UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

INDIGENOUS DELIBERATION: COMMUNITY DRIVEN RESEARCH,

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHERS, AND CAPACITY BUILDING IN THE

CHICKASAW NATION

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment for the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

by

DALAKI JYM LIVINGSTON

Norman, Oklahoma

2023

INDIGENOUS DELIBERATION: COMMUNITY DRIVEN RESEARCH,

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHERS, AND CAPACITY BUILDING IN THE

CHICKASAW NATION

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

BY THE COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF

Dr. Justin Reedy, Chair

Dr. James Olufowote

Dr. Norman Wong

Dr. Paul Spicer

Dedication

I dedicate this to those that lived in two worlds but felt they never had a home in either.

I dedicate this dissertation to my grandpa, Ira Mitch Fisher. A perfect neighbor, a gentle teacher, and someone who always believed in me. Thank you, Grandpa, for wanting to listen to my tales. Your little traveler has many more things to see, and stories to tell.

Acknowledgements

I need to thank best friends, a family I chose. Martin Romero, you are one of the greatest men to have blessed my life. Kieona Romero, you bring a light in the world I am glad that is in my life. Kalin Despain, you are the younger brother I always wanted and the one I always needed. Thank you. Alonna Despain, you fight for a better world and your existence alone is a boon to those efforts. Caleb Duff and your wife Taryn, you always listened to my trials and bolstered my resolve. Miles might separate us, but we will never be alone.

Thank you, my Table-Top groups: The group formerly known as Mithril Phoenix; Greg, Candy, Caleb, Wil, Jake, Jason, Alonna, Kalin, Olivia, and Gene. The Children of Ash; Ben, Yuki, Morgan, Michael, Gestal, and Kalin. Quatro Macho; Andrew, Caleb, Ryan, Kyle, Michael, and Ben. You kept me sane and cultivated my creativity. We have seen many adventures, rolled plenty of dice, and I am humbled to be your friend.

Thank you to my cohort, at OU. An academic path is lonely, but enjoyable with friends in the same boat. The names are numerous, but your warmth is incalculable.

Thank you to the CEIGR virtual writing group. Nathan and Jessica, for your consistency to keep the writing group alive. Also to Julie and Vanessa, for guiding me with vital conversations and making me a better colleague.

My committee, thank you. Norman Wong, you showed me my first semester the importance of the work we do. James Olfuowote, you gave me my

first in-depth research opportunity and started my passion in health communication. Paul Spicer, who gave me a chance to grow and opened a side of research I am now passionate about. My chair, Justin Reedy, without him, I would not be finishing this program. He gave me faith I did not have in myself. He taught me I am not a diversity hire, but what I have to say matters, and people need to hear it. That is what I appreciates about you.

Thank you, Kevin Stein. You encouraged me to keep going and here we are. I hope I still hold the record for most Stein classes taken by a single student. Southern Utah University, a home away from home, is how we ended up at OU. Go T-Birds.

My lifelines and safe harbors in the sea of academia: Justin Lund and Jessica Blanchard. I know no one more deserving of the words mentor and friend. You both truly never gave up on me when the system did.

We weigh success by final product but sometimes we can miss important milestones. The asterisk above this project would include a slew of historical and personal hardships; to name a few: a pandemic (Covid), an expulsion, an insurrection, the makings of World War 3, moving time zones, a dozen family deaths, natural disasters, and more. As Elton John would say, "I'm still standing".

Thank you, Chris, for the motivation.

The writing group that was godsend. Elizabeth Besozzi, Jaimalene Hough, Chris Anderson, and Daniela Spade. Thank you to the UNCW Junior Faculty

writing group: CiCi, Chris Stuart, Kati Sudnik, Emily Jones, and Christie

Willingham. The place I found refuge, people who welcomed me wholeheartedly,

and a time when I needed them most, thank you to all of the UNCW

Communication Department.

      To the family I found in Wilmington, thank you for the Karaoke nights,

the Crest Saga playtests, and Jackbox hangouts. Arber, Autumn, Alex, Michael,

Darrel, Kiersten, and of course Tom, thank you for being safe harbors in the

crushing sea. You help make a home for a vagabond.

      Lastly, thank you, my first-grade teacher, hopefully I am smart enough for

the back row now.

ABSTRACT

INDIGENOUS DELIBERATION: COMMUNITY DRIVEN RESEARCH,

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHERS, AND CAPACITY BUILDING IN THE

CHICKASAW NATION

Dalaki J. Livingston

University of Oklahoma

This study examines the experiences and roles of community researchers in
The Chickasaw Nation's Indigenous Deliberation. The 2-day deliberative
gathering happened in 2018 which sets a precedence for continued Indigenous
Deliberation with various partners with the Center for the Ethics of Indigenous
Genomic Research (CEIGR). The deliberation was community-driven and
situated in the needs and concerns of The Chickasaw Nation. This study used
interviews with the community researchers, the deliberative event's transcripts,
and autoethnography experiences of the author as an Indigenous scholar and
academic partner of CEIGR to analyze the roles and decisions community
researchers enacted. The three entry points for data is analyzed together for
this case study of the first Indigenous Deliberation conducted within a Tribal
community about Genomic research and biobanking. A thematic analysis was
conducted to determine the overarching themes of Indigenous Deliberation
within collaborative partnerships between community and academic
researchers. Three themes permeated each entry point: *Community*

Contextualization, Deliberant Support, and *Equitable Partnerships.* Findings

explore the themes surrounding the community-driven deliberation and the

roles community researchers played in its planning, implementation, and

evaluation. Findings indicate community-driven research should be focused

within the community research is being conducted and that their needs are

paramount. Findings support and build upon the need for equitable

partnerships between Indigenous peoples and academics. Through the

experiences of the community researchers, I explore the complexity in

maintaining relationships. I explain how each theme is present in each step of

the deliberation process and how those roles work together to support an

Indigenous Deliberation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Yá'át'ééh shik'éí dóó shidine'é

Shí éí Bilagáana nishłį́

Haltsooi bashishchiin

Bilagáana dashicheii

'Ashiihi dashinalí

Shí éí Dalaki Livingston yinishyé

Ákót'éego diné nishłį́

Ahéhee'

Hello, I am Dalaki Livingston. I am of the White people. I am born for the

Meadow Clan. The White people are my Maternal Grandfathers. The Salt Clan

are my Paternal Grandfathers. Introductions are an integral part to understanding

where we come from, where we may proceed, and how we are connected. I am a

member of the Navajo Nation. Like formal introductions, research requires we

know where we come from to be dependable partners.

In conjunction with the Center for the Ethics of Indigenous Genomic

Research (CEIGR) and the Chickasaw Nation Health Department (CNHD), I

interviewed members of the Chickasaw Nation Research Team involved with the

planning and implementation of the tribal deliberation conducted. Democratic

deliberation is an approach to stakeholder engagement that emphasizes community perspectives. Public deliberation gathers people from diverse backgrounds from a community and engages in reflection and dialogue in search of collective solutions. The deliberation planning process and implementation are informed by frameworks of group deliberation and community-based participatory research, which share egalitarian values.

Deliberations are used to evaluate policy, laws, and societal issues and generate consensus. The three deliberations conducted as part of this overall CEIGR research program: Chickasaw Nation Health Department (2018), Southcentral Foundation (2019), and Missouri Breaks Industries Research, Inc. (2019). I want to expand on their findings and improve upon deliberations that focuses on Indigenous needs and collaboration. The Chickasaw Nation Health Department (CNHD) deliberation was the first completed in a series of partner deliberations and is a forerunner in Indigenous deliberation. A tribal deliberation conducted within the Chickasaw Nation explored genetics and genomics research and the ethical, legal, and social implications those raise for Indigenous peoples. I work with the CNHD to explore their experiences. The evaluation and findings behind these deliberations are important foundational work to Indigenous communication theory and praxis.

The Chickasaw Nation community researchers (i.e. Chickasaw Nation staff who planned and ran the CNHD deliberation) were an integral part of the

CEIGR partnerships deliberation creation, implementation, and evaluation. Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers on this team used appropriate tools they needed to approach community's needs. I inquired further into their experiences, before, during, and after the deliberation. The questions revolve around using deliberation as a process, recruitment of participants, and future application of similar processes. We further improve upon deliberations by seeing what worked, what didn't work, and what needs to continue to work.

In this dissertation, I asked: how is deliberation adapted to meet community needs? What roles do the community collaborators adopt to plan, facilitate, and implement deliberation? How does Tribal sovereignty reify deliberation processes? I conducted interviews with most of the dual-role researchers working on this project; analyzed the transcripts from the deliberation; and applied my auto-ethnographic experiences as a member with CEIGR to analyze the deliberation holistically as an Indigenously focused deliberation.

This research is important to improve future deliberations in Native communities. The results will guide and bolster future community projects using deliberation as a communicative framework. I believe the deliberation conducted with CEIGR is the continuation of and foundation for future Indigenous communication research, a nascent area of scholarship in communication.

In recent years, we see a rise in deliberation as a mechanism to enact democracy among local communities (Weiksner et al., 2012). Topics covered by

deliberative events revolve around a community's needs. Since we come from different communities, with different needs, Native Tribes also vary in their needs. To address some of those needs around genomic research, the Center for the Ethics of Genomic Research (CEIGR) conducted several deliberative events with different Native communities (Hiratsuka et al., 2020; Reedy, Blanchard, et al., 2020).

The research questions I ask is goalpost of the conversations in the next two chapters.

RQ1: How is deliberation adapted to meet community needs?

RQ2: What roles do the community collaborators adopt to plan, facilitate, and implement deliberation?

RQ3: How does Tribal sovereignty reify deliberation processes?

We see a blending of western ideologies and an Indigenous system of knowledge creation. Through a closer look at the Chickasaw Nation Health Department Deliberation, we can improve enclave community deliberation. Through the focus on the roles of the community researchers and their experiences in the deliberation planning, recruitment, and implementation, we can become better partners, and researchers.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

I remember talking to Dad on the phone while walking home from OU. I asked him blatantly, "why didn't you teach us Navajo?" I was always curious about his reasoning and finally found the courage after several states' separation. His response was something I knew all too well.

He was quiet for several moments that stretched across the distance, "I didn't want you to feel the same shame I felt when I didn't fit in. I would get funny looks and teased when I spoke Navajo in high school and middle school. I would probably do things differently now but then…"

I interrupted, "Dad, its okay. I understand. I look forward to learning now. How's mom doing?" I hid my tears in the change of subject.

For centuries, Indigenous peoples in North America have created, maintained, and perpetuated knowledge creation systems (Kovach, 2009). With European colonization, these methods of knowledge creation have been criticized, overlooked, and even aggressively sought to be terminated (Belone & Werito, 2022). Native peoples still maintain their knowledge creation systems even in the face of governmental adversity (Wilson, 2008). We can see how sovereignty is enacted from Indigenous choices in methods of knowledge creation, to specific topics within genomic discussions in deliberative events.

Historic trends of health administration in the US originated from a biomedical model of health (Sheridan & Radmacher, 1992). Individualism and reliance on medical technology to treat sickness and health leaves integral aspects of health out of the equation. Because Tribal nations do not adhere to western ideas of individualization, I argue that deliberation and Indigenous methodologies overlap in two areas: community, and partnership. Partnership provides channels and mechanisms to help address community needs (Israel et al., 2011). The direct way to determine community needs is to go to the community. In this dissertation, I address the questions of why and how these areas of knowledge creation come together. The answers to these questions help us improve deliberation, grow Indigenous methodologies in western channels of knowledge creation, and show how they combine to improve and support Tribal communities. This work is a small step in bridging a historically imbalanced gap between western research and Tribal communities.

First, the historical and current implications of colonization regarding Indigenous health needs to be covered to understand the importance of Tribal and university partnership. Second, the literature in the fields of critical scholarship and democracy as progress towards community-based participatory research is discussed. Throughout this section, I explain the need for Indigenous voice and scholarship and representation in democratic spaces. Third, I examine the convergence between critical scholarship, deliberation, and Tribal partnerships.

Colonial Health and Native Peoples

When European settlers arrived on this continent, they brought with them a death. I am not referring to foreign diseases alone, but to the colonial structures that were implemented to kill the culture and traditions of Native peoples. Diamond (1997) grossly misrepresents the virgin soil theory of the Americas as why new bacteria and viruses are the reason for the depopulation of the America's. New bacteria and sickness definitely are factors in the depopulation of North America, but they are not the leading cause. Cameron et al. (2015) explains that Native Peoples were denied the resources and the capacity to recover from pandemic level sicknesses. Diamond oversimplifies the horrors and the impact colonization, and the colonizer had on Native peoples.

European populations had time to recover from sickness but, in the Americas, Indigenous people were relocated, disenfranchised, and forced into new diets. These biological factors reduce a population's ability to recover from deadly diseases and this is not considering the amount of psychological trauma and hardships on Indigenous peoples. Swedlund (2015) also iterates that it was not simply the germs or advanced technology that led to the decimation of Native populations but the colonial structures that exacerbated the diseases and illnesses. How can a population recuperate without rest, food, necessary sanitary conditions, and a support system? If we dismantle those conditions, any population will have a hard time recovering. Relocation and forced slavery only

add to ongoing complexity of difficulties Indigenous peoples faced (Cameron et al., 2015). As mentioned, colonists also introduced foreign plants and different agricultural production which greatly altered diet (Romenofsky, 2010). Colonists efforts sought, overtook, consumed, and left destruction in their wake.

Native peoples in North America are not used to treaties being upheld by government bodies. Colonial expansion pushed Natives from their ancestral lands in a variety of ways: relocation, reservation formation, and assimilation practices. We see how important physical location can be to some tribes. For example, Basso (1996) conducted an ethnographic inquiry with the Western Apache tribe in Arizona. In his inquiry, we see a rich cultural connection to the physical locations on Apache lands. Native health practices are cultivated over experience living on their lands. Culture is not only shared through language, but the spaces shared across time. The connection and wisdom that sits in these places can maintain culture that colonizing forces sought to actively steal, change, or destroy. Culture dynamics are not static and stagnant. People adapt to hardships and connections are forged. We see a strain placed on post-contact tribes with a threat to their geographical location and environment.

Moving through the problematic history of colonial governments and Native peoples, we reach a complicated part of Indigenous history: residential schools. Young sons and daughters were taken from their home, forced to attend geographically distant schools, and pushed through assimilation programs

designed to 'kill the Indian and save the man' (Bombay et al., 2013; Gershon, 2021). Like most colonial structures, the severity of residential schools does lie on a spectrum. I exist because of these educational programs which was mild compared to others. My father went to school off reservation and met my mother in his high school years. My story is usually an exception to Indian education programs, not the norm. On the harsher end of the spectrum, hundreds of unmarked graves through Canada and the United States were found at residential schools (Austen, 2021; Gershon, 2021; Richard, 2021). The sexual, physical, and emotional abuse administered at these colonial establishments leaves a wake of trauma that echoes across generations. Though I was not a student in one of these programs, I do not speak my Native language and must take extra steps to learn it and learn about my own Navajo culture. Western colonizing practices sought to erase the Native, but the Native remains. Resistance persists.

Why did we talk about historical trauma and colonial structures that upended Native peoples' lives? If we look at the biomedical model of health (Mishler, 1984), it focuses on the biological aspects of health and the scientific biology. Biomedicine is strongly rooted in the post-positivist epistemology and a focus on the physician's scientific/technical expertise, objectivity and emotional detachment when dealing with patients (Apker & Eggly, 2004). This model can leave out important factors of the human experience. If I am to work with Native communities, I would be remiss if I did not include the cultural dimensions and

contextual factors of health (Airhihenbuwa, 1995). How do Native communities socially construct health? If Natives are separated and their familial and interpersonal relationships are attacked, we can see a drop-in support. Health disparities, heart-wrenchingly, are preventable (Braveman & Gruskin, 2003). Health disparities surrounding Indigenous people are more than individual behavior. Minorities are not committing suicide more often, not receiving college education, or dying from diabetes, liver disease, and heart disease because of ethnicity (CDC, 2015). How are health disparities preventable? Applying money, resources, and research to these problems with a colonial lens addresses symptoms but does not necessarily fix the issue.

