

An Indigenous Knowledges Perspective on Valid Meaning Making: A Commentary on Research with the EDI and Aboriginal Communities

Michele A. Sam, Ktunaxa

Accepted: 15 January 2010 / Published online: 27 April 2011
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011

Abstract Offering an Indigenous perspective, this commentary discusses collaborative research, shared meaning making, and knowledge building specific to child development, and reflects on social, cultural, and historical aspects that influence these processes. Drawing upon experiences of developing a collaborative research approach with which to engage Aboriginal communities to appreciate, understand, and potentially use the Early Development Instrument (EDI; Janus and Offord in *Can J Behav Sci* 39:1–22, 2007), a teacher-administered rating scale on kindergarten children’s development, the commentary focuses on five key questions relevant to research processes undertaken with Indigenous Peoples, and the importance of social, ethical, and cultural aspects of validity: How do Indigenous epistemologies and knowledges inform and influence research processes that utilize the EDI as a measurement tool? How can the EDI be used as a measurement tool within a research process that fosters the thriving of children and their families in Aboriginal communities while promoting Indigenous Peoples’ self-determination? In what ways do local, Indigenous cultural and ethical considerations inform aspects of validation research pertaining to the EDI? How can (Western mainstream) universities build research capacity that is informed by Indigenous knowledges and ways of being, doing, and knowing? What are the potential consequences of using normative research tools—such as the EDI—as a method to build knowledge on children’s development with Indigenous Peoples and Aboriginal communities? This commentary suggests that from an Indigenous perspective, research on child development is valid and meaningful knowledge if it is clearly linked to the children’s and families’ wellbeing according to local cultural norms and values.

Keywords Indigenous meaning making · Ethical and consequential aspects of validity · Aboriginal knowledges and research methods · Early Development Instrument

M. A. Sam, Ktunaxa (✉)
Human Early Learning Partnership, University of British Columbia, 4th Floor, Library Processing Centre, 2206 East Mall, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z3, Canada
e-mail: michele.sam@ubc.ca

This commentary, offered from an Indigenous perspective (cf. Turner 2006), discusses five core questions with regard to the validity of research on child development that utilizes the Early Development Instrument (EDI; Janus and Offord 2007) with Aboriginal peoples.¹

1. How do Indigenous epistemologies and knowledges inform and influence research processes that utilize the EDI as a measurement tool?
2. How can the EDI be used as a measurement tool within a research process that fosters the thriving of children and their families in Aboriginal communities while promoting Indigenous Peoples' self-determination?
3. In what ways do local, Indigenous cultural and ethical considerations inform aspects of validation research aspects pertaining to the EDI?
4. How can (Western mainstream) universities build research capacity that is informed by Indigenous knowledges and ways of being, doing, and knowing?
5. What are the potential consequences of using normative research tools—such as the EDI—as a method to build knowledge on children's development with Indigenous Peoples and Aboriginal communities?

These questions have evolved from reflections upon and experiences of developing and planning collaborative research with and in Aboriginal communities in effort to support the possible implementation of the EDI, a teacher-administered rating scale on kindergarten children's development (Janus and Offord 2007). By raising these questions for discussion, this commentary suggests that shared meaning making and knowledge building about child development should be responsive to Indigenous Peoples' priorities, and requires considerable time and resources that are culturally principled in Indigenous thought and processes of engagement.

The commentary delineates how a comprehensive program of validation research can be informed and expanded by local, contextualized Indigenous perspectives and knowledges, and would thus become more responsive and useful to Indigenous Peoples' within their respective communities. More generally, the paper raises important questions of how community-based research on child development can benefit from Indigenous knowledge creation and transformation that has been passed on, since time immemorial.

The questions and arguments proposed in this commentary speak directly to validity issues that Messick (1998) refers to as the ethical and consequential aspects of his unitary view on validity² (see, in this issue, Guhn et al. in press). The five interdependent questions posed above are addressed in turn. Reflections and insights for each question stem from experiences of research with the EDI with(in) Aboriginal communities.

1. How do Indigenous epistemologies and knowledges inform and influence research processes that utilize the EDI as a measurement tool?

