate you are "different" from members using the organization's services.	Do you need more than one person to help facilitate a group of 12?
Did you ask the appropriate organization member for approval of your project?	What are possible outcomes if a child goes home and tries to do this activity without supervision?

Module 2

Module 2 asks students to read two articles. The first article by Rachel Wendler (2012), "Human subjects protection: A source for ethical service-learning practice," looks at ethical concerns involved with service-learning students and focusses on decolonial, feminist and participatory methods. The second article by Jan Hammill (2001), "The culture of masculinity in an Australian Aboriginal community," can be problematized from a number of perspectives.

The inclusion of the Hammill article provides an accepted research article that allows students to think critically about a subject. Many students, upon seeing an assigned reading in a syllabus, automatically assume the reading is sanctioned by the professor. Asking students to be critical thinkers also affords an opportunity to have them question grand narratives and teachings that have historically positioned western understandings as superior. Similarly, the article provides openings for discussions of power and privilege and highlights how one can align themselves as an ally without the community identifying them as such, and without their work functioning to serve the needs of the entire community.

This article also demonstrates why some interventions might not be as welcomed or successful as others and highlights how researchers can further personal agendas in manners that appear to be driven by community members. This component allows students to question the authority of academia/institutions, and it creates space for discussion of western solutions being imposed on non-western societies in manners that outwardly suggest there is a need for communities to conform to the aspirations and societal constructs of western neoliberalism, globalization, and capitalism.

Module 3

The final component is the coming together of students and facilitators for a discussion of their time in the community. Students sit in a circle and each student is given an opportunity to discuss anything related to ethics, projects, or classroom theory and learning. Next, the facilitator expresses a positive sentiment(s) to each student. These words can reflect something positive about the student's being, an action the student has taken, their growth over the term, or how the student has helped the facilitator to grow. This ensures the facilitator has been

present and mindful of how students negotiated their time in the community and creates a situation where power dynamics can be inverted through the facilitator's expression of learning from the students. Finally, each student is asked to reflect on their time in the community. Topic flexibility is required as students are often emotionally exhausted at this juncture and offering a safe environment for positive or negative discussions is necessary.