Health disparities are preventable differences in disease, injury, violence, or opportunities to achieve optimal health and occur often in socially disadvantaged populations. Disparities are categorized by ethnicity, gender, sex, age, income, and education (Braveman & Gruskin, 2003; CDC, 2015). The CDC attributes varying factors that can lead to health disparities: poverty, environmental threats, access to healthcare, individual & behavioral factors, and educational inequalities. Factors are layered upon one another.

The average income of a four-person home on the Navajo reservation is $20,005 (Business, 2004). The national poverty line for the same household size is $26,200 (Shrider et al., 2021). According to the Census Bureau, (Shrider et al., 2021) the national median income is 67,521. The national poverty line is above

the median income for Navajo people on the reservation. Income changes what people can afford in healthcare, insurance, education, diet, etc. In the current capitalist climate, we often measure wellbeing by income. By the above measure, Navajos on the reservation are making a third of the national average. The factors surrounding disparity compound instead of mutually exclude (Braveman & Gruskin, 2003). We can compound poverty with access to healthcare. If a person becomes sick and cannot afford a doctor or medicine man, this can create a strain on the household. If a son or daughter gets sick, their performance in school decreases. An increase in depression may spike from doing poorly in school, not having enough money to eat, and knowing they cannot see a doctor. The increased depression might lead to negative behaviors and individual decision making. People can turn to cheap or dangerous alternatives which add upon the financial, spiritual, and physical strain.

Addressing health disparities is not a problem that is simply fixed by throwing money at the situation. Pouring more water into a bucket with several cracks does not fix the issue because the cracks are there in the first place. Native American representation and data collection is another area that perpetuates disparities and labeling and representing populations accurately is a difficult task (Gone & Trimble, 2012; Romenofsky, 2010). If we look to mortality rates, we know that there are issues with misclassification of Native peoples (Anderson et al., 2014). The reporting of race on a death certificate can be wrong. We use

11

mortality rates to help determine healthcare effectiveness, the wellness of a

community, and the longevity of a population (Anderson et al., 2014).

Mislabeling people changes the data, skews our perception, and leads to erasure.

We need accurate data to make accurate assumptions (Keppol et. al, 2008). Native

Health relies upon data, but incorrect data diminishes the impact of health

initiatives.

We can also see an issue with how Native People are counted in the 10-

year census. Self-reporting does not account for personal and tribal criteria of

Native-American descent. Tribal registration is a better way of accounting for this

limited data but is also limited (Orr, 2017). Tribes that are federally recognized

have specified criteria to be counted as a member of the tribe. We can compare

the census numbers to the tribal rolls to help us identify discrepancies, but this

leads to other issues. Tribes that are federally recognized become the data we

work with and not all tribes are federally recognized. To be considered a member,

tribes institute criteria like Blood Quantification (blood quantum or quant.), roll

numbers, or ancestral lineage(Orr, 2017). Blood quant is a colonial structure that

still affects tribes today. Blood quant was used to assimilate a minority population

(Dennison, 2012). Tribal membership criteria is up to the Tribe but this is a

different form of tribal politics (Cattelino, 2008; Orr, 2017). Federal recognition

of membership is an attempt to quantify culture. We cannot just deny all forms of

data but by understanding their limitations, we can begin to address and identify disparities more accurately.

Public health research about Native Americans lumps Tribes into an oversimplified cultural identity (Gartner et al., 2021). Native representation in research is difficult when dealing with different tribes. We know census data is a large snapshot of a diverse population under an ethnic identifier. The Navajo Tribe is going to have different issues than Alaska Native Tribes served by the Southcentral Foundation. The Oklahoma Tribes have different needs and issues than the Florida Seminole Tribe. Tribal diversification also changes the data landscape since we cannot progress with research in a Pan-Indian approach. With large data sets of multiple tribes, we can see an increase in generalizations that might not be true for one tribe. With science, we can inadvertently be racist. Stereotypes around drinking, diabetes, and violence can lead to negative local and national perception of Tribes. The opposite can also be true: if one Tribe has the highest suicide rate but on average, we know it is nationally high, the tribe might not be able to receive the needed resources or attention for that issue. The larger the data set, the less accurate the data becomes for specific tribes. Larger data sets should not be ignored because they do illuminate possible issues and disparities, but we still are not addressing health disparities in their locality.

The purpose behind this chapter is to look historically at how Native people were treated and continue to be treated. Despite the horrors Indigenous

people have faced, continue to face, and will face, they remain; they survive; and they adapt. Quickly listing the mistreatments of Native peoples is difficult for me. We are not our hardships but understanding where we come from is an integral part of moving forward. I am here to see and speak about how Indigenous people adapt and grow, despite colonization's influence.

CHAPTER III

DECONSTRUCTING/RECONSTRUCTING THE ACADEMY

The fluorescent lights glowed, and AC blew in the meeting room in Norman, Oklahoma. The Center of Applied Social Research (CASR)'s fourth floor is where I was to have my first meeting with a research consortium. About five new faces, and three familiar ones filled the room as I slunk in. The meeting call was starting, and the middle of the long desk sat a triangle black microphone. Dial tones and small talk filled the room as I searched for an outlet for my computer. A few minutes to spare and my colleague welcomed me, a fellow Indigenous Ph.D. student from anthropology. "Don't worry, you're going to be fine." He followed with some jokes to ease the tension as the room and conference callers began to sound off a roll call.

This roll call followed introductions and quick connections. Extra context and conversation lingered on each caller's identifying information, but the length was a welcome change to the curt introductions I usually saw in professional settings. The attention was pointed to me as Justin introduced me as a new Graduate Research Assistant to the consortium and I opened my mouth and staggered through an introduction. The tongue tripping, at the time, seemed to be because of my nerves. I wrongly attributed the stumbling with the nerves but

being in a space and place as both Indigenous and a Scholar was exciting. I was

hopeful and humbled to be in this place. Is this how it is supposed to be?

Transition from Problematic Scholarship

Scientific inquiry is not always morally ethical. Documented minority

exploitation in the ASU Case (Orr et al., 2021) to Henrietta Lacks (Skloot, 2010);

unethical scientific experiments, such as Tuskegee (CDC, 2021); and the use of

colonial upheld structures, science can cost the humanity it often seeks to

understand. In this section, we will discuss health communication, critical theory,

Indigenous methodology, Indigenous partnerships, and Deliberation.

We can see justifiable reticence in Native communities. Historical

'helicopter research' leads to distrust. The term helicopter research is foreign to

some but an unfortunate reality to minority peoples. The idea is derived from how

a helicopter operates; it will hover, collect information/data from a distance while

being invasive, and leave when the researcher is satisfied (Basso, 1996; Gone &

Trimble, 2012). The issue with this type of research treats the minority peoples as

subjects to be observed and dehumanizes their agency, sovereignty, while taking

without offering an equitable outcome with the community. The benefit of the

research resides with the researcher and the institution they hailed. The greater

good justification still leaves Indigenous communities waiting for the good to

trickle down the ivory tower.

We transition from problematic scholarship in several capacities: health communication, critical theory and research, and Indigenizing research spaces and places. Transitioning to a community appropriate, culturally significant, and capacity building research approach takes time and faces many challenges. Small steps accumulate, and we should exert for leaps or bounds.

Health Communication

We know the biomedical model is insufficient to address health disparities so we can look at more holistic means of health (Zoller & Dutta, 2008). The role behind health communication research is "not to break out in print but to generate health communication knowledge for directing health care policy, practice, and intervention" (Kreps, 1989). Health communication research sometimes shares the failings of traditional health education: lacking engagement with social and political theory, a surface understanding of power relations in health settings, and deficiency in systemic, rigorous practice and self-reflexivity (Sears, 1992; Stevenson & Burke, 1991; Taylor, 1990). The focus of this dissertation is not to reminisce on the shortcomings of previous research but focus on the transformation. Growth in Health communication sprouted because of multiple viewpoints. Human communication branches around community, people, places, and experiences. When we look at health issues with different lenses, we can see truths and answers to community and individual problems.

Being Native is full of tensions. I am a citizen of the Navajo Nation but also a citizen of the United States of America. I see a strong push for individual accomplishments in western academia where my family fostered a strong affinity towards familial ties and community. Education is proselytized by my Elders all the while being systematically challenged to attend and pay for school. Push and pull, these tensions require Indigenous citizens constant monitoring about which role to fit. Historical western approaches can wash out the complexity of the Native experience. Native identity is political, cultural, individual, collective, historical, genetic, but most of all, complex. A holistic view towards health (Kreps & Thornton, 1992) and the Indigenous experience is how I approach the complexity.

Political theory is where we see a rise in democracy and deliberation integration in community engagement. In power relations, we see a disparity with government and research institutions with Native Tribes. Addressing these power disparities are tackled through critical lenses. The reason we mention it in health is the dynamic nature health communication research has grown over the years (Dutta, 2007). Self-reflexivity is an essential part of critical research, Indigenous ways of knowing, and the path towards addressing community health needs.

The complexity of being Native in a western world requires a lot of tensions to be addressed. I introduce a new idea: Compounded Community Research which goes beyond the notion of multicultural since that indicates you

can, to an extent, separate the various cultures at play. This includes an understanding of colonial entanglements and active processes of Indigenizing research. My hope with this dissertation is to address the compounded community concepts that populate the Indigenous experience and how these processes have been forming and continue to grow.

Health disparities cannot be simply attributed to individual choices. The same health issue, like cardiovascular disease increases drastically based upon the location a person lives (Romenofsky, 2010). The factors revolving around health disparities is exacerbated by power structures in health, education, and economic stability (Harper & Pratt, 2021). For us to understand Indigenous ways of knowing, we need to understand why these power structures oppress, exploit, and overlook minority peoples.

Critical theory

Critical theory is an important response to traditional methods of inquiry in academia. Unfortunately, previous western academic pathways of research have left out important perspectives and continue to ignore or exploited marginalized communities (Dutta, 2007, 2012; Zoller & Dutta, 2008). In addition, Health Communication comes from a tradition heavily founded in social psychological models of behavior with a strong emphasis on stimulus-response school of communication with a focus on the individual (Lupton, 1994). Health

disparity complexity cannot be summed up by individual factors nor understood through the dominant societal structures that generate these hardships.

Critical theory challenges power structures that oppress and exploit minority populations. Challenges to hegemony and patriarchy stem back to Marx but extends through Women studies and engages the subaltern (Dutta, 2012). Typically silenced by those in power, whether overt or structurally designed, the voice of the minority goes unheard, unadhered, and overlooked. We need these voices for a more robust democratic system. Championing minority voice is how the lost, forgotten, and exploited bolster policy, and health.

Voice is like breathing, it is hard to notice it unless it is absent. Voice in critical research prioritizes voices and experiences that the hegemony sought to quell. Voice gives insight to what is experienced. The majority's voice might silence or overwhelm minority experiences but that does not make them more important. I argue that it makes those voices even more important. Grassroots research in health communication and Indigenous research methods prioritize the experience of those at the community level.

For example, researchers examined the voices of Northern Nigerian community members that resisted the polio vaccine (Olufowote & Livingston, 2021). From a western medicine standpoint, refusing a lifesaving vaccine seems ridiculous or at least foolish. The medicine has been created by researchers and helps survivability of a deadly disease that rocked the world. By looking at those

voices that resisted the vaccine, however, their reasoning was more complex than western science might have understood.

Polio vaccination resistance stemmed from distrust of western entities, and various issues concerning basic human needs. Why would people line up for a vaccination when they are lacking clean drinking water? Why would a people, who were at the face of sterilizing treatments from western entities trust this miracle drug that would save them now? The community voices told a larger and harsher reality than tests pertaining to vaccine effectiveness (Dutta & Basu, 2017; Olufowote & Livingston, 2021). Voice in critical research bridges the humanity with human research.

Research and reflexivity should be synonymous when problematic practices saturate minority peoples. Colonizing Indigenous Spaces has negatively impacted Tribal communities regarding research. We see Tribes not trusting the Academia, Government, and capitalism(Orr, 2017). Reflexivity, as previously mentioned, paints the picture of where we are, who we are beholden to, and how those connections might drive us. Transparency is a necessary component of community-based research but knowing where we come from creates difficult conversations. We need to move past the colonial and towards compounded cultural research.

Voice and reflexivity are important foundations to build better research, democracy, and community. Steps are being taken to address the colonial, and

critical research is part of the path. We need to understand how colonial research and colonial democracy is being refuted and changed but we need to define a few things to address this tension.

Culture-Centered Approach

Culture-centered approach (CCA) and Culture-sensitive approach (CSA) are different ways to view culture regarding health research and campaigns. Using culture, we know that these two approaches differ in values, goals, power, hegemony/structure, and evaluation criteria (Dutta, 2008; Dutta, 2007; Dutta et al., 2013). I argue that the two approaches are both tools in a toolbox that can and should be utilized. Not every health campaign is created equal. Research in the past ignored culture in many instances and in the 60's and 70's, Latino researchers argued this was a large reason why Entertainment-Education, the use of taking information and turning it into entertainment for the purpose of educating, was not as effective as intended (Dutta, 2006). We need to reemphasize culture in health research and in the past fourteen years, we can see the two approaches, CCA & CSA, used to address these past concerns and misgivings.

For a health campaign, certain criteria must be met (Noar, 2006): people or publics that are target of the campaign, organized communicative efforts, establish desired effects and outcomes, and conducted over a period of time. This is different from campaign principles. To be culturally sensitive, health

campaigners need to understand the cultural contextual factors in the audience they are trying to engage. This includes formative research, audience segmentation, and using those cultural markers to create a more persuasive message. Culture is another tool to be used to increase the persuasion of created messages. Being culturally sensitive also helps researchers avoid taboos or inappropriate messages towards the audience.

Culture is not a tool to be used but a dynamic creation of the society the researcher is engaging. A CCA puts the culture as the forefront of the process. Instead of using the culture to create more persuasive messages, the researcher works within the culture to enact change, give voice to the voiceless, and bolster community ways of knowledge creation and problem solving (Dutta & Basu, 2017). The CSA operationalizes culture as a static factor that increases probability of individual change (Dutta, 2007). The CCA sees culture as the vehicle, driver, and the destination of the research. Prioritizing culture, we can see deeper differences in these two approaches.

Dutta (2006) argues that E-E holds different values than what the subaltern culture might hold. Culture-sensitive approach prioritizes the values of the researcher and the funding institution over the minority population. The larger monolithic value system is imposed through the CSA. We see values through the goals that the campaign establishes. The end objective facilitates the decisions of researchers in a health campaign. Where does that end objective come from? In a

CSA, the goal comes independent from the cultural group. We do use cultural markers to help guide those decisions of campaign design, but the end goal is still created and sustained through the researcher's goals and any larger funding entity (Israel et al., 2020). The CCA prioritizes the goals and values of the cultural group over the researcher. Values are no longer imposed upon the community, but they can continue to facilitate their own beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors.

The direction that goals are dictated is how we get the directions top-down and bottom-up. The bottom-up approach is the direction of grass roots. The structure of the health campaign and the focus of culture illuminates whose agenda we want to follow. Top-down or a CSA prioritizes the researcher or institution. For example, the Global Polio Eradication Initiative (GPEI) focuses upon the eradication of polio in the world. Campaigns have been held in all 1st-3rd world countries. With two countries left for the World Health Organization (WHO) to declare the world polio free, we saw in northern Nigeria a clash of values (Olufowote & Livingston, 2021). With a top-down approach, messages and campaigns become one-directional. Value systems that clash with the top-down message can be met with resistance. Polio is a deadly virus, and the eradication is not a bad thing. In my evaluation and discussion so far, of course we would want to go with a CCA but there are drawbacks to the paradigm.

The larger the population we work with, the harder it is to conduct a CCA. We see a prioritization of the subaltern and the silenced voices that are not the

24

majority, but what if we are dealing with the majority? The researcher would have to segment the audience and through these factors, we cannot assume there is a cultural climate established over age, gender, sex, nationality, etc. Going to the culture of the group where a cultural connection does not exist would waste time and resources. I view this like quantitative and qualitative methods. CSA has a specific purpose to help change individual behavior on a mass scale where CCA wants to engage with a community to identify, solve, and bolster their own agenda.