Within Indigenous societies, knowledges have traditionally been co-constructed according to local experiences, reflecting environmental, social, ethical, cultural, and relational characteristics. Accordingly, Indigenous knowledges have been validly interpreted and transformed into community action, if they built upon those local environmental, social,

¹ I use the terms "Indigenous Peoples and Aboriginal Communities" to reflect an orientation to original relationships embedded within local traditions, lands, and languages, and the recognition of Federal Indian and social policies that have restructured us as Aboriginal communities: urban and reserve. These terms are not interchangeable, and yet are reflective of the complexity of everyday experiences as I live them.

² Messick's use of the word 'unitary' does not mean 'homogenous' or 'standard', but 'integrative' and 'holistic', in contrast to 'fragmented' and 'disconnected'.

ethical, cultural, and relational considerations. In addition, Indigenous Peoples have processes that are rooted in a tradition of orality, and that function to support knowledge transformation (Fixico 2003). Stated differently, Indigenous Peoples' knowledges are informed by Indigenous Peoples' processes of witnessing and living within their local context and place, and within their relationship to others (including lands and peoples; cf. Kawagley and Barnhardt 1999). Indigenous knowledges are—and need to be—revitalized through active participation in knowledge transformation; for example, through purposeful sharing activities, such as storytelling. Knowledges and processes of knowledge sharing are validated through intergenerational relations, and through reciprocal processes inherent to Indigenous Peoples' social infrastructures (Corntassel 2003). (In the following, I will refer to such localized, contextualized Indigenous knowledges provided by Indigenous Peoples as primary sources of data.)

Local, contextualized Indigenous knowledges reflect transformative cosmologies; meaning that these knowledges reflect “a culture’s guiding story” and the “ways of relating and understanding themselves in natural community”, which serves as the foundation of people’s worldviews (Cajete 2008, p. 495). In order to meaningfully and validly engage within a research process and, ultimately, interpret research findings within specific community contexts, it is thus necessary to engage in dialogue with the local people *and* become familiar with the local transformative cosmology *and* recognize the impacts of colonialism upon that cosmology.

A positivist research paradigm, on the other hand, creates a culture of knowledge building that uses normative scientific methodologies and methods, and such a paradigm has been, to large extent, perpetrated upon Indigenous social infrastructures. Whether or not such positivist research paradigm has resulted in knowledge building that can be meaningfully and validly used for transformative purposes in Aboriginal communities is currently contested by many Indigenous scholars, who are privileged in having access to more than one system of knowledges (Alfred and Corntassel 2005; Cajete 2008; Ermine et al. 2004; Kovach 2009; LaRocque 2010). By juxtaposing Indigenous, localized, contextualized, relationship-based principles and processes of research with universal positivist research methods and paradigms, as discussed below, it will become evident that research projects, and measurement validation, cannot create locally meaningful, valid research results and knowledge unless they are being informed by and complemented with local Indigenous knowledges.

Indigenous knowledges contribute to a research validation process that considers the social and ethical implications and consequences that ensue from utilizing a measurement tool such as the EDI in Aboriginal communities. The EDI is implemented in British Columbia as a population-level measure, embedded within research that explicitly aims to “create knowledge that helps children and their families thrive” (see the Human Early Learning Partnership website at www.earlylearning.ubc.ca). This research approach raises epistemological questions (Crotty 1998) and teleological issues (Humphries 2008).

The subsequent questions and suggestions aim to engage researchers and community members in a dialogue that enhances research processes that not only create knowledges necessary to support children and their families thrive according to their cultural ways of being and their cosmologies (i.e., worldviews), but that also enable the revitalization of those complex knowledges essential to the identity of Indigenous Peoples. These questions and suggestions illustrate the possibilities for a tool such as the EDI to be embedded within a social justice—decolonizing research—agenda, which explicitly acknowledges historical, political, social, ethical, and cultural aspects, which continue to influence whether children and families are thriving within their respective social infrastructures (Emberley

2007; Grande 2007; Smith 1999). Within a research process that pursues a decolonizing and thus a social justice agenda, those whose culture, language and identity have been impacted—and who, as a result, may thus be vulnerable—are more likely to participate in research that can influence culturally congruent outcomes for future generations.

2. How can the EDI be used as a measurement tool within a research process that fosters the thriving of children and their families in Aboriginal communities while promoting Indigenous Peoples' self-determination?

Research on child development and education that utilizes a population health approach—as is done in projects using the EDI—is, by its very nature, a political and ethical affair, as such research may affect policies and practices in, for example, education or community service organizations (Humphries 2008). Messick (1998) argues that a unitary view on measurement validity requires that the social-political and ethical consequences that ensue from using a measurement tool must be addressed within a comprehensive validation research program. Accordingly, social, political, and ethical considerations pertaining to Indigenous Peoples need to be considered when discussing measurement validity questions for a tool such as the EDI that is used in Aboriginal communities.