The goals and the structure of the campaigns speaks to a hierarchy of power. The community and the researcher play different roles in the power relationship of the health campaign. A CSA holds the researcher as the expert, the changing agent. The goals, values, and use of culture indicate that the researcher and their backers are the most influential and important aspect of the health campaign. CCA cedes the power of the researcher and prioritizes the community. The voice of the subaltern or the community we are working with is used to being silenced or forgotten. The researcher is there to not give them a voice but to let them speak. CSA uses western-dominated ideals of health, and this is not always the best approach.

When using a CCA, it really challenges the current structures in place. This is one of the powerful instruments of the approach. Using northern Nigeria Newspapers, Olufowote & Livingston (2021) located speech acts of resistance by

community members. The GPEI was forcing the vaccine on children and some people did not appreciate their approach. One account talked about how they didn't need this vaccine when they don't have medicine for their other ailments. Large societal and structural issues were salient to the community that the GPEI did not know. The CCA would prioritize those narratives of resistance because trying to solve an issue in a top-down approach does not address other legitimate concerns of the local community.

A CSA can measure its effectiveness in several capacities: message reach, message salience, and behavior change. Behavior is one of the hardest things to change but by seeking to change attitudes and beliefs, behaviors will be more likely to change (Levy & Friend, 2000; Rundall & Bruvold, 1988). The researcher develops the methods and criteria in determining if the campaign was successful. CCA secedes the evaluation to the community on the effectiveness of the campaign. Since the community had a hand in the selection of issues, development of solutions, and implementation, we would want the community to determine the means to evaluate. Research looks and is approached differently with cultural members leading the project. The researcher is not the expert on the community, but they do bring to the table experiences and ideas that can be used to support the community's efforts. Both approaches do require evaluation during and after health campaigns. Evaluation might look similar, but the project could lead to important differences.

Health campaigns and health initiatives shifted towards multiple

philosophical and pragmatic entry points into research. One important track is the

holistic approach to understanding health in communities. Indigenous

communities are unique in their sovereign status, and we see the shift more

drastically in these communities. During the first round of vaccinations with

Covid, communities on Tribal land in Oklahoma were some of the first places to

be ready for vaccine administration. Health messages emphasized taking the

vaccine to help protect our Elders on the Navajo Nation (Powder, 2021). The

community is comprised of individuals but the focus on the individual is not the

dominate paradigm.

Indigenous Ways of Knowing

Ways of knowing populate the world through traditions, oral histories, and

cultural practices. Wilson (2008) argues acquiring knowledge about the world is a

sacred pursuit. Research is how we create connections between us, others, and the

world. Research fosters connections to increase knowledge, bolster community,

and grow people. The rigor involved with qualitative and quantitative research is

still found within Indigenous ways of knowing. The creation and understanding of

our world are conducted through multiple practices vetted by experience of those

before us (Kovach, 2009). Recording Indigenous methods looked different before

colonization. We see a step in the right direction acknowledging Tribal Elders as

sources of information with the recent changes to APA citations, but these ways of knowing are not completely contained in critical ideology.

The intent behind Indigenous knowledge systems was not to counteract the colonial power structures but to strengthen and bolster the community. Hegemony allows spaces for opposition and creates structures to appease these resistances (Daase & Deitelhoff, 2018). For example, capitalism has commercialized the going green ideology of sustainable resources. Something can be sold as a green product to appease the narratives against the gutting of natural resources. Indigenous knowledge systems adopt critical perspectives since they resonate with Indigenous ways of knowing ideologies but do exist separately.

One of the challenges to Indigenous Methodologies is asserting these methodologies need to be congruent with traditional western practices. The west and the Indigenous philosophically are different and that creates a divide between adhering to the standards derived from colonial domination in research (Kovach, 2009). We see a lot of similarities with qualitative research since it looks at a larger lens to the community's experience. Prioritizing the researched and not the researcher, we see a power differentiation in research practices.

We see a gravitation towards Indigenous methodologies by non-Indigenous people. We see an uptick in research that holds researchers responsible. Each generation grows a little more empathetic and ways of knowing the world without hurting it becomes a goal instead of a dream. Holistic, and

cyclical is the basis of Sa'ah Naagháí Bik'eh Hózhóón (SNBH) teachings where balance is the goal (Nez, 2018; Werito & Vallejo, 2022). We want to find that balance in the community and using these teachings, I believe I can build upon the conceptual framework of Indigenous Deliberation. Being Diné, using these teachings seem the most appropriate in understanding how we balance two different philosophies. We need to see a transformation in how we conduct research with Native Peoples. In SNBH, we take the good with the bad and balancing that requires ceremony. We need to treat research as ceremony and begin the balancing act.

Decolonizing vs. Indigenizing

Colonial democracy is problematic to deliberation and Indigenous ways of knowing. Colonial democracy hurts minority communities through education that seeks to replicate the dominant ideology of the social elites and perpetuate the status quo (Quinless, 2022). The system is designed to recreate what is currently established instead of trying to change or improve. Education turns into a form of assimilation instead of empowerment in current academic structures. The assimilation mitigates minority voice. Colonial democracy still seeks to colonize in ideology, perspective, and structure. Because colonial democracy slanders deliberative democracy ideals, sovereign minority peoples are justifiably hesitant.

Democracy should bring all voices, concerns, and ideas together to better and grow communities. Decolonizing these spaces that allowed genocide, and

29

exploitation is a difficult conversation. Decolonizing is a necessary process that should improve the democratic process (Gaudry & Lorenz, 2018). Native peoples do not exist in a vacuum and living with these democratic structures leads to adaptation and alteration. Decolonization with Indigenizing exists on a spectrum. We have Indigenous inclusion, which is surface level decolonization and representation (Gaudry & Lorenz, 2018). This end of the spectrum runs the risk of tokenism and does not change the colonial structure. In the middle we have reconciliation Indigenization which seeks common ground between the two spaces: colonial and Indigenous. Decolonial Indigenization envisions the overhaul of the entire academy to reorient knowledge production situated on balancing power relations between Indigenous peoples and the academy, and hopefully transforming the system into something dynamic and new (Gaudry & Lorenz, 2018).

Upending racist and power dividing systems is how we address colonial democracy. The problem in deconstructing systems of oppression is knowing where to begin. Democratic structures, colonial or idealistic, are a colonial entanglement. A colonial entanglement is when a colonial system, structure, or resource is woven into the fabric of Indigenous identity and culture (Dennison, 2012). Completely separating the colonial from the Indigenous will not revert the harm done but could cause greater damage. Plants take time to grow and so does change. The answers to decolonization should be found where communities resist

oppression and Indigenous ways of knowing continue. We cannot find the answer to decolonizing through a colonizing system. The answer is already among Tribes. Indigenizing is reclaiming ways of knowing and practices of community governance. Problematic origins do not necessitate impossible improvements, but they cannot be the sole solution. Structures can be changed, improved, and altered. Finding the answers is difficult but we have an opportunity to strengthen deliberative democracy by Indigenous adaption of deliberation. We can embrace the voice that is often overlooked and seek how these places and spaces of Indigenous sovereignty change democratic processes for their communities.

Deliberation

The deliberative civic engagement process is broken down into two components: deliberation and civic engagement. Deliberation is "the thoughtful reasoned consideration of information, views, experiences, and ideas among a group or individuals" (Nabatchi, 2012, p. 6). Civic engagement is the participation and action within the democratic system. Civic engagement is rooted in community but in the broadest sense. Deliberative scholarship spans a multitude of disciplines: anthropology, engineering, political science, medicine, communication, etc. Deliberation's application and interdisciplinary nature lends a much-needed avenue in engaging communities.

Citizens engaging with community needs, laws, and policy is the foundation to a democratic deliberation. The argument is made that "a morally and civically responsible individual recognizes himself or herself as a member of a larger social fabric and therefore considers social problems to be to be at least partly his or her own; such an individual is willing to see the moral and civic dimensions of issues, to make and justify informed moral and civic judgements, and to take action when appropriate" (Ehlrich, 2000, p. xxvi). Individuals create community; creating spaces and places for dialogue is paramount to an effective and ethical democracy.

In short, individuals forge connections through civic engagement with other citizens, issues, institutions, and the political system (Weiksner et al., 2012). Civic engagement facilitates voice, agency, empowerment, and effectiveness, that provides opportunities to be heard. Civic engagement requires active participation and authentic opportunities to make a difference (Nabatchi, 2012). We see opposition to colonial democracy by participation by all the members of a community. Being Indigenous is full of tensions between political systems, institutions, and cultural division. Critical research calls for more equitable democracy (Siu & Stanisevski, 2012) and we can gain a more robust civic engagement by looking at how Indigenous communities engage. We need voice, we need agency, and through these we can improve upon systems designed to oppress.

Deliberation ideals about democracy are situated in a western foundation but are not antagonistic towards Indigenous paradigms. Deliberative civic engagement advocates follow two broad rationales: the intrinsic value of democracy and the instrumental benefits. Democracy intrinsic value exerts the process itself is an outcome. Habermas (1975) calls for the widening of participation and inclusion in democracy through deliberation to address power inequalities present in communication among and between decision makers and the public.

Smaller publics can influence larger ones. Democratic theorists have championed "mini-public". Mini-publics are a microcosm of a larger public and by using a smaller group to educate, interact, and learn from, the larger public can benefit from these smaller groups (Dahl, 1989; Fishkin, 1991; Fung, 2003; Gastil, 2000). Mini-publics have been effectively used for over a decade across several states. One of the most notable examples comes from Oregon state where they utilize the mini-public process to inform citizens of important ballot issues (Gastil et al., 2017). The Citizen Initiate Review (CIR) is now a practice spanning almost a decade and several states (i.e. Colorado, Massachusetts, California) (Knobloch et al., 2019).

We look to the CIR's because, in deliberative democracy theory, the programs provide a rich environment of policy information, within a smaller public that can be used to benefit the larger community (Gastil et al., 2017). With

these mini-publics, democratic deliberation can be facilitated, evaluated, and potentially replicated across varying topics, issues, and publics. The CIR's produce citizen review statements that are given to the larger voting public. The deliberative process is distilled into this document and provided as a resource for the public. The review statements were a useful alternative source of information. Some were inspired by the statement to vote on ballot measures they might have skipped (Gastil et al. 2018). The CIR facilitated civic engagement through deliberative action.

We see a split in literature when discussing the citizen initiatives. One follows closely with the deliberative model and the other focuses on the formation, sustaining, and execution of citizen initiatives (Igalla et al., 2019). From the later line, we see an importance behind citizen reviews and how they take responsibilities that can expand into a broad range of public values. Citizen initiative research is more associated with self-created, and self-sustained initiatives such as grass root initiatives (Ornetzeder & Rohracher, 2013). We see a difference between this line of research because it is mainly focused upon citizen created and sustained efforts and does little to include governmentally created initiatives, yet their findings indicate the initiatives include strengthening democratic practices (Igalla et al., 2019). Even though government funding and facilitation backs part of these initiatives, the purpose behind citizen initiatives persist. Citizens engage with issues that are relevant to the larger public and this

furthers the democratic agenda. The alternative line of citizen initiatives usually

engages the critical lens of research and how democracy is being hindered with

the ill distribution of power. Though power between participants, government, or

communities is considered, we see deliberation as a stage to negotiate a space

between these two research lines.

Ideology can only go so far but to make changes, it needs to be tempered

with realistic expectation. I ascertain that the themes present in these CIR

statements are ones of collaboration, inclusion, and realism. We see strangers

gathering for a larger public. People are more inclined to buy-in with initiatives

that are honest, up-front, and inclusive with citizens and residents (Torri &

Martinez, 2011). The deliberation process in these CIR panels provides

moderators and opportunities for each person to speak. Since citizens are

evaluating the policies and are provided with resources to help facilitate an

informed decision, I argue that the citizens are grounded in the community's

reality. But we need to replicate these processes and adapt it to Indigenous

contexts. Building it from a community perspective is going to require the

grassroots approach.

The length of time that surrounds the various CIR's in each state is going

to lead to changes in the CIR process. The inclusion of the vote-tally provided by

the CIR panelists questioned the merit behind this measure (Gastil, 2018; Gastil et

al., 2017). Later CIR's would not include these panelists' votes toward the ballot

measures. With small changes, we can track the important pivots and changes to these different CIR's by comparing them. Similarly, if we had Indigenous Deliberations already conducted across a series of events, we could better support Indigenous Deliberations and how they need to be adapted. We see in real time CIR statements growing and adapting in mini-publics. Small changes take place from deliberation to deliberation, whether it is different organizers or small process changes. Themes exist between these small changes because democracy is based upon process not topic. To see where we are going and where we come from, I see guidance in how to evaluate and analyze an Indigenous Deliberation from CIR meetings.

The messages created at the CIR meetings are another exemplar of communicative power and responsibility in a democratic society. Information can be a tool for persuasion and understanding what those messages are saying is integral for future scholarship. Behind each message is an ideal and that ideal is perpetuated by individuals that create and distribute those messages. In Indigenous contexts, the focus is not surrounding the individual but the community. We see an important convergence with citizen initiatives, communication research, deliberation, and social change. Opinion is shaped by the messages that persuade.

We see that deliberative theory is based upon the idealized citizen and that people genuinely want to help their communities (Cohen, 1989). Democracy

works when the people in the democracy come together. We see challenges arise from political religious, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds that can cause splintering in juries and deliberative forums (Fung, 2003). We know that in these initiatives, there is a possibility to improve citizen deliberative capacity (Pincock, 2012), but long-term research is lacking. We know other studies have been done with the Oregon CIR and evaluated the effectiveness, and quality of the deliberative process (Knobloch et al., 2014). With the rise of deliberative climates and forums, an increase in citizen participation, and other states adopting a CIR for policies in local and state government, I would argue, within deliberative theory, that there are themes that transcend state and topic and contribute to the validity of deliberative theory. Research has focused on the topics deliberated, the process of deliberation but we see a lack of research surrounding the Community Members part in the deliberation planning and implementation.

Sovereignty/ What tribes are doing now?

Native Tribes do act on their own behalf in addressing health disparities. Because of historical research misconduct, the purpose behind research resides with the researcher. Research is a useful way to elicit needs of a community and hopefully facilitate a path to address those needs. Research often fully engages in the first half but lacks severely in the 'what now'. Native communities can vividly recall this tale of half-hearted attempts and claims of raising the tide for all ships but what happens when communities do not have ships to ride that tide? We are

exhausted from the continued 'gift' giving to western academia (Tsosie et al., 2021). The greater good leaves room for the deepest shadows.

Tribes are not simply agents to be acted upon. Tribes exercise their sovereignty in research methods (Kovach, 2009; Running Wolf & Rickard, 2003), community engagement (Belone & Werito, 2022; Hiratsuka et al., 2020), and partnerships (Hiratsuka et al., 2020; Reedy, Blanchard, et al., 2020; Reedy, Orr, et al., 2020). Federally recognized tribes are sovereign nations and maintain autonomy concerning their citizens. As sovereign nations, tribes are taking action to address their own health issues.

Indigenous Methodologies differ from critical theory and qualitative methods. Indigenous methodologies are trees that grew separate from the western purview of research and existed before colonial settlers arrived (Kovach, 2009). Indigenous methodologies do not exist in a vacuum but grow and adapt even in the face of colonizing agents of western research. We see an alternative path to ways of knowing that is still based off observation but situated in the community's ideals, culture, and ambitions. Indigenous methodologies stem from traditional teachings.

We discussed briefly the various tensions surrounding Indigenous research and methodologies continue this complexity. The academy has strong roots in western ideas and systems of knowledge creation. We can fill volumes of western inquiry whether post-positivist, constructivism, or critical. Critical theory

challenges the hegemony and seeks an alternative to colonial power structures but in some ways, it is a reaction. Whereas Indigenous methodologies are a true challenge to hegemony because they are developed outside of it (Kovach, 2009). Separate from western knowledge creation, Indigenous methodologies have been developed, applied, and passed on beyond the origin of western ideology.