Continuing over the past centuries, Indigenous Peoples have been, repeatedly, removed from their lands, severing their connections to their societies, their language, their principles and values, and their local ceremonies and traditions (Blackstock 2000). To this day, this sort of dissociation and disconnection is frequently perpetuated through scientific research. Researchers and policy makers commonly refer to and infer an 'Indian problem' in their discourse (Shewell 2004).

If language within research reiterates assaults on Indigenous Peoples' self-determination by creating and/or maintaining hierarchies, according to which "Aboriginal children fare worse than non-Aboriginal children", and if language and research (seek to) validate that there is an 'Indian problem', new generations of Indigenous People will grow up experiencing a society with an entrenched sense of their inferiority. If our language and our research, on the other hand, foster dialogue and relationship building, and engage local communities in a process that enhances self-determination, we can contribute to transformative knowledge building that supports our children and their families to thrive (cf. Womack 1999).

This has important implications and raises critical questions for our dialogue about EDI-related research with Indigenous Peoples and in Aboriginal communities: For example, should the EDI be used as a normative measurement tool that 'validates' that 'Aboriginal children' are 'vulnerable', which is the label that is assigned to relatively low EDI scores? Or should the EDI be perceived and be used as a measurement tool that provides (secondary source) research data to be interpreted within light of local, contextualized primary source data, by those whose data it is; that is, in light of culturally and socially relevant Indigenous knowledge and lived experiences? Is it adequate to use EDI data to compare (groups of) children across communities, and to thus transport a normative concept of 'vulnerability' into all communities, or were it more adequate if EDI data were interpreted and transformed into locally valid meaning according to complementary contextual knowledge and information?

Apart from raising questions about the interpretation of EDI scores (e.g., assigning the label 'vulnerable' to low scores), this discussion also raises questions about the process of the research itself. When EDI scores are interpreted by people within local communities, generally a process of dialogue and engagement needs to unfold. Local people need to

bring their own knowledges and questions into the discussion in order to make meaning of EDI scores, and in order to transform EDI data into knowledge that can help children and their families thrive.

Making meaning of test scores is essential to Messick's view of measurement validity. Engaging in local dialogue may have powerful side effects. Engagement fosters relationships, enhances curiosity, interest, and awareness, and contributes to capacity building for all the parties that are involved. Researchers that engage in dialogue with Indigenous Peoples and with local Aboriginal communities are confronted with the local social and cultural realities of community life, and community members that engage in dialogue with researchers are exposed to research knowledge and opportunities to reaffirm Indigenous Inquiry (Kovach 2009).

A process of engagement with Indigenous Peoples and Aboriginal communities takes time, but it may contribute to greater self-determination in their social infrastructures: As local peoples become more actively involved in the opportunity and the responsibility to interpret and act upon research information, they also become more grounded within their local knowledges and cosmologies and their local values and visions for the future. In other words, Indigenous Peoples can thus rebuild their own responsibility—ability to respond—in socially and culturally acceptable ways. In such process of enhancing self-determination, universities would simultaneously benefit as they would become more relevant for, as well as responsive to, Indigenous students and their communities.

Research initiatives along these lines of thinking, which are conducted in collaboration between the Human Early Learning Partnership at the University of British Columbia and Indigenous Peoples, are briefly presented here. These interrelated initiatives provide an example of how university-based research can support Indigenous Peoples' self-determination, while researchers enhance their own research capacity within communities, informed by Indigenous Peoples.³

On the EDI, it is routinely reported which language(s) a child has learned at home and which language(s) a child speaks at home. It is also reported on the EDI, whether a child is 'Aboriginal'. However, prior to 2008, there had been no effort to establish a connection between children's Aboriginal status and their heritage language, and it was most frequently reported that "Aboriginal children speak English". For the past few years, we recorded the names of all Indigenous languages known to exist across Canada and the Northwest of the United States of America. We set out to produce statistics showing how often teachers recognized, on the EDI, to which Indigenous languages Aboriginal children have a relationship. These statistics were then represented on geographical maps. In addition, these maps were reconstructed to privilege geographical boundaries of Indigenous language groups according to traditional territories.

In the years following the production of these Indigenous language territory maps, the reporting of Indigenous languages by teachers on the EDI increased. The numbers rose from 3.4% in 2008/09 to 12.8% in 2009/10. This research inquiry has thus created an awareness of the complex issues of identity inherited by up and coming generations of Indigenous Peoples in their early years. By literally putting Indigenous languages back on the map, EDI research provides information that can potentially support Indigenous Peoples' relationships to their knowledges through language.

³ Community-based participatory research, as an approach, has been implemented across the United States with American Indian and Alaskan Indian populations, through university-based institutions, with great variability and apparent success and sustainability (Minkler and Wallerstein 2008).

The EDI can thus support the rebuilding of some level of cultural continuity, as Indigenous languages reflect cultural ways of knowing, doing and being. Currently, the children of our Indigenous nations, for the most part, are not being recognized as belonging to Indigenous language groups. Rather, they are thought of as Aboriginal peoples who speak English; denying their inherent rights to their heritage, knowledges, and languages. The increase in the reported numbers over 1 year illustrates that there is potential to shift this current and past reality, through building awareness of the importance of language and heritage to Indigenous Peoples' identity. In light of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, this is a notable stride forward, and a positive contribution of EDI-related research to self-determination.

3. In what ways do local, Indigenous cultural and ethical considerations inform aspects of validation research aspects pertaining to the EDI?

In his unitary view on test validity, Messick (1998) states that it is necessary to consider social consequences that ensue from test use, and need to be addressed and integrated into a comprehensive validity argument. Most importantly, it needs to be asked whether social consequences associated with a test's use are in line with the purpose of the test. A main purpose of the EDI is to create knowledge that helps children and their families thrive. To create transformative (research) knowledge requires a conscious approach to understanding that for some peoples and societies, 'thriving' is defined within, and reflective of, specific Indigenous cosmologies. In some cases, the definition of thriving may be at odds with normative (Western) cosmologies, and in others it may be in line with or complementary to normative (Western) cosmologies. This is not just a matter of semantics or of philosophical debate, but speaks to concrete social consequences of the sort that Messick was considering.

If, for example, children's thriving in kindergarten is, at least in part, defined by their (beginning) ability to read and write, and children who are not able to do so are subjected to specific educational interventions, then a certain definition of what it means to be thriving can have a pervasive influence on young children's daily lives through all of the systems and relationships that surround and embrace that child. If, on the other hand, children's thriving were defined, at least in part, by their opportunity to explore and connect to their natural environment in company of adult community members, young peoples' lives would become structured differently.

The question of what defines 'thriving' is not just a definitional question. It also becomes a question of communication: How are research findings communicated and interpreted? How are secondary sources of data, such as EDI data, related to primary sources of data, such as local Indigenous knowledges and cosmologies? In Indigenous societies, orality is a method of sharing information. Stories, as one example, offer information, connected to local places, customs, events and people. Orality actively builds participation in relationships to knowledge and actively builds relationships between people, whereas written dissemination of research knowledge is a one-way affair, and is thus, by definition, not relationship-building, but rather prescriptive. An oral form of knowledge dissemination allows new information to be shared through, for example, the interpretative, relationship-building means of storytelling *and* engaged critical dialogue. A form of knowledge dissemination that is grounded in a tradition of orality has thus a greater chance to become transformative, whereas written knowledge translation may be perceived as impersonal and prescriptive, without relationships to ensure accountability.

Incorporating the rich traditions of orality into collaborative research processes, data interpretation, and knowledge dissemination can thus support university-based researchers

to build capacity that allows them to develop accountable relationships within the cultural and local contexts of Indigenous Peoples; and in doing so, it will enable the necessary approaches to building knowledges that help children and families thrive. Viewed from this perspective, the EDI, rather than being a research tool that constructs normative ‘knowledge’, can thus be a research tool that contributes informative secondary source data to localized, contextualized research. Viewed from this perspective, the valid interpretation of EDI data thus relies upon the meaningful integration into local knowledges and cosmological approaches, via processes based upon Indigenous oral tradition: dialogue, engagement, and personal relationships.

4. How can (Western mainstream) universities build research capacity that is informed by Indigenous knowledges and ways of being, doing, and knowing?