With the application of Indigenous ways of knowing, we see tribes utilizing their own methodologies in health, governance, and research (Jacob, 2014). I am not here to convince people about the legitimacy of Indigenous ways of knowing through the lens of western academia. We already discussed the short comings of western research couched in settler colonial ideology and practices. Like all community-based research, it needs to come from the community.

Another way Tribes are enacting sovereignty is through their policies and implementation of Institutional Review Boards (IRB). Several tribes have created their own IRBs to determine which research is appropriate for their communities (Around Him et al., 2019; Ketchum & Meyers, 2018). This safeguarding facilitates tribal agency in maintaining their own research agenda and only engaging in research that is beneficial to their community.

Indigenous methodologies are not stagnant. Just like how Native peoples have adapted to settler colonialism, so do their methodologies. Indigenous knowledge systems developed separate from western ideologies which gives a unique perspective to the human experience. Indigenous methodologies can also

respond to western ideas without being completely reactive in their foundation. Indigenous methodologies and partnerships can work together to achieve Tribal needs. Partnerships take form with universities, government entities, or other Tribes (Ransom & Ettenger, 2001). Partnerships elevate Tribal communities on the same level as their partners in terms of power. Partnerships thrive when the outside party respects the Tribe's sovereignty, authority, and autonomy. The question does not become what the researcher gets out of relationship but how does the Tribe benefit. Equitable relationships face the challenge of historically disparate relationships, and Tribes need to be supported in amending this dynamic.

Partnerships are a step in the right direction. Resources that Tribes might need can be provided through these partnerships and improving the academia through Indigenous ways of knowing can be a complimentary cycle. The issue in the past was the disregard for Indigenous peoples and their methods but with a rise in critical scholarship and an emphasis on community engagement, we see a path that improves both parties. We will discuss current partnerships in the next subsection.

I argue that Native and western academic ways of knowledge creation are not competing ideologies but tools in a toolbox. I view these approaches to meaning making in a pragmatic approach. The community, historically, has been underrepresented and merely a subject. Some call for a shift towards those

narratives. Academic research does bring tools to analyze narratives. Scholars writing literature reviews is just like community members seeking elders (Israel et al., 2020).Research was not invented by western practices (Wilson, 2008). Native and Academia add to our understanding of health disparities. Instead of viewing the two paradigms as competing, I want to place them as complementary. Because Indigenous research responds to colonial structures, we witness a colonial entanglement. A colonial entanglement is when a colonial system, structure, or resource is interwoven into the fabric of Indigenous identity and culture (Dennison, 2012). Separating it completely would mitigate the path communities have traveled, adversities they have faced, and hurdles they have overcome. For example, separating Oklahoma Tribes that were relocated would not change the adaptations the various communities had to use to survive. Indigenous methods that had to adapt to overcome oppression and escape erasure provide valuable insight and resilience.

Any researcher working with Native tribes needs to address their own biases in their work. Biases take different forms. We see this with placing the narrative in the minority community (Dutta, 2007). We also see this championed by Ethical, Legal, and Social Implications Research (ELSI) research (Blacksher et al., 2021). I am half Navajo and half European descent. I cannot unmake the genetic information that exists in my body. I am the embodiment of a colonial entanglement. My father was a part of an Indian-exchange program that relocated

him during the school year to Utah to gain a colonizer-sanctioned education. While at school, he met my mother and eventually 9 children were born. I cannot separate the DNA or the cultural integration of my mother and father. Without colonialism, I would not exist, and other significant tribal practices would also be non-existent.

Communities need to be involved with each step of research (Israel et al., 2010; Macaulay et al., 2011). Some approaches only include aspects of research that includes the community but that does not advance health equity. Tribal support needs better research. One core tenant of community based-participatory research (CBPR) is a more holistic approach to research. First principle of CBPR, recognition of the community which addresses the issues of representation of data. Knowing the community, we can come to know their needs. How can a researcher support a community if they do not know the people they are working with? Community based participatory-based research (CBPR) champions a more robust partnership with community. Research cannot be one-sided messages aimed to 'fix' a community.

Research is dynamic, just like interpersonal relationships. Another core element of CBPR is community participation in all aspects through the entire research process; this is mandatory to fostering health equity. Trust is built when the researcher and the community see one another as partners. Partners imply a degree of mutual respect and power. We secede authority and gain equality in the

research process. Research in CBPR needs to lead to the empowerment of communities. Dropping money into an impoverished community does not solve larger disparities. We know disparities can compound together. Empowering the community helps the community address their issues and find solutions. We can avoid a savior complex and treat the community as an equal.

To some, the CBPR is insufficient to realistically approach the needs of communities (Dutta, 2008). The critiques surrounding CBPR is in its formation and goals. The goals of a CBPR might not always grow from the community but approaches the issue with a western agenda. Funding sometimes is external and that is a consideration when working in with Tribal partners. The culture sensitive approach (CSA) is what Dutta argues is like the approach CBPR uses. The goals and resources flowing from outside sources come with outside values attached to it. The intent might not seem diabolical or problematic, but the values remain. The helicopter comes in and tells the community what the issues are but, in a CSA, the helicopter hovers close to the ground. The researcher can grab cultural markers to make their messages more persuasive to the researcher's goal. If we follow the core principles of CBPR, I argue we avoid a CSA since the formation, implementation, and evaluation remain with the community. The end products of the research might belong to the researcher and adds to their curriculum vitae and prestige. The critique is fair since not all benefits remain with the community but especially if we only include parts of the CBPR.

The CCA (Dutta, 2008) seeks the voices of the subaltern (Dutta, 2006) and give voice to the voiceless (Dutta, 2007). We know that Native Populations are marginalized, and their voices can be challenged or silenced. For example, The North Dakota Access Pipeline Indigenous voices were silenced. The pipeline was originally going to go through a white community who successfully lobbied to have it rerouted. Again, the tensions seem to come to who defines help and harm and who does the system work for. The issue was the pipeline was going through Native lands even though the tribal members lobbied against it as well. The structures in place followed the letter of the law but the strings were pulled in favor of the white community. To create health equity, we need to address power imbalances within current systems. Disparities are preventable but to prevent these issues, we need to know where there are breaks in the line.

A CCA seeks the community members and asks what issues or problems they have. The identification of the problem can also stem with community members coming to larger institutions with the worries and concerns. These grassroots approaches tend to be highly effective (Dutta, 2008; Zoller & Dutta, 2008). The people living in their community know about the hardships, challenges, and trials they face. The community knows that the reason they do not have a healthy diet is the lack of healthy options in a desert location reservation. Not only does problem identification happen in the community but so do the solutions. CCA prioritizes the community over the researcher. The pendulum of

44

research swings towards the community but this alienates a middle ground of knowledge creation.

An effective way to increase equity in health research is to treat that community's knowledge creation as equal to western academia. One way to improve collaborative research is through Tribally Driven Participatory Research (TDPR). We see TDPR retains important elements of CBPR community empowerment, full tribal participation, and capacity building (Christopher et al., 2008; Fisher & Ball, 2002, 2003; Mariella & Carter, 2009) The deviation between the two satiates Dutta's (2007) critique of CBPR. The formative parts of health research come from the tribe. The tribe is acting sovereign on how they want to identify, address, and report their work. The power and the voice remain with the tribe. The TDPR also satiates the worry of focusing on Native ways of knowing exclusively. The option remains with the tribe to bring in outside voices and perspectives into their research (Mariella & Carter, 2009). The research is not passive to the community but emphasizes the participatory need of TDPR.

A short coming of CCA, and the forsaking of outside influence, is that it often means neglecting outside resources as well. Developing and implementing research is expensive. In CBPR, we can see funding being granted to research designs and then working with communities. The dialogue before indicates a partnership but the worry of outside influence on research goals remains. To avoid outside value systems being forced upon the community, a CCA

45

perspective would avoid those types of institutions and entities (Dutta, 2011).

This can leave much needed funding out of the equation. With TDPR, we can

formulate needs of the community through the community and access the

structures in place to receive funding to achieve tribal goals of research. We flip

the script. To get funding, we do need to substantiate a need for the community,

but TDPR really encourages a grassroots approach which helps participatory

research.

What can institutions do to foster equity? How can we encourage and

grow this type of research? I draw upon the example of the Center for the Ethics

of Indigenous Genomic Research (CEIGR) as a combination of CBPR and TDPR.

The establishment of partnerships is essential to any community engagement. The

resources pooled together by the CEIGR consortium and grant funding helps

multiple tribal agencies and offer transparency to funding to the parties

involved(Blacksher et al., 2021). We know that different tribes have different

needs and generalizable information is difficult with our deficiency in accurate

data, but we can garner transferable data that could help inform further research in

different communities. The knowledge creation is shared across a variety of

settings but that only comes from trust.

The definition we take on health disparities is problematic. We may see

societal and cultural factors that attribute to individual health and behavior, but it

is through this shortcoming of this definition that we can rectify those disparities.

We may be tempted to look at individual behavior as the cause of disparities, but we are working with communities that predate the formation of western academia. By looking at culture as a vehicle to address disparities (Airhihenbuwa, 1995), we can approach health and equity in a holistic way.

We transition to a potential methodological framework to draw upon. Sa'ah Naaghai Bik'eh Hozho (SNBH) is the belief that we are part of nature and that when things become unbalanced, we can come back into balance. That process, SNBH, is how we can correct the imbalances that have been struck in our lives (Nez, 2018). Imbalances can occur when someone else does something to us, when our environment changes, or through our own actions. Looking at mental health with SNBH, we differentiate the western medicinal perspective to view mental health as a holistic issue (Gone & Trimble, 2012). The imbalance in tribal disparities stems from actions done to, with, and from us. To reach health equity, we need to rebalance the world that we live in. Using TBPR, we can right the scales of Indigenous scholarship on par with academia. We can engage communities and seek understanding of their reality to identify those imbalances that can ripple through generations and communities.

Partnerships

Unethical research in medical, academic, and governmental capacities oversimplifies the constrained relationship tribes have with western approaches to knowledge creation. Broken treaties, structural racism, sanctioned genocide is

47

added upon the distrust and hesitancy tribes hold. Regardless, Tribes continue to enact their sovereignty. We see a transition from being research subjects to governing research on their own terms. Research is now conducted by or with instead of upon. Research is not a passive process to these communities.

Collaboration matters. The tribal sovereignty enacted through research is an important foundation for any collaboration conducted with non-majority populations. The actions and decisions made by Indigenous communities possess transferable frameworks and qualities that can benefit the subaltern.

Research is utilizing ways we can create health equity. I argue that Community-Based participatory research (CBPR), the Culture-Center Approach (CCA), and Tribally Driven Participatory Research (TDPR) all are paths researcher institutions can effectively partner with AI/IN communities to advance health equity. The principles in each approach help address the issues of disparity in AI/IN communities.

Past research earns the title Helicopter Research (Hodge et al., 1996) regarding working with study-communities. The helicopter approach follows a process: come in, view from above, collect data, and leave with snapshots of the community. The researcher never touches the ground, and the study-community is forgotten after the ride. Bad research like the case against Arizona State University followed western protocol but left the community vulnerable and exploited. Samples were taken from the Havasupai tribe was used for multiple

studies and garnered mistrust among study-communities (Burhansstipanov, 1998; Hodge et al., 1996; Macaulay et al., 1998). Not only were disparities in these communities not addressed, but the resources also used to "help" never reached that ideal.

To effectively partner, we need to understand the need for it. Traditional western, heteropatriarchal, capitalist approaches often define Indigenous communities as needing help because they do not conform to prescribed ideals. Indigenous peoples have several examples that showcase how that "help" provided by governments, missionaries, and academics have caused compounding harm (Dennison, 2012; Richard, 2021). This work is proposing a correction to this by shifting the power of who gets to define help and harm and what that looks like. Not only Indigenous peoples but also other minority populations.

Deliberation theory is a shift from problematic structures. Democratic deliberation, an approach to stakeholder engagement that emphasizes community perspectives. Public deliberation convenes people from diverse backgrounds and engage in reflection and dialogue in search of collective solutions. The deliberation planning process and design are informed by frameworks of group deliberation and community-based participatory research, which share integral egalitarian values (Blacksher et al., 2021). With CEIGR, an NHGRI-funded Center of Excellence in Ethical, Legal and Social Impacts of Research (ELSI), helps bring together academic and community partners to help community

49

members deliberate on ethical genomic research. The deliberations were collaboratively designed with tribal leadership and extensive partner input and involvement in the deliberations.

Each deliberation poses different, locally relevant questions about varies topics. but used the same deliberation structure and measures to gauge the quality and experience of deliberation (Blacksher et al., 2021; Chambers, 2003; Hiratsuka et al., 2020; Reedy, Blanchard, et al., 2020). Public deliberations research has several foci, but I am narrowing in on the experiences of community members involved with the creation and implementation of deliberative events. Deliberation Scholarship is often oriented towards the participants in the deliberation process: presentations, questions and answers, and the discussion while increasing civic engagement with community issues and concerns. Evaluations often are outcome oriented, but we can gain valuable insight by looking at the process (Gastil et al., 2012). The point behind deliberation draws our focus to these communicative experiences. I want to focus on the experiences of community researchers that enabled the deliberations. Deliberation is complex and requires several moving parts. Planning is a critical component of a successful deliberation. The degree of planning required is extensive in resources, such as time, money, community responsibilities, and research fatigue. The deliberation information generated at these events can help shape a community's perception (and vice versa) about policy and lawmaking, which in turn can lead to

the creation, amending, or termination of policies or laws (Chambers, 2003; Fishkin, 1991; Gastil, 2000).

Community member collaborators are an integral part of the creation, implementation, and evaluation of deliberation. Still members of the community but bearing a larger role in the development of these deliberations, we inquire further into their experiences, before, during, and after the deliberations. We can further improve upon deliberations and community-based research and move towards a mixed-methods evaluation; qualitative and Indigenous. Their experiences are not often the focus of deliberation reporting and community members have an active role in the deliberation. The distinctive insight to the needs of their community combined with their role in the totality of the deliberation offers a unique area for examination.

This dissertation wants to step into that area that is often missed in deliberation, and health communication. The ground between researcher and community member. Knowledge creation is prominent in Indigenous communities and health communication scholarship. The meeting of the two is where a solid bridge for the upcoming generation of Indigenous and communication scholars can be built. Little is explored with Indigenous methodology in health communication and in civic deliberative inquiry. In this dissertation, we can begin bridging two gaps, or at least, begin the construction.

CHAPTER IV

MIXING METHODS

I was sitting in a graduate level course. The conversation was a mixture of arguments, raised voices, and a determined instructor to emphasize the importance of quantitative methods. The choice of tools, philosophical underpinnings, and the devout argumentation urged us forward to the heated debate. Sitting in the class, my keyboard clacked, and hands continued to raise. I gingerly raised my hand, "Where would you classify Indigenous methods?" The question was quickly answered with an air of dismissal. The answer pushed Indigenous methods into Critical or Interpretive research. I was not satisfied with the reasoning since it had elements of both but did not warrant a home in either.

Sitting there, I felt the painful memory when I first discovered I was different from my friends. A kid at the public swimming pool yelled at me to go back to my own country. The statement was incredibly aggressive, rude, and ignorant. I was too stunned to respond, mainly out of confusion. When I got home, I asked my siblings what to say to that. That is the first time I felt like I did not really belong. I was pushed into a category that did not fit me nor was it sufficient to describe my experience. I straddled two worlds with a foot in both, but a home in neither.

I felt this same way with my research in the first half of my graduate school experience. I was gently and sometimes forcefully pushed into a category that did not cover my experience. The research methods I wanted to use and would learn about later in my career did not easily fit into the paradigm prescribed by western typology. Through my experience, I started to see research holistically and that changed my views about researching, being the researcher, and what I researched. The process was a cycle to understand the world.

Cycle of Research

Research is based off observations (Tracy, 2013). Qualitative research is not different in that regard but prizes the data in a way that offers an alternative way of meaning making. Thinking of research methods as tools in a toolbox, we would not use a hammer for a screw, and we would not use a screwdriver for a hammer. If we think about the epistemological views of research on a continuum, post-positivist is in one area where we focus on a universal truth out there in the world and reality is constructed through the lived experiences of humans (Anderson & Baym, 2004). With knowledge creation, we can see a need for causality but what happens when we are dealing with a population that does not fit the normative curve? Some researchers argue qualitative research is anecdotal and it is non-representative (Anderson & Baym, 2004; Tracy, 2013). On the contrary, qualitative research is highly representative. The representation is not of the larger population but of the minority or the masters/disasters of the

communication phenomenon. Epistemologically, we look at the other end of the continuum of post-positivism and look at constructivism, reality is created and shared among people (Littlejohn & Foss, 2011). We construct reality within our experiences. For example, if we look at the biomedical model of health communication (Kim, 2010), we can come to understand cancer as a malformed biological status of tissue in the human body. The factors that go into cancer can help us identify causality and hopefully mitigate cancerous factors in our life. But to heave cancer is a different experience to the factors that lead to the disease.

My niece was 3 years old when they discovered a tumor on one of her kidneys. The cells were cancerous, and she underwent chemotherapy. Quantitative measures would not capture her experience of cancer or the community's response to this child in a small-town community. Cancer and the constructed reality and experience can be richly explored using qualitative research methods. We can observe the messages of support that the family received. We can observe the symbolic convergence of community members wearing items in her support and the meals prepared for my sister's family when they did not have enough time to cook food since they went to the doctor's office for her treatment. We can capture the reality of shaving our heads in solidarity with this scared 3-year-old. The long-lasting effects of cancer and potential stigmatization (Goffman, 1963) can help us build theory into the social understanding of sickness.

Quantitative research is to test theory while qualitative research is to build theory (Tracy, 2013). Qualitative research is not to determine causality. Qualitative research is to understand the meaning in the human experience. Because we are looking to build theory and explain relationships of meaning making, it would be inappropriate of qualitative research to claim causality. This does not mean it is anecdotal. Qualitative research seeks to find transferable qualities, not causality. Transferable indicates that themes and aspects of my niece's lived experience has potential to apply to other children that have been diagnosed with cancer. We build upon those experiences and continue to record those observations and explain their relationship.

Qualitative research looks at distinctive and exceptional cases. Millions of people go under cancer treatment but by narrowing it towards a specific group, we reach an area that the normative curve would harder to claim causality. Something about these cases in the tail ends of the curve provide insight into how to deal, understand, or construct the social reality that is presented. By looking at a 3-year-old's experience in a town of 1500 people, we may see distinction compared to other cancer experiences. We might have a smaller sample because we are not seeking causality but that allows us to dive deeper into the data. By understanding the connections between what is communicated to this child and a community's response to cancer, we can delve into those relationships to build our understanding of reality. Through this process, and by applying what we find to

other children, eventually we can start mapping out a model of what is happening or find transferable patterns that exist in this child's experience. We build the theory from this experience to discover what is important and what relationships matter. Once we have a road map of what is important, we can use quantitative methods to operationalize and test hypothesis about those relationships.

Research is a giant feedback loop and without qualitative research, we would not know where to find generalizable knowledge. From the tail ends, we can see relationships of meaning making in extremes. Not all qualitative research is created equally. We can increase the rigor of our qualitative research in several ways (Cresswell, 2007; Tracy, 2013). Tracy discusses the Big tent criteria but Creswell delves into specific rigor improving practices. There is some overlap, and Cresswell (2007) calls for at least two rigor improving strategies and I discuss four that I think are beneficial to my line of research: rich data, multiple entry points, member checking, and acknowledging biases.

We established qualitative methods build theory while quantitate tests it. Creswell (2007) and Denscombe (2008) and Chatwood et al. (2015) all call for a mixed method approach to research. We do see a climb in mixed method usage, but the commitment is a daunting task. We employ multiple approaches to pragmatically seek a holistic approach. If we want to draw upon epistemological and ontological philosophies, I argue mixed methods seeks to understand as fully

as possible the meaning making, relationships between meanings, and potential causality of meanings.

Before I explain the importance of qualitative research in a mixed methods approach, I find it expedient to answer reasons mixed methods are not employed. Mixed methods require resources, time, money, personnel, etc. Time, for instance, is an academics greatest enemy. We practice under the idiom of "Publish or Perish". Though mixed methods might give us a more robust understanding of reality and potential universal truths, we are on a time crunch. The time to do a good mixed methods research project is a gamble on a person's career. If a mixed methods project is completed, researchers might segment it into several papers to get more mileage out of their hard work. We see an exchange of quantity over quality. The research in the segmented papers is not bad work but is less than the combined project. Drawbacks do exist. There is the argument, "instead of doing two different studies half-way, why not do one study really well." This argument is flawed in the conception of good research. Though we may be dividing resource and energy to different types of methods, this does not reduce the quality. The extra time to conduct a great mixed method is already calculated into the work. We do not have to sacrifice quality of our work to seek multiple ways of knowing. I argue it is more efficient to address multiple questions at the same time.

Challenging as mixed methods might be, pragmatically, I need it in my research. If I am to work with Indigenous populations or minorities (not always mutually exclusive), I might have several shareholders in the research I am conducting. I have a stake in the research. The community I am working with and the institution I work for have a stake. Those actors in this narrative influence what research questions and hypothesis I develop. The institution might want to see causal research into health behaviors, but the community wants to develop an Indigenous way of meaning making health concepts. If I am to holistically approach the needs of a community, a mixed methods approach is simple choice. I have limited time but taking extra time now, I can answer two questions at once in a single project. The answer is simple, but this does not mean easy.

Qualitative research role helps me understand the depth of my community's meaning making. We can develop specialized ways of knowing and develop transferable qualities that could help other similar communities. Qualitative research informs the connections between meaning making. Pragmatically, we do not live in a paradigm of exclusive post-positivism or constructivism. Either end can help answer imperative questions to a tribe, the individual, and to the researcher. If we are to use a Culture Centered Approach (CCA) (Dutta, 2006, 2007), it would be inappropriate to bring in solutions to a community from an academic position. By working with the community, we can qualitatively ascertain important values, and practices, while edifying our

understanding how communities would address the problem. Through the community we can build an approach that is from within their human experience and operationalize those concepts to measure what the community hopes to measure.

I argue that mixed methods are paramount to the future of research (Creswell, 2007; Denscombe, 2008; Tracy, 2013). Community engagement is a continuum of best practices in AI/AN communities. The best way to be persuasive or effect in a community is to have a stake in the process. People are more likely to help if they are a part of it. I am more committed if I have a stake. I argue that one of the most powerful aspects of Mixed Methods is humility. Humility is required for mixed methods. The researcher has a lot of power in most research situations. The researcher has the voice, resources, and influence. Researcher expertise reigns dominate in disagreements with the community in a not-so-distant past. Humility secedes degrees of that power. What sacrifices do we make to follow one path exclusively? Mixed methods are the pragmatic approach; using a single method is not efficient. My experience is not king and should be flexible, just like my methods. Stalwartly following one method can lead us to sacrifice what the community might want, need, or desire. Concessions made in behest of our own agenda is part and partial to distrust among communities and researchers.

Democratic principles can help transition western conceptions into a new, holistic understanding of community needs. This is not new to Tribes but spoken differently. For example, there is not a lot of Native Languages that have a word for conservation. The idea of conserving is not something conceptualized. Conserving is a tertiary outcome to maintaining a balanced environment. Non-native plants came from somewhere, just like colonial structures that have transitioned into colonial entanglements, but they do have a place in the new ecosystem. We must understand how it fits now and how to adapt it to make sure it adds to the new landscape. Separating the system from the community does not solve how the system was broken and runs the risk of repetition (Dennison, 2012). Qualitative research sometimes faces the criticism that it produces anecdotal and non-representative findings.

The SNBH is a complex system of knowledge that seeks balance between two paradigms; Beautiful Way (Hózhóójii-female) and Protection Way (Naayée' k'egho-male), with hózhó at its core (Nez, 2018). Looking at the two paradigms of western democracy and Indigenous ways of knowing, we can seek a balance that leads to a harmonious way of life. This methodology is my structure for understanding community deliberation collaborators. The reason I want to use this includes the teaching directive SNBH is used. If we see research to connect, teaching is another way we can learn and grow. Knowledge acquisition with

61

different names give it different capacities and being flexible is how we can best approach Indigenous Communication Research.

A common assumption is that we engage in mixed methods when we include qualitative and quantitative research methods. But we do not adhere to a typical understanding of mixed methods. Another method has entered the chat: Indigenous research methods. By using the model created from the thematic analysis, we can help elaborate the transformation civic deliberative events underwent within and Indigenous context. The strength of those different layers depends on the findings. Say we see a large portion of emphasis and member checked findings point to individual commitments.

The evaluative framework is constructed with community researchers. We need to determine what is deemed improvement and combine Native ways of knowing and academic ways of measuring or vice versa (Sprain et al., 2014; Sprain & Reinig, 2018). Their comments drove the structure of the evaluation from their interviews and their experiences (Running Wolf & Rickard, 2003). Evaluating the Indigenous Deliberation was less on the success of the deliberation but on the decision of the community-driven gathering.

We are seeking the transformation of deliberation. We see it used and adapted by Indigenous communities and now we seek to transfer these processes beyond individual Tribes. We enter the community as partners and not experts to lead them from their troubles. We do not need a messiah complex in Indigenous

Deliberations. We construct a framework using qualitative and Indigenous experiences and refine it into transferable themes. The sample might be deemed anecdotal because we are using a highly specific population to develop this model, but we can develop a transferable model that could apply to other communities. This deliberation was the first of its kind and set a precedence for future deliberations. The first one set a tone that others followed and understanding how the partnership came together on this deliberation informs repeatable steps to follow or avoid.

Realistically, we have a lot of stakeholders in this project. For that reason, we need a mixed methods approach. Since we are a part of the process, beginning to end, we can see how the meaning making of this community is grown, sustained, and cultivated. Since we are a part of each step, we can see what works and what does not work. The holistic approach to research empowers the people we are working with more so than an individualistic approach. We increase our Indigenous and qualitative rigor through multiple data points of entry. We encapsulate the need of the researcher, tribal institutions, and the community with the power of how the deliberation unfolded (Archibald, 2008) which holds similar principles to member checking (Creswell, 2007). The wonderful thing about member-checking is that we don't have to wait until the results are written to check back with community members if things are making sense or working. We can be the tool to help iterate the meaning making and Indigenous

Deliberative Model based upon the community's experiences (Siu & Stanisevski, 2012). Though it would take extra time to conduct this project, we are morally inclined in our relationship with the community. We can work with community members to form this model and hopefully utilize it in future deliberations. The goal is capacity building.

Mixed methods are not a clash of paradigms. We need to see it as a community of practices (Denscombe, 2008). Different questions require different methods but the theoretical feedback loop, we can see the process in a microcosm in our mixed methods research. Because of Covid, deliberation research has had to evolve. Planning and implementation are conducted virtually until Covid restrictions lax. The way research is conducted is also changing to fit the new norm of the era of Zoom. The technological affordances given by Zoom comes with gives and takes. We now have access to larger distances between communities to meet regularly. Flexibility in physical location can be seen as a boon in community leader outreach. Zoom does limit important nonverbal aspects of communication and the immediacy of in-person communication can create a disconnect between participants (Kinney, 2012). The situation affords this project an opportunity to tap into the network of Indigenous Deliberation on an International stage.

Reason to mix with Indigenous ways of knowing, without the context of CEIGR training, I would be less equipped to understand the content.

Autoethnography can be utilized to align storytelling and experiences in a contextualized manner (Archibald, 2008). Autoethnography as an Indigenous method combines the lived experience of a partner that is both Indigenous but also in the realm of academia. The meaning making occurring in these spaces can be difficult to connect and interpret if a person is not familiar with these spaces and places.

Goal

The purpose behind this dissertation is to explore how Chickasaw Nation improved the deliberation process. Chickasaw Nation's deliberation is a foundational cornerstone to future uses of enclave deliberation. The purpose behind this project is to improve the deliberation process for Indigenous communities that would want to use this method in ascertaining needs, concerns, and questions that a community might need. We discussed how Indigenous ways of knowing predate western publications of knowledge creation and that each derive from different foundations. The building of this project was intended to prioritize the needs of Chickasaw Nation. I want to know how deliberation is utilized efficiently, ethically, and effectively.

The steps of this project iteratively informed the findings. The transcripts guided what to ask and follow up in the interviews and the interviews influenced evaluation of the transcripts. I went back and forth between each. The cyclical nature informed the decision making and behavior in the deliberations by the

65

community facilitators. Deliberation decisions required time and knowledge about the community. The right question to a western trained researcher might be redundant to the community. I used transcripts from the deliberations conducted in 2018 to guide my interview questions and analysis in the roles and decisions of dual-role researchers. The crux of the deliberation required community members in the planning and execution. Their voices and experiences are where I found transferable themes that can help other communities alter future deliberations to fit their needs.

Adhering to CBPR and TBPR principles, each step of this methods section is under meticulous review. Following the preproposal with committee members and a year's worth of collaborative meetings with members of the CEIGR team and community partners, we reach this pathway to bolstering Indigenous Communication. Indigenizing Western methodologies by identifying what is similar, different, and how those components can be best fitted to benefit the community through the community's needs.

A top-down approach to community issues leaves out important contextual and cultural dialogue and understanding. Here is the intersection in communication and Indigenous scholarship I want to strengthen: native voices and collaborative research combined to improve future deliberations and to generate long lasting relationships with the communities I hope to work.

We need to keep asking these questions in health communication and deliberation. Unfortunately, Indigenous research methods and approaches to health communication are minimal. I aim to increase Indigenous research in communication. Tribal implementation and alteration of deliberation is not only necessary but helps further health communication as a community-based endeavor. Theoretical, and practical. Indigenizing health communication making the case for doing this project and the kinds of questions you hope to address from a health communication perspective. We see theoretical and practical transitions in health communication in this project. Indigenizing health and community engagement programs will bring an emphasis of communication theory in a non-western paradigm. We part from a multicultural lens to a specific cultural perspective and prioritizing the communities needs and wants. Instead of doing this on Indian Country we transition to 'this is being done by Indian country.

Future applications of these findings include an Indigenous Deliberation model toward a) using the framework to help implement other Indigenous Deliberations, b) evaluating previous research conducted in collected Indigenous data and consultation, (i.e. All of Us program), and c) creating a foundation for Indigenous communication literature that builds upon deliberation theory. The timeline of this project is reliant on the needs of the communities I am working with and adherence to the various research protocols put in place by those Tribes and institutions.

CHAPTER V

DATA, METHODS, AND MORE

Attendance for the GEN meeting had a combination of 14 different profiles: students, leadership team members, and the guest speaker. I was writing down important phrases in jumbled notes on a Word document. We reached a time for sharing as this community blossomed across cable and wires. I was in my position as a Research Scientist with CEIGR and working mostly with the GEN program. I knew the next leadership meeting was going to change things. I watched as these students opened and connected with the speaker. Professional connections are sometimes perceived sterile, but this interaction was deeper.

The conversation continued after the Guest left. Students talked about the speaker and their words. To summarize, this was going to change how they communicate, interact, and think. The silent text messages between leadership members were full of excitement and relief. I knew in that moment that we needed the Native Students' experiences to know how to improve this program. The GEN program was designed for them but adapted with them. We were in a western University but had carved out an Indigenous space. This is when I realized this is how we improve deliberation. This is how we Indigenize a western concept. We find it in the community, with the community, and do our best to keep doing it for the community.

Research Design

I have spent the last four years with CEIGR and GEN growing into a

researcher: first as a graduate student, to a research assistant, then a research

scientist, and currently a PhD candidate.

Qualifications for my research abilities stem from the tutelage of mentors, and

literature through this consortium. Through the trainings, conversations, literature

reviews, and observations, we come to the following research questions:

RQ1: How does the dual-role researcher plan, facilitate, and implement

deliberation?