In current policy and research discourse, it is often conveyed that research universities and policy decision making entities (e.g., local government) need to help communities to build their research capacity—with regard to, for example, planning, prioritizing, developing and administering child and family services, health services and interventions, and education and training. Not only does this privilege Western mainstream ways of knowing, but it also reflects a certain attitude and value about Indigenous Peoples’ knowledge.

It needs to be realized that researchers in research universities and policy decision making entities need Indigenous Peoples and Aboriginal communities in order to build their own capacity to address issues that are of societal relevance in socially, culturally, and contextually appropriate and meaningful ways.

This acknowledgement should not merely remain politically correct rhetoric, but should become a conscious aspect of conducting collaborative, community-based research. In disciplines that focus on community organization, social justice, environmental activism, or democratic education, this notion is widely endorsed and enacted. In fields, such as population health or psychology, which have, traditionally, been more strongly influenced by a positivist epistemology—and which are the home disciplines out of which the EDI has developed—such an approach is relatively uncommon. This presents a challenge, as it is always difficult to change established methodologies and epistemologies in any discipline.

In fact, at times, researchers may be unaware of epistemologies or research methodologies that are foreign to their field. So, it may be that—even in the best of intentions—traditional epistemologies and research methodologies are employed in cases in which other epistemologies and methodologies would be potentially more valid and more effective for the research process. The moment this situation is being acknowledged, it opens up opportunities for what I call ‘interdisciplinary inquiry’ and what Kovach (2009) calls “Indigenous inquiry”—that supports the creation of something new. It may be that complementing Indigenous cosmologies and approaches to knowledge creation with research methodologies and epistemologies from population health and psychology leads to innovation in research and professional practices. The resulting innovative research practices may turn out to be very effective in applying research knowledge—as, for example, the data that is obtained via the EDI—in a manner that allows communities to transform their local resources and knowledges in culturally congruent ways. In other words, an innovative, interdisciplinary integration of primary source data and secondary source data may be very powerful in supporting the thriving of children and families according to Indigenous Peoples’ values and vision.

5. What are the potential consequences of using normative research tools—such as the EDI—as a method to build knowledge on children’s development with Indigenous Peoples and Aboriginal communities?

Since the time of first contact between Indigenous Peoples and the diverse settler populations coming to North America, colonization, disowning, subjugation, and disempowerment have been continuous and pervasive aspects of life lived as Indigenous Peoples. And just as the early years of development are a critical period for the development of a person, so are the experiences of previous generations critical for the development of the current generation and generations yet to come. In other words, the well-being of our ancestors is fundamental to the potential for the thriving of our children and families today and in the future. As Indigenous scholars, such as Deloria (1992, 1997, 2006) describe holism and transcendental Indigenous knowledges, and non-Indigenous scholars, such as Bronfenbrenner (1979) and Elder (1994), describe a holistic, ecological approach to studying child development, it becomes clear that there is a need to take into account the impacts of a historical and intergenerational dimension as much as it needs to take into account the life-span of the developing person.

For conducting research and co-constructing meaning with Indigenous Peoples about the early years of their people, a historical awareness, that takes into account the political, social, and ethical factors that continue to influence Indigenous Peoples lives, is thus an inevitable necessity. From a positivist epistemology, past and current political and social context factors are commonly stripped away from research designs, in order to conserve so-called objectivity. In fact, interpreting research data from a historical, political, and ethical perspective is frequently perceived as bias.

Constructivist, bio-ecological views on human development, however, state the opposite: In being (allegedly) value-free, positivist approaches are commonly saturated with cultural bias. In other words, if developmentally relevant political and social context factors are not explicated and not taken into account when studying and interpreting human development, the omission of this reality leads to biased results (cf. Harding 1994). For conducting valid research in Indigenous communities on the early years, historical, political, and social realities must therefore be taken into account, especially because colonization continues to have such destructive effects on Indigenous Peoples’ well-being.

For research that is using the EDI, or other measurement tools at a population level, this has important implications. It implies that research universities have to develop capacity and awareness for how to integrate historical and political realities into their research designs. Otherwise, their research may easily lead to biased and thus invalid research findings, which may (unintentionally) cause harm.

In light of these considerations, it becomes evident that the EDI can be used in two ways. The EDI can be used as a tool that continues a process of colonization—by using the same language and hierarchies as past research and public discourse have used in regard to the “Indian problem” and by ‘validating’ findings that minority populations are not thriving or are vulnerable. Alternatively, the EDI can be used even more powerfully as a tool that begins to de-colonize research, by contributing to a research culture of self-determination and empowerment, through supporting local Indigenous inquiries.