RQ2: How is the deliberation process altered to meet community needs?

RQ3: How does the deliberation process contribute to and/or hinder

sovereignty?

To answer these questions, I used three sets of data to find themes within the

Chickasaw Nation deliberations and their community researchers: Transcript from

the deliberations from 2018, interviews with the dual-role researchers, and

autoethnographic observations. I selected these data sources over the past 2 years.

The following is the step-by-step process, in a linear explanation of the steps this

project followed. A further explanation why this project is not necessarily linear

follows these procedures.

First, each step of data collection required approval from Chickasaw

Nation Health Department Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the University of

Oklahoma's IRB before collecting any data. Ethical and effective research with any sovereign nation requires this as a baseline, not a ceiling. Any other requests or decisions with publishing or dissemination of results is through the purview of Chickasaw Nation and requires approval thereof.

Second, I received the transcripts from the research team of the 2018 deliberation. The transcripts were the two-day deliberation conducted in 2018 with Chickasaw Nation citizens. The purpose behind the analysis of the transcripts was to analyze and observe the communication used by the dual-role researchers. Two facilitators were present during the deliberations: a Chickasaw Nation community member and citizen and the other was an academic partner. My focus is on the community-facilitator.

Third, with the deliberation transcripts, I used the emerging themes to help inform and bolster the interview questions. Looking over the transcripts repeatedly, I grouped speech acts of the facilitator and grouped similar speech acts together. The constant comparative analysis of the dual-role researcher's communicative roles is the crux of the transcripts. Transcript analysis was done before interviews and again after interviews. I sandwiched the interviews with the transcripts to give offer a fresh set of eyes on the transcripts and then to give more context to emerging themes. This follows several of Cresswell (2007) practices of qualitative rigor.

Fourth, I used semi-structured interviews to explore the dual-role researchers experience, role, communication, and insights. The interview questions are found in Appendix A. The interview questions were developed from the literature review and autoethnographic experience surrounding deliberation. The questions were written before access to the transcripts. Extra questions were added, and the previous questions improved with the findings derived from the transcripts.

Fifth, to answer RQ2 and RQ3, I conducted a thematic analysis of the deliberation process. Answering these questions is facilitated by the interview questions. The conversations with the dual-role researchers are how we address the changes necessary to make deliberation work for their needs.

Finally, we get the synthesized results of dual-role researcher communication and roles with the deliberation process. Implementing my experience as an Indigenous researcher but also coming from the academy, I explore the complexities and implications of the dual-role researcher. This is how we improve deliberation.

Process to Procedures

This project went through various iterations in concert with consultations including members of CEIGR, Chickasaw Nation, mentors, and partners. The evolution of this project is an echo of how I want to do research with Tribal

nations. Research is a learning process and only through careful consideration, conversation, and direction did I reach this dissertation.

Each step of this process focuses on The Chickasaw Nation's deliberation because they are the forerunner of Indigenous deliberation. Chickasaw Nation deliberations is the first Indigenous collaborated enclave deliberation recorded. It is through the insights from community facilitators, analyzing community facilitator communication during the deliberation, and connecting the praxis and the theory with CEIGR experiences. I approached this design with multipronged purpose. Blacksher (et al., 2021) notes the importance of community members in the deliberation. Deliberation often uses heterogenous recruitment that is tied by a common factor. The factor this time was the Tribal community. The adaptations to make these enclave deliberations work is part of the focus for this research. Previous scholars call for similar adjustments to meet situational needs (Gastil, 2018; Gastil et al., 2017; Knobloch et al., 2014) but the needs for this deliberation were centralized in the community. We see a community centered approach to deliberation that is collaboratively created and implemented. The topics discussed for the deliberation were determined by the community researchers. The people within, working for, and wanting to help their community is an integral part of the deliberation's success.

Participants

I interviewed all three of the community researchers from the Chickasaw Nation Deliberation, all of whom helped with the design and implementation of the deliberation and one of whom served as a co-facilitator during the gathering. We lack research focused on community as dual-role researchers. Dual-role researchers are community members that straddle the divide between western and Indigenous roles. The negotiation between the two roles while working with outside entities to facilitate research is a constant reality and sometimes struggle. Working with CEIGR, I further noticed the importance of dual-role researchers being integral to community engaged research.

By working with the Indigenous community members that helped facilitate the genomic deliberative events in their communities, I interviewed those that helped shape and implement the deliberative event. I intend to use these interviews to adapt future Indigenous deliberations to the needs of that community. In collaboration with the Center for the Ethics of Indigenous Genomic Research (CEIGR), we know studying Deliberation as a process is helpful in progressing democratic principles and ideals. There is a dearth of Indigenous Deliberation experts. Their experience is needed and having three different sites conducting these deliberations is incredible. Starting with those community collaborators and conducting a Snowball sample, we can reach most Indigenous Deliberation experts in follow-up research.

Recruitment was facilitated through email and virtual conversations with the lead researcher for the deliberation from Chickasaw Nation. We have intermittently talked about the importance of community, Indigenous spaces and places, and civic engagement. We see a need in deliberation scholarship to follow this process. We see a need for Indigenous scholarship to Indigenize systems of communication for the benefit of the community. We see a need to repair and improve upon partner relations. Through the community collaborators is where we see the wheel meet the road and we can see how these two worlds collide.

Rigor

Research is a giant feedback loop and without qualitative research, we would not know where to find generalizable knowledge. From the tail ends, we can see relationships of meaning making in extremes. Not all qualitative research is created equally. We can increase the rigor of our qualitative research in several ways (Cresswell, 2007; Tracy, 2013) Tracy discusses the big tent criteria but Creswell delves into specific rigor improving practices. There is some overlap, and Creswell (2007) calls for at least two rigor improving strategies and I will discuss four that I think are beneficial to my line of research: rich data, multiple entry points, member checking, and acknowledging biases.

This dissertation is three pronged: transcripts from the Chickasaw deliberation from 2018, interviews with community researchers and facilitators, and autoethnographic observations. The past four years has placed me in a unique

position with CEIGR to see how theory and praxis intertwined to help support communities. The process to get to this project was long but necessary.

The interviews were used to inquire about decisions behind planning, in the moment thoughts, perceptions and observations, as well as post deliberation experiences. The transcripts helped inform about the dual-role researchers' part in the deliberative event. I asked about recruitment, items, or prompts that needed to be adapted, or changed. Deliberation is a time intensive process. To fully guarantee qualitative rigor criteria, through the interviews I used member checking, and extended time with the data.

An important part of this project is the autoethnographic explorations. Each step angle surrounding the Indigenous deliberations give a new lens understand what worked and what needs to work. A post-positivist approach is not always an appropriate paradigm when working with communities. The tools that a post-positivist approach uses can be beneficial and helpful but the ideology behind those methods can be problematic to a CBPR approach. Separating oneself from the research and creating a distinct division puts a wedge between the researcher and the community. Because of my involvement with CEIGR, the processes to undergo a deliberation is like watching a textbook unfold. The difference is this textbook is also being written. It is through the experience of my partnership with CEIGR that I unique understanding to how and why this project is important. Translating this experience is difficult but unique through the eyes of

someone learning firsthand about this partnership, and project. Experiential

learning while also coupled with rigorous academic research is how I developed

this project and plan to progress my research lines. Recreating that path is part of

knowledge creation.

Rich data is one of the biggest ways we can improve qualitative research.

Rich data is how we differentiate from quantitative research. Data and ogres are

very similar to one another; they both have layers. Rich data includes

familiarization with that data. We need to take an adequate amount of time in our

data. A tennis player needs to be familiar with their equipment, the court, the

weather conditions, and their opponent. The equipment is knowing the process

and procedure of how you want to conduct your research. The court is knowing

the literature surrounding your research focus. The weather conditions are

understanding the factors surrounding the data you are collecting, such as: how

does my presence affect those I am researching, does the type of qualitative

research infringe on their livelihood, would I be able to come back and ask follow

up questions? The opponent is the situations where negative cases might appear.

Maybe alternative explanations of what you are seeing. All of these need to be

taken into consideration when developing and executing a research plan.

Evaluation and transformation of Deliberation covers gaps in deliberation

literature. Indigenous methods have familiar ground with critical and qualitative

research methods. Prioritizing the lived experience and putting the power in the

hands of the community, we can move toward a holistic approach to health research. We know evaluation in deliberation is difficult at best, but we can put the evaluation where it matters, in an Indigenous framework (Kovach, 2009). This dissertation prioritizes the community over the researcher and that is one of the most important ways to measure ethical research conducted with Tribal communities. I am using an Indigenous autoethnography to explore the complexities of Indigenous and academia collaborative research (Archibald, 2008). Storytelling and experience can be an Indigenous methodology that the closest comparison is autoethnography. This situates my background in this project as well as tempering it with qualitative interviews and transcripts to approach this research.

We need to ensure qualitative rigor. To obtain rich data, we need to be able to capture it. Multiple instances of data collection help us catch multiple angles of reality. Returning to the example of my niece's experience: we could do several collections of data to help us understand how people showed support to a child and what those acts meant to her and her family. We could do interviews with the family, neighbors and those that donated time/money. We could provide cameras to the family to create a visual diary of their experiences and gestures. We could also include open ended questions before and after chemo treatment to see how their experience and view of these kind gestures stay the same or change. This helps us with a term called crystallization (Creswell, 2007). Crystalline

structures are created with multiple lines and edges. By using multiple data entries, we can paint a clearer picture of the meaning making and the relationships between those meanings.

Member checking is another way we can increase the rigor of qualitative research. After we come up with our findings, we need to go back to the people that we are observing and researching and show them the results and findings. Through dialogue, we can check to see if the findings are an accurate representation of their reality. Criticism is drawn from this because we are giving members power where the researcher is the expert. The people we are working with might object to findings because it paints things in a negative light, or they disagree with the relationships. The purpose of member checking is to see if what we observed and constructed from the data represents what is present. Member checking does not mean we scrap what we found completely but maybe we are missing something: a connection, a factor, or an important data entry. Member checking helps us with validity of our findings because we can accurately represent the experience of those small-town folk that helped a young girl with cancer.

Qualitative researchers are the tool. Tools can be calibrated, break, or even be refined. Going into research, we understand that biases exist. We recognize those preceding factors. Instead of trying to cut those biases out like an infection or decontextualizing our positionality, we embrace it. Our experiences are valid

entry of knowledge creation, and it is through our experiences that we see the world. Coming to an R1 university for research, my horizon has expanded. I am the uncle of a young girl that had cancer. My attachment to my niece might make the kind gestures from neighbors more salient to my recollection. My mother is a nurse and so hospital terms and phrases are commonplace. I participated in the symbolic experience of cutting my hair off. Now there are legitimate concerns with embracing our biases. For specific reasons, we go Native. How can we see the forest if we are stuck behind a tree? Acknowledging our positionality does not take away from our qualitative research but gives it an extra layer to understand the context of the situation. We do not need to level our trees to see the forest but knowing where we stand in the forest can help us understand the trees around us more fully.

With these steps and checks for qualitative rigor, we can argue against the claims that qualitative research is anecdotal and non-representative. I am not saying qualitative research is better than quantitative methods; each method is suited for different tasks. A big argument against quantitative methods is the lack of external validity and the limitations of decontextualized research. We need to view these methodologies as a paradigm of common practices (Denscombe, 2008) and broaden our understanding of the roles these tools play in research.

This project was three pronged in Indigenous deliberations research. I interviewed the dual-role researchers from the Chickasaw Nation deliberation site

that was partnered with CEIGR. In conjunction with those interviews, I analyzed

and created a framework for future Indigenous deliberations on how to adapt

Deliberation to Indigenous needs. Finally, I explain the process with my

experience to better understand the nuance of this process. A constant

comparative analysis is used to create the evaluative framework but situated in

Indigenous ideologies to further improve the deliberative process.

Data Analysis

Because each tribe is different, I am not arguing that each Indigenous

framework is a catchall for Indigenous peoples. I need to reiterate that

transferable themes and qualities of these Indigenous Deliberations can and

should be adaptable to the needs and topics of the individual tribes (Carson &

Hartz-Karp, 2005). We are altering deliberative theory with a culture-centered

approach through a thematic analysis of three entry points. Indigenous

Deliberations are transformative, and I postulate that the steps feed into one

another.

Thematic analysis was used for the data. Thematic analysis is a systematic

constant comparison of the material and formulating overarching themes across

data. A thematic analysis is conducted in six phases: becoming familiar with the

data, generating codes, generating initial themes, reviewing themes, defining and

naming themes, and producing the report (Braun & Clarke, 2008). Each step is

derived from the data and the connections that create overarching themes. The

connection between themes provides important context for relationships in the data. Each step builds to produce themes that are potentially transferable.

Becoming familiar with the data is the first step in a thematic analysis. Building from within the data, a thematic analysis is reflexive. Themes can only be found if researchers are heavily engaged with the data. The goal in this first step is becoming familiarized with the data. Step one sets the groundwork to generating codes through rigorous notetaking. Phase two is an incremental identification and comprehension of codes. At this stage, specific codes are generated and detailed. Codes are specific while the themes are more inclusive and abstract.

Phase three is generating initial themes. The researcher starts identifying general themes through grouping codes that are similar (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2008, 2019). Codes converge into larger themes and subthemes to make sense of the data and its importance. The themes that are reported are dependent upon the research questions. At phase four, we review the themes and collapse or split the generated themes. A themes importance is based upon the research questions asked and how the codes are connected in the theme and how they relate to other themes. By looking over the past codes and themes, we reflectively cultivate the themes to be more precise and detailed.

Once reviewed, the next phase is naming and defining themes. A map is generated for the data so another person can navigate the text and identify the

themes present. We identify and explain the importance of the themes. The importance stems from the detailed account of the themes as well as their connections and inter-play with each other (Braun & Clarke, 2019). Dual-role researchers' experience was collected through three entries to provide a robust analysis on the themes surrounding the deliberation. The final two phases are best represented through the results and discussion portion of this dissertation. The final phase is writing up the report. The six phases of a thematic analysis were followed to identify themes within Indigenous Deliberation.

Through the interviews we can conduct a thematic analysis of common themes that Indigenizes the Deliberation process. As we progress through the six steps of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2008), which has built in rigor measures, we engage with the data deeply and richly. The reason I would use a thematic analysis instead of a grounded theory approach is because of the philosophical underpinnings of the two approaches. Grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) requires mutually exclusive categories and it can become problematic in representation of important themes. If we are judging importance by quantity and not quality, we should use Glasser and Straus' (1967) conceptualizing of grounded theory. Grounded theory would count all instances and is well suited for a content analysis to analyze the occurrence of themes. We could have a thousand feathers and a single lead ball, and the most important theme would be the feathers in a

grounded theory approach. A thematic analysis identifies all themes and the

relationships between those themes substantiate what the most important theme is

(Boyatzis, 1998). The single lead ball that is found could be the theme that helps

reduce suicide the most even though the thousand feathers are used by the larger

population. The qualitative approach to themes helps us identify important

findings that could lead to important relationships. The themes within the data are

weighed of importance by the community and mutually excluding these

categories might prioritize my positionality over the community.

CHAPTER VI

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The conference room was cool and the conversations light. This was the first time I was at the Health Facility in Ada, Oklahoma, and the first time I met Bobby, Christie, and Michael. We were visiting with GEN to talk about Chickasaw Nation's Tribal IRB. We were aflush with questions and conversation as we sat around the table. The voices were familiar, but the faces were new. I had conversed with them over CEIGR telecommunicated meetings.

As we sat around the conference room, we talked about a deliberation project that was recently conducted with Chickasaw Nation. We talked about the partnerships and how the entire project had to go through CN IRB. The focus of the Tribal IRB was to protect their citizens and was different from other institutional IRBs. Policy and practices discussed showed me a degree of community involvement that was part of their formation. The other GEN students followed up with excited conversations and we made connections to the conversations we were having in our trainings.

We were talking with employees of Chickasaw Nation. The research was directionally community driven. We even got to see where the deliberations were conducted. The theoretical and idealistic conversations about community-based research was and is being accomplished in this space and place. A seed was

planted; I saw a reality where two things from different origins exist in the same, non-competing moment. Change was a verb, not a distant ideal.

Thematic Analysis

Several overarching themes were found through the deliberation transcripts and interviews with community researchers. This chapter contains four parts in each theme: definition, timeline examples, role enactment, and larger implications. The three themes in Indigenous Deliberation are *Community Contextualization, Deliberant Support,* and *Equitable Partnerships*. I structured the discussion to answer the RQs and present the process in categorical segmentation. Below is the structure for each theme.

Part one is the definition. This includes a description about the theme surrounding Indigenous Deliberation. The definition between each differs. Each theme is interconnected and builds towards a cohesive Indigenous Deliberation. The community researcher perspective is prioritized in developing these themes. The definition is derived from iterative contact with the data and is reflective of the context and content presented in the transcripts.

In part two, I go through each part of the timeline and how the theme was enacted in each phase. The deliberation process happens over a period of time with markers that indicate a change. I broke the planning normally associated with deliberation into two parts since the interviews indicated that work was being done to set the foundation for the deliberation. Once deliberation was decided on

as a path forward, I talk about each theme regarding their import in the planning phase. This phase is where most decisions were made for the deliberative event. Personnel were added and roles negotiated to cover all the necessary bases a deliberation requires. Deliberation days is the time where the deliberants gathered, and the event unfolded. The day is usually the major focus of research and rightly so. Rich conversation is had, and the topic is delved deeply. The post-deliberation phase is where write-ups, distribution of results, and future research is planned. I refer to the deliberation process often regarding the overall timeline. I will refer to the specific phases by their designation here. I give the examples of the Indigenous Deliberation themes in the designated phases for linear clarity.

Part three is intertwined with part two since this is where the examples are given. I expound upon the roles of the community researchers and their importance surrounding the themes enacted. I needed to group the discussion in this way to adequately talk about the relationship between the themes and the dual-role researchers. When I first started out with the roles of the community facilitator, the community researchers, which I use synonymously, I did not know they had a hand in each deliberation step. Instead of going over their individual roles separately, I am going to talk about how each theme of Indigenous Deliberation is facilitated through their experiences, and communication. Indigenous Deliberation themes are found in each step of the deliberation process and only come to fruition because of the dual-role researcher.

INTERVIEWER: How were You involved with the deliberation process?

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: …So I have kind of that dual role. You know the research is occurring in my division. So I have I have to provide that administrative approval and seek Higher administrative approval, but as the IRB chair, I also have to make sure that this this project went through the Chickasaw Nation Department of Health Regular IRB because of the dual-role responsibilities community researchers must maintain, I explore how those roles translate in adapting the deliberation process to their community. processes, right? Just because it wasn't going in taking part in my division doesn't mean that I can bypass the regular IRB processes and so I've kind of had dual hats both as a participant in the research and also as the IRB chair.

The dual-role researcher, or community collaborator usually maintains several responsibilities but also maintains several audiences to consider. The collaborator is constantly juggling community, administrative, and academic responsibilities. Dual-role indicates multiple responsibilities.

Part four, connects the theoretical implications behind the theme and what needs it addresses. Part four is also intermingled because separating the theoretical implications, the role of the community researchers, as well as exemplifying the Indigenous Deliberation themes would be a disservice to the complexity and interconnections between each part.

88

The deliberation success and rigor were already determined previously (Reedy et al 2019), so we are looking at the community researchers' decisions and reasons behind observed success of the deliberation. A successful deliberation checklist was meticulously adhered but the experience with the dual-role researchers adds a dimension not previously explored. The needs listed in the literature is connected to the themes. The impact and potential future implications of these practices could have been explored.

This dissertation has several audiences, and the results are written skewed towards those interested in pursuing deliberation as a methodology in community. The community can be their own or one they may work with in the future. The success behind the first Indigenous Deliberation on Genomic Research and Biobanking resides within the complexity of partnership and community driven aspirations. The several areas that set this deliberation apart from other reports is looking at the community researchers: their role and experience in the deliberation edified the pursuit of community knowledge. The decisions behind the deliberation process cultivated a space and place to engage community. Through three overarching themes, we see purposeful decisions adapt the deliberation to fit the community.

I make a distinction in the quotes and references for the rest of the discussion by Co-Facilitator, Community Expert, and Dual-Role Researcher. I make the argument that they are all Dual-Role researcher but to include

anonymity, I assigned the different voices with the predominant role served by each of these three people. Multiple responsibilities were held by the researchers but for distinction, the primary role identified is how I will identify them throughout the rest of the discussion. Below indicates the specific roles identified by the Dual-Role Researcher.

> DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: So that was one Aspect of it, just given that kind of divisional approval to participate in this in this project. The other way I was involved in it administratively is that I had to seek approvals for my line of support to make sure that it that my line of support was OK with us participating in this research Project.

Additional expectations and roles are continued in their voice.

> DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: So final approvals were given and so that was I had to make sure that that was done and then also I had to also make sure that the deliberation was being planned, according to Chickasaw Nation policies and procedures, and that our engagement with the community was being involved with was being conducted according to Chickasaw Nation policies and procedures. And so, I kind of had that parallel track throughout the whole project administratively and then also from the IRB perspective.

IRB was under the Dual-Role researcher's purview as well as research design and maintaining lines of communication. The Community Expert was the expert that had been working with Chickasaw Nation for over 20 years.

> DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: [Community expert] who had a role in delivering some unbiased information. He was and he was an information giver because he had to present to the, to the deliberants. What a biobank is. What genetic research is. What is it you know? And what is genetic medicine, you know? And he had to do that in an unbiased way. Right. So, he wasn't trying to buy us the deliberate, one way or another, he just had to provide straight information so that they would have a basic baseline.

Their purview was presenting information about genomics and biobanking. They are a community researcher since their priorities were with the Chickasaw Nation Health Department. They also had a hand in writing and developing the deliberation, but the main task was topic expert for the community.

The last individual was the Co-Facilitator. The Co-Facilitator was in-charge of facilitation and recruitment. The facilitation process was shared between the two facilitators, the academic partner, and the community researcher. I designate their role as Co-Facilitator since this was their major role in the deliberation. They had a large part to play in cognitive surveys that predated the deliberation. Other responsibilities existed but moving forward with references

from the deliberation transcripts and the interviews required distinct labels to discuss the complexity and interconnected approach to the deliberation.

Community Contextualization

Deliberation requires a foundation for deliberants to deliberate. To discuss deliberation questions and content, the community needs buy-in, and the topic needs to be situated in the community. *Community Contextualization* is defined here as establishing a topic that is sourced from the community while also creating a foundation for the community to engage with the topic at a deeper level. The active decisions to establish the topic for community and build the foundation for discussion is established at each stage of deliberation: pre-deliberation, deliberation planning, deliberation day, and post deliberation. Each step included prevailing decisions that contextualized the topic for and in the community.

Pre-Deliberation

During the pre-deliberation, cognitive interview surveys were conducted before deliberation was even a word formed in a partner's mouth. The cognitive interview surveys were the steppingstones toward deliberation as a path forward.

> CO-FACILITATOR: Through those surveys, a lot of the same information was coming-- A lot of the questions were coming back that were similar because we have a great social media set in place for us and then we have a tribal newspaper that goes out.

The decision to conduct a deliberative event considered several factors but through the interviews, a driving force was the interest in the topics and larger implications of this type of research. The topic was established from the community and given merit as a topic because of the connective interest. Repatriation was being conducted with Chickasaw Nation. Though we could not figure out the word during the conversation, we revisited the conversation post interview.

> CO-FACILITATOR: Where they go to our homelands and if they find anything that is Chickasaw Nation, then there's a ceremony they do, and they'll go and rebury those remains. And so they were all interested in that.
> INTERVIEW: Oh, OK.
> CO-FACILITATOR: Because it was about Genetics, so they kind of related the two and were really interested in that part. They had a better understanding of what the genetics part was, and they brought up the 23andMe, ancestry.com, how those things worked.

Questions and interest were percolating. The interconnected communication to the community from the Tribe and the researchers going out into the community offered a chance to connect similar interests and connect issues.

The community researchers were involved with the pre-deliberation research. Building the deliberation from the community was one of important research goals. Research built from a community is where claims and needs are

substantiated by those within and not those from without (Christopher et al., 2008; Diop, 2000; Israel et al., 2011; Torri & Martinez, 2011).

Deliberation Preparation, decision to deliberate.

Preparation is not only a concern but a purposeful exercise in *Community Contextualization.* Gathering people is difficult for the level of conversation that happens in a deliberative event. The two days warrants a degree of community buy-in. Because the questions about biobanking and genomics already had a connective foundation to the repatriations happening, buy-in was not an uphill battle. Contextualizing the topic for deliberants was providing a basis for them to delve deeper into the topic. Another integral part to the deliberation's success was the dissemination of information beforehand.

> INTERVIEWER: What do you think contributed to the success of the deliberations?
>
> CO-FACILITATOR: Because what we had sent out to what you know what the deliberation was kind of what the topic was, what would happen before we had the deliberations, we sent all that out to participants to get them ready.

Community Contextualization is aiding the deliberants with information. The information given bolsters the discussion. This practice is common in deliberation and a potent enabler of contextualizing the topic for the deliberants.

The preparation and buy-in, moving hand-in-hand, is coupled with the recruitment.

Recruiting is also *Community Contextualization.* The recruiter role before the Co-Facilitator was a compounding decision for *Community Contextualization*.

> DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: [Co-Facilitator], first of all, she's very
>
> engaging personality wise. She's so well established in the community.

The connection between the topic and the deliberation is facilitated by the role of the community researcher, the Co-Facilitator. The connections the Co-Facilitator cultivated and maintained before, during, and after the recruitment process situated the conversation in the community. The community relevance was engaged at several entry points in the community. I discussed previously the importance of representation and being able to see oneself in research and deliberation topics is paramount to supporting voices of the community.

> DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: So in retrospect You know, having her in
>
> place was huge for the recruitment and then also just having her at the
>
> deliberation again, although I was not there at the event, I know having
>
> her present as a person from the Community that all these that had
>
> recruited these people, right so they know her and they knew her and I
>
> think that that was huge having her actually at the event and not just as
>
> their recruiter.

The Co-Facilitator was not a token or a set piece but a liaison for the community and a connective role that tied the deliberation together in impactful ways. The community researchers exemplified the calls for CBPR and Tribally driven research to build within the community and importantly, facilitate the research at each step of the process.

Deliberation Day

The day finally shows up for deliberation and the preparations come to fruition. Each role by the community researchers provided *Community Contextualization.* Establishing the topic is not just a way to provide information but in a way that is as free from bias as possible. For example:

> CO-FACILITATOR: Community Expert was, I mean, he was nervous because he was saying--, 'I have to make sure that the information I give them, it has to be relatable to-- I mean they can understand it where I'm not talking too much'. Not so much scientific words, but you know, bringing it down to where they could understand exactly what he was going to be up there explaining. And so, it was just. It was just every day, I mean, it seemed like there was something that we had to take care of.

Each day was filled with preparing for the deliberative event but also during the deliberation as well. The Community Expert fielded questions to provide as clear and concise answers while also avoiding their own opinions. This is seen in the deliberation transcripts.

The role the Community Expert operated was important in continued establishment of a foundation for deliberants to engage the topic. Robust conversation requires a general level of information. The goal is not to convert but to converse. We see the combination of deliberation theory and design in conjunction with contextualizing the topic in the community. This differs from contextualizing the topic for the community. The information was built from within, and the Community Expert conducted conversations to maintain that focus.

The deliberation design was to see the community's perspective on the issues. A surprise was the harmonization of interests between community researchers and the community. Though shocking in vivo, the reflection on the alignment of thoughts makes a degree of sense. The responses about the topic and concerns lining up is too important to shorten:

> DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: And the thing that really surprised me with the results of at least the preliminary results on the biobanking and genetic research and genetic medicine was that the concerns that were voiced by the participants are, you know, who these are community members that don't do this for living. Those concerns that they voiced in the solutions and things that they talked about were about the exact same things we talked about here and from a professional research and an IRB perspective. So, when the participants talked about 'well, we're concerned

about who's going to access this data, who's going to this, this genetic

medicine lasts forever, how am I going to protect my information?' You

know in two generations from now, when they still have access to it, who's

going to run a biobank? How much does it cost? What's the benefit to us?'

These are the same questions that we asked in our department right from

our perspective, the exact same concerns that the [Community Expert] and

I and those of us in the research world hear the same concerns that we

have. The community had the exact same concerns and so I thought that

was really pretty cool.

The unique situation Chickasaw Nation is in, they cover several counties in

Oklahoma, and a large conglomerate of peoples under their jurisdiction. The

deliberants coming to similar questions, concerns, but also benefits speaks

volumes to the role of the community researchers. The perceived benefits were

also similar:

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: And not just the same concerns, but the

same benefits as well. They saw the same potential benefits to it, so often

they would say, 'yeah, we would do this as long as we feel confident that

the Chickasaw Nation has oversight over what's going on'. So, I mean so

many times you hear like in the Genetic medicine, Genetic research world

that [others] don't want anything to do with it, right? They just don't want

it? That's not what we heard at all. It was like, hey, we are willing to

listen. We are even willing to participate. But we want assurances that

somehow our Tribe is going to take care of us if we dip our toes in these

Genetic waters. If the tribe is going to take care of us and have oversight

over these activities, we are willing to do that. So, it's both ways It's not

just protection, it's also engagement. But in in a way that they feel like

That we're that we're overseeing it in in a good way in the tribe.

Disclaimer about the above quote, this is not a report on the findings of the

deliberation. That has already been published. The key takeaway is the

community impact and community researcher resonance. The deliberants

emphasized the research oversight but still making sure it stays with the

community and is designed for them.

The Dual-Role Researcher was not there the day of the deliberation. The

deliberation was not designed or implemented to be persuasive but to inform and

facilitate conversation. Deliberation theory was followed and flexible to support

the conversations that the community wanted. The Co-Facilitator and the

Community Expert, on the day of the deliberation, were the driving roles in

conjunction with academic partners.

Post Deliberation

The first example is something that happened between the scenes. I say

post deliberation and put this example here because it was not during the time the

deliberants were all together. This was how the topic was saturating conversations

not during the deliberation.

> INTERVIEWER: Was there a difference between day one and day two,

like when it started up?

> CO-FACILIATOR: we did the first night and the second day when they
>
> came in, they were talking about how They talked about it because there
>
> were a couple that rode together, and they talked about it all the way home
>
> About, you know the questions that they were asked and you know and
>
> just things that they didn't they didn't realize like especially like the
>
> samples for 23andMe and they never thought about that. and they just
>
> were really engaged in everything.

This exemplifies an important aspect of *Community Contextualization*, deliberant

saturation. The topic transcends the moments in the deliberation and extends

beyond the context of the event. The topic now enters into conversation outside

the observed space and this is one of the goals of deliberation and community

work. The topic is not just a research project but a item that is connected to the

deliberants, the community, to the larger whole. The first instances that the

deliberation was reaching a deeper level of conservation and was living rent free

in deliberants' heads.

The topic and the process both persist beyond the observed space. The deliberants that participated had experienced a process that was unique and different to previous research conducted:

INTERVIEWER: How did it affect the communication in your community around the topic?

CO-FACILITATOR: Ohh it was good. I mean I had I got emails from people afterwards.

INTERVIEWER: Ohh wow and.

CO-FACILITATOR: And I would see people that participated, and they would thank me for, you know, for having deliberation. And you know that they see the flyer that they were glad that they got to participate because they had no idea that the Tribe even had this grant. Explaining to them, 'Now you know, we're not doing any form of genetic testing. We're just putting our toe in the water to see what you know, to see what our community thinks, not that we're going to move forward with anything.' But yeah, I had got comments from them and then afterwards they completed the recordings. They [Academic Partners] sent it to us. And so, we were able to send it to those people that participated, and they were shocked because some of them had said in, like, focus groups or, you know, something where there was data collected and they never heard from them again.