Accordingly, Indigenous knowledges can contribute invaluable to a program of validation research: First, if Indigenous People’s cultural protocols are to be at the core of collaborative community-based research in Aboriginal communities, it evidently implies that Indigenous People are involved in the development of the research questions, designs, data interpretation, and knowledge transformation, as they are the experts and respected

authorities on the local cultural protocols and experiences. This process would enhance the self-determination of Indigenous Peoples, and, at the same time, research universities would have the opportunity to build their capacity to support valid community-based research.

Second, an oral tradition of meaning making and knowledge sharing, by its nature, involves personal dialogue among people, and thus builds upon existing personal relationships, or creates the opportunity for building new relationships. In fact, the traditional activities of Indigenous social infrastructures have always been at the core of what in today's sociological parlance is referred to as building social capital. Ironically, processes, such as building social capital, that are essential for our societies, were being re-discovered by twentieth century Western researchers (e.g., Putnam 2000), while they have always been and continue to be an essential aspect of Indigenous ways of living (see Atleo 2004; Kovach 2009). If the data obtained with the EDI are first contextualized and then shared as an active expression of a tradition of orality—then EDI research can contribute to a research process that builds on existing traditions of shared meaning making, and yields a greater chance of leading to knowledge interpretation and transformation that is in line with the purpose of the EDI, namely, to create knowledge that supports children and their families thrive. (In fact, in British Columbia, university researchers and community members currently share and discuss EDI findings in small local research forums in non-Indigenous communities.) If, on the other hand, the primary channel of disseminating EDI information is in written form—one-directional from university researchers to communities—then the data interpretation process pertaining to the EDI might alienate communities that rely on personal dialogue and relationships for knowledge sharing. In addition, if this dissemination occurs in a way that privileges the university researchers' values and goals, rather than the community stakeholders' values and goals, communities are at risk of once again becoming objectified subjects of research.

Third, if EDI scores are interpreted in a local, contextualized, rather than in a normative, comparative way, it provides communities with a sense of ownership and autonomy, rather than with a sense of disownment and dependency or helplessness. In fact, it has been noted by the Cree-Metis scholar Emma LaRocque (2010) that a “psychology of colonization lingers centuries after colonialism as an institution has expired” (p. 6). Indigenous Peoples inherit a world in which they live in what Cree scholar Neal McLeod calls ‘ideological and spatial diasporas’ (2001). Therefore, an EDI-based research program, in which resources are dedicated towards exploring research questions pertaining specifically to Indigenous Peoples and Aboriginal communities, has to explicate these underlying ideologies, in order to create research evidence that validly and meaningfully speaks to the thriving of children and families in the political, social, and cultural ecologies in which they are growing up.

1 Concluding Thoughts

The current population-level administration of the EDI in British Columbia and other Canadian provinces comes—due to its political and scientific reach—with great opportunities as well as with great responsibilities. In this paper, I have delineated the ways in which EDI research can be informed by Indigenous ways of knowledge sharing and meaning making as well as by Indigenous cosmologies and epistemologies. In a comprehensive, ongoing validation research program that seeks to deduce valid meaning from EDI scores, it is necessary to interpret the secondary source research data from the EDI by contextualizing it through primary source data; that is, by contextualizing EDI research

within locally existing cultural, social, political, and ethical realities through the engagement of local Indigenous Peoples. As the interpretation of EDI data potentially influences decision making, practices, priorities, programs, and services pertaining to Indigenous People's early years of life, the factors that affect the data interpretation process are directly linked to probable consequences of using the EDI as a research tool. Therefore, the factors affecting the interpretation of EDI data are inevitably linked to a holistic concept of validity as proposed by Messick (1998).

As has been argued in this paper, a validation program for the EDI may benefit from incorporating research processes that are based on Indigenous knowledge that speak to the values inherent to orality as a pedagogical tradition of Indigenous Peoples. Furthermore, a validation program for the EDI may benefit from explicating the social, political, cultural, and historical ideologies and realities that affect children and their family's daily lives.

This paper contributes to a step into the direction of building such an ethically valid research program. The arguments presented here are intended to be an invitation for researchers and communities to engage in a research process that enables Indigenous Peoples to act according to self-determination and to embrace the idea that they can build their own research capacity for conducting community-based research; and that they can in turn contribute an important aspect to the validation of the interpretation and use of EDI scores. The paper is also an invitation to all to take on the response-ability to conduct research across disciplines and sectors, on behalf of the well-being of their children. (All My Relations, Texas)

Acknowledgments It is important to recognize, acknowledge and honour all of the peoples whose homelands I have been blessed to visit and work within. There are too many to name. I hold my hands up to them and to the membership of the HELP-Aboriginal Steering Committee, who guide and support opportunities for our collective work through activities of value. This commentary is one such opportunity and is provided to me through my role at HELP. I have been enabled me to work with Dr. Martin Guhn, whose support in writing this commentary has ensured that the ideas inherent to it, are communicated in useful ways. I wish to acknowledge my children whose sacrifices are many and enable me to work according to the dreams of our ancestors, for the ones we may never meet. I am thankful and honoured to be chosen as their living link.

References

- Alfred, T., & Corntassel, J. (2005). *Being indigenous: Resurgences against contemporary colonialism* (pp. 597–614). *Government and opposition: Politics and identity IX*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.
- Atleo, R. E. (2004). *Tsawalk: A Nuu-chah-nulth Worldview*. Vancouver, British Columbia: UBC Press.
- Blackstock, M. D. (2000). The aborigine report (1837): A case study in the slow change of colonial social relations. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, 20, 67–94.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cajete, G. (2008). Seven orientations for the development of Indigenous science education. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*. California: Sage Publications.
- Corntassel, J. (2003). Who is indigenous? "Peoplehood" and ethnonationalist approaches to rearticulating indigenous identity. *Nationalism & Ethnic Politics*, 9, 75–100.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Deloria, V., Jr. (1992). *God is red: A native view of religion*. Golden, Colorado: Fulcrum Press.
- Deloria, V., Jr. (1997). *Red earth, white lies: Native Americans and the myth of scientific fact*. Golden, Colorado: Fulcrum Press.

- Deloria, V., Jr. (2006). *The world we used to live in: Remembering the powers of the medicine men*. Golden, Colorado: Fulcrum Press.
- Elder, G. H., Jr. (1994). Time, human agency, and social change: Perspectives on the life course. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 57, 4–15.
- Emberley, J. V. (2007). *Defamiliarizing the aboriginal: Cultural practices and decolonization in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ermine, W., Sinclair, R., & Jeffery, B. (2004). *The ethics of research involving indigenous peoples: Report of the indigenous peoples' health research centre to the interagency panel of research ethics*. Regina, Saskatchewan: Indigenous Peoples' Health Research Centre.
- Fixico, D. (2003). *The American Indian mind in a linear world: American Indian Studies and traditional knowledge*. New York, New York: Routledge.
- Grande, S. (2007). Red lake woebegone: Pedagogy, decolonization and the critical project. In P. McLaren & J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Guhn, M., Zumbo, B. D., Janus, M., & Hertzman, C. (in press). Validation theory and research for a population-level measure of children's development, wellbeing, and school readiness. *Social Indicators Research*.
- Harding, S. (1994). Is science multicultural? Challenges, resources, opportunities, uncertainties. *Configurations*, 2, 301–330.
- Humphries, B. (2008). *Social work research for social justice*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Janus, M., & Offord, D. (2007). Development and psychometric properties of the Early Development Instrument (EDI): A measure of children's school readiness. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 39, 1–22.
- Kawagley, A. O., & Barnhardt, R. (1999). Education indigenous to place: Western science meets native reality. In G. A. Smith & D. R. Williams (Eds.), *Ecological education in action: On weaving education, culture and the environment*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations and contexts*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- LaRocque, E. (2010). *When the other is me: Native resistance discourse 1850–1990*. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- McLeod, N. (2001). Coming home through stories. In A. G. Ruffo (Ed.), *(Ad)Dressing our words: Aboriginal perspectives on Aboriginal literatures*. Penticton, Canada: Theytus Books.
- Messick, S. (1998). Test validity: A matter of consequence. *Social Indicators Research*, 45, 35–44.
- Minkler, M., & Wallerstein, N. (Eds.). (2008). *Community-based participatory research for health: From process to outcome* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone. The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Shewell, H. (2004). *'Enough to keep them alive': Indian Welfare in Canada, 1873–1965*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York: Zed Books.
- Turner, D. (2006). *Towards a critical Indigenous philosophy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Womack, C. S. (1999). *Red on red: Native American literary separatism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.