The community researchers noticed the process provided a different structure to address community input. The process was also an adaptable approach to engage before, during, and after.

We discussed ad nauseum about research that was not community focused and lacked the follow up. The follow up provided contextualization for the community to see the topic existed beyond the two days and scenarios. The topic mattered to them, and their findings and solutions were recorded and distributed. The cyclical relationship that research should be is embodied when *Community Contextualization* happens at each stage of the deliberation process.

Improving upon *Community Contextualization* is a reflective process. For future deliberations, there are multiple lines and levels within a community:

INTERVIEWER: Was there anything about this process that you would change?

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: I think if I could have somehow engaged my line of support, my upper leadership a little bit more up front instead of just asking for approvals. And trying to explain, you know what we were trying to do, if I could have engaged maybe one or two people a little bit more deeply into the process, so that they would have a more a deeper understanding of what we were trying to Do and really kind of ingrain that instead of just like getting approvals,

I stated improving this theme requires self-reflection and time. The path towards building upon a successful deliberation in another topic, or in a similar area is engaging and contextualizing the topic deeper with other aspects of the community. Communities are not monolithic and do retain their nuance. Administration is one layer to Tribal research and creating the contextualization of topics is an important thought to maintain in future Indigenous Deliberations.

The community saw this topic reaching beyond the observed deliberation. Reaching beyond the present into future contexts:

> DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: They seem to catch on to those issues and concerns that are not immediately in front of you but maybe two or three or four generations down the road. They had the same concerns that I do. Fears about control, access, use of Tribal data. How is it used? How is it represented? How is it presented to the community? They have the exact same concerns as I do.

The community buy-in was beyond the individual and extended to the community in the present and the future. The longitudinal consideration of the topic is another connective buy-in for deliberants. The reflection in concerns is another demonstration that building in the community and members working for that community resonate quickly. This does not mean agreement must be reached but that understanding is approached.

Summary

Though the deliberation was derived from feedback from the cognitive surveys, buy-in for a deliberation was needed at all levels of the community: researchers, administration, and community participants. Deliberation was something new and different from previous research practices like focus groups and talking circles. Both practices answer different questions in different ways but deliberation was different.

The community needed to engage with deliberation questions in a meaningful way and that requires meticulous planning, prep, and moderation. Decisions surrounding this theme focused the community to informing, discussing, and achieving *Community Contextualization*. The Indigenous Deliberation Themes do intermingle and benefit from one another. An overview of these combinations are addressed after the themes are explored.

The deliberation had two facilitators for the day of the deliberation. The integral ways *Community Contextualization* was enacted was through the co-facilitator and community expert. A co-facilitator from the community was selected for the deliberation and served to fill several roles during the event. The deliberants knew both the community researchers, expert and facilitator.

Another important instance of this theme was the use of scenarios. The scenarios were hypothetical situations that deliberants might find themselves in or easily relate. The concept of Biobanking and Genomic research is not a common conversation between the general public. The scenarios were developed with the

partners to situate the Biobanking and Genomic research in the community. Constant back and forth was used develop these scenarios, which is part testament to community *equitable partnerships*, but we will discuss more about that in a later theme.

The scenarios were used in small group conversations and explored the nuances and complexities of genomic research in the community. The researchers needed to situate these hypotheticals in realistic situations. The scenarios sparked continuous discussion within and between groups.

The results were given to the participants. The findings were compiled, checked by community researchers, and distributed to the participants. Community was integrated in each step of this deliberation and a critical part of the deliberation. The continued lines of communication provided the information back to the participants and generated necessary dialogue. Distributing results mitigated misrepresentation and bolstered accurate representation of conversations, and decisions. The deliberants had worries, concerns, but also saw the benefits of genomic research, which would need careful approach. Findings given to the deliberants is not only a step of rigorous research practices, but it also contextualizes the research. The buy-in was not in the fleeting two days of the deliberation but a continued conversation.

Distributing findings placed the community within the conversation. The topic was derived from the community, the topic expounded for the community,

and the conversation facilitated beyond the deliberation. The holistic contextualization is an inclusive practice that invites further discussions about genomics, the use of deliberation about other topics, and establishing trust within the community.

Deliberant Support

Deliberant support is the second theme. *Deliberant Support* includes tertiary acts designed to take care of deliberant's needs: food, sleep, compensation, space, and communication. *Deliberant Support* extends to communicative needs because human communication is a necessity for deliberation conversation. I delve more into this aspect of deliberation coming from an Indigenous perspective. These necessary acts provide a support structure for deliberants to worry less about physiological needs and focus on the topics. Two days, with large blocks of time each day, is a big ask for participants that are geographically spread across 13 counties in Oklahoma that the Chickasaw Nation spans. The difference between the first two themes is the first emphasizes the topic. *Deliberant Support* is the connective tissue surrounding the topic. The decisions enacted by community researchers were planned with academic partners. The emphasis on this Indigenous Deliberation theme is on supporting deliberants.

Pre-deliberation

This is the one theme that did not have a specific quote for the pre-deliberation phase. The community driven topic, which was also supported by the ELSI grant, had several layers of deliberant support. The legwork for this Indigenous Deliberation theme is different to conceptualize from the deliberation transcripts. We talked about the various ways Tribes enact sovereignty and how community-based research are built from within the community. The structures already in place to support citizens and their community is something that is not heavily discussed in deliberation research. The connections forged before any research or previous research is one of the ways deliberants are supported.

Community needs also predate any discussion in deliberation. Since the topic was contextualized through the community, the needs surrounding it preexisted. The deliberation does not always create solutions or talking points so much as provides a forum to explore thoughts and notions already developing. *Deliberant Support* is the lubricant for conversation. The needs are important and if ignored, then why would an obscure or distant topic matter to the constituents in the room? We see this happen in Northern Nigeria (Olufowote & Livingston, 2021) with resistance narratives surrounding polio vaccines when basic needs are not met. Communities need degree of assurances that food, water, and a safe space are available.

Since needs of a community are situational, we need to be situated in the community. *Deliberant Support* is built upon previous good will and might need further engagement because of ill will fostered.

Deliberation Preparation/Decision to Deliberate

Deliberation practice includes providing food and lodging for deliberants. This practice is seen in judiciary deliberations and CIRs. Supporting Chickasaw deliberants is not an exception to this protocol. The same considerations as other instances of deliberation but incorrectly addressing those implications can isolate or negate a potential deliberant's ability to engage. Meticulous planning was followed to fit the Chickasaw deliberants.

> DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: It's not just research. There's also logistics that have to be taken care of because you've got people that you're dealing with and people that eat and they need to have a place to stay. They need to have a place to gather just the planning on where we're going to hold it. What facility could we hold it, you know? That would accommodate, you know, 15 or 20 people, you know, and spread out and that kind of stuff. And so I was involved in those logistics as well as the methodology of The of the research itself.

Each aspect of the deliberation was designed with the deliberants in mind. The meticulous planning was to provide a space that thoughts, feelings, concerns, and queries could be fostered and supported.

The entire community research team was constantly advising on how to best address their community. The Co-facilitator had an additional role to contextualizing the deliberation but also supporting the deliberants during and leading up to the event. Stable structures are built through consistency and a needed support decision was included the Co-facilitator in the recruitment:

CO-FACILITATOR: Yeah, yeah, yeah. And then they would ask, too, if I was going to be part of it, if I would, you know, after I would explain it to them. And I told them, yes, I would be. You know, I would be there when it happens.

Involvement at each step. This provided consistency and support.

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: I know having her present as a person from the Community that all these that had recruited these people, right so they know her, and they knew her, and I think that that was huge having her actually at the event and not just as their recruiter. And that happens a lot in research in tribal communities. Researchers will engage community folk to be recruiting, and then that's it. That's all they do, right? It's just they're they just recruit and then you don't see them anymore. I think having [THE CO-FACILITATOR] take that next step and not just be the recruiter, but also be part of the deliberation event itself was really important because that was there, that continuity of Community presence,

true Community presence and involvement, not just in the recruiting but in the event itself, I think was really critical.

Continuity of community presence, a true community involvement is the goal behind deliberant support. I discussed the needs behind wanting and needing to feel welcome. We can be acutely aware when we are not welcome. The steps toward this deliberation were designed to support the deliberants in an obvious way for deliberation theory and community researcher perspective but it resonates in a deeper reason through an Indigenous perspective. Be seen. Be heard. Be a part of the community. Community researchers that want to be there and are a part of the project start to finish provides a support that can be lacking in other research endeavors. We need to bring the deliberation to the community, in the community, because it is about the community.

Deliberant support is also making sure everything was good to go. Community Expert was situated to provide information but how they provided information, as well as the Co-Facilitator was a support structure that fostered solid conversation. Deliberation already gives a space for this but having community researchers is a form of deliberant support.

CO-FACILITATOR: Each part was prepared. We made sure we were covered, you know, consents, Flyers, all that. And then it got down to OK, it's getting close. So, this is what our script is going to look like. These are the questions that we're going to ask. The [Community Expert] was in the

room. We made sure that you know the [Community Expert] was there

because he could answer the things about the genetics part about the

biobanking and precision medicine.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. And I feel like some other in the crowd did know

[him] as well, so that kind of--

CO-FACILITATOR: Oh, yeah, yeah. They knew. Yeah, because [he] and

I have been with the tribe for like 20. 20 years by then.

Experts coming into a community and providing information and then leaving

was a situation the research team wanted to avoid. The purposeful decision

enabled a rapport in a situation that had previously led to mistrust of researchers.

The intent behind it was not to capitalize off of relationships but make deliberants

more comfortable. Community researchers bridged a previously rocky role with

outside researchers and research that was not as heavily engaged with the

community. With the lack of persuasive material and an increase in preparation to

ensure balanced material, the Community Expert in particular was providing

deliberant support to get rid of bias. A fair presentation of information is part of

supporting deliberants.

Deliberation Day

Beyond the essentials for the deliberants, support is also shown through

the moderation in the deliberation. Supporting deliberants requires

communicative expertise mixed with community culture expertise. Supporting

deliberants provides a foundation that they feel safe and confident to share their thoughts. Support in this category is one of the driving forces behind the CNHD deliberation. Deliberant support was provided by the community facilitator and community expert. I do not argue that the deliberant expert was not integral in the success. The decisions that facilitated Indigenous Deliberation through the experiences of the community researchers is where I analyze. They met the deliberants where they were at and provided communicative assurance, questions, and thoughtful responses. Deliberant support in both the physical needs and the communicative needs is something that requires constant attention and is facilitated when we build on the community and for the community.

An example of providing food and managing expectations is a kindness in participating in longer planned research events. Part of support for Deliberant is the execution of discussed accommodations:

> CO-FACILITATOR: Because it was four hours. It was on a Friday night and a Saturday morning, so we wanted them to understand that. This is a Friday night and it's going to take this many hours, but we fed them. We told them don't worry about getting something to eat. We'll have food here for you, and then we'll take a break and the same as the next morning. We told them, you know, we'll have breakfast here for you and then. We'll-- it'll be like a light breakfast and then we'll have lunch.

Co-facilitator and Community Expert managed expectations to help facilitate

conversation. This was done in conjunction with the facilitator as well. Food

seems like a simple item to address and sometimes can be negligible. The support

to provide food for community members often cannot come from specific types of

funding sources. Because support for community-engaged research looks

different than historical western research, it can be difficult to notice the

importance of providing this *deliberant support*.

    Another important role was interaction with the deliberants. I talked

previously about communicative needs. The needs surrounding group interaction

is easier to spot when it is present but unfortunately easy to notice for participants

when it is absent. Between the interviews and the deliberation transcripts, we

garner this example coupled with transcript connections:

    INTERVIEWER: How is Co facilitating?

    CO-FACILITATOR: It was wonderful. Because it gave. We introduced

    [Facilitator] and she's from the University of [state] and then myself

    because we wanted somebody from the tribe to be an interactive part. That

    and then you know, it felt like we would make them more comfortable,

    more apt to participate. And it just I was nervous.

The quote provided is the tip of the iceberg when it comes to the deliberant

support the facilitators, and community expert provided. Four different

communicative support subthemes manifested in the deliberation transcripts and

confirmed through the interviews: humor, honesty, gratitude, and turn-taking. Humor was used in a specific manner that could be misplaced if people are not a part of the community or similar humor. Putting individuals through the wringer or purposeful humor is one of the ways a community researcher can engage with the deliberants. Humor could be used to distract but in this instance it loosened up deliberants quickly and spoke to the rapport previously established.

The other communicative support subtheme was honesty. Questions to the Community Expert were direct and penetrating. The deliberants connected to the topic and saw the benefits, concerns, and worries behind it. Honesty though was used throughout the deliberation by the community researchers. When questions were not known, that was said. The direct honesty when something was unknown or needed to be researched later was a support that might be overlooked. People can notice when made up answers are used to maintain an air of informative superiority. Honesty in the facilitators and presenters supports the deliberants and fosters trust. The knowledge deficiency acknowledgements spoke volumes louder than forced meanderings. The result was deliberants continued questions and furthered lines of communication. Though honesty might seem a given in deliberation situations, honesty might be overlooked in pursuit of personal vanity. Honesty mitigates distrust and fosters communication support.

Gratitude was another example of *deliberant support*. This subtheme is often enacted most strongly in the crossed streams of *equitable partnerships* and

deliberant support. The facilitators thanked responses and insights. Participants were supported in their views and their perspectives were recognized and given appreciation. The communicative climate was positive responses and that stemmed from being seen and heard.

The last subtheme, turn-taking, is also often seen by both facilitators and the presenter. The expert facilitation supported all deliberants and turn-taking strategies were utilized to include as many perspectives as possible. The co-facilitator did this when recognizing individuals wanting to speak. The deliberation transcripts did not provide the telling signs but the co-facilitator would recognize when individuals wanted to speak. Because the synergistic qualities of deliberation conversations, it is integral to keep the conversation building with each comment. Each comment does not have to evolve the topic but the facilitators were adept at connecting responses to one another. Turn-taking is a collaborative effort and a direct way community researchers and academic partners engaged in *deliberant support*.

Another example includes the shared responsibility and taking care of physical items. The deliberation included space manipulation and the use of tools to engage with the deliberants:

CO-FACILITATOR: You know, and then even getting the whiteboard, getting the cards, getting the markers, getting the, you know, everything set up the.

INTERVIEWER: The stickers.

CO-FACILITATOR: Yes, yes, the stickers and those were just things that were part of my To Do List and I didn't get that done until like the day before. And I was saying, Oh my gosh, that's one of the most important things is having all these.

Each role and responsibility accumulated into the success and support of the deliberants. Effective and impactful community research often requires several people to make it work as hoped. The simple markers to the elaborate laying out of tables is all part of the process and sets deliberants up to focus on the discussion. The community researchers constantly engage with materials and conversations to bolster and edify. Supporting a community you care about becomes the floor, not the ceiling.

Post Deliberation

Supporting deliberants is cyclical: the post-deliberation stems into the possibility of future deliberations. The support and structures previously used, and some not even engaged leave an array of future approaches to Indigenous Deliberation. Future plans to participate and how to support future deliberants and deliberations is how forward thinking is engaged.

INTERVIEWER: There might be ways that we could move forward and find ways to evaluate how much of an impact did it have upward and downward and outward.

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: Right.

INTERVIEWER: And I think this is a good spot for us to think about that. How do we approach that?

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: Well, as I mentioned a while ago, that's why I'm so glad that we're reengaging this, that you're interested in it and that it's making me think again about this. So maybe it's not Dead, right? Maybe It's just that it's been asleep for a little while and it needs to just to be woken up and to be revisited. And maybe it's beneficial. Maybe that the time in the events that have happened in between might give us a different perspective on them. You know what, you know, how might deliberation be used because of the COVID affected the community so profoundly and the way we do business.

Future Indigenous Deliberations need to be built within the community and applying the *deliberant support* structures previously seen and utilized sets not only a precedence but conversations about how to best support the community. Covid was disruptive to this type of in-person deliberation. The lessons and support learned and used sets the stage for future community-driven research.

Equitable Partnerships

The final Indigenous Deliberation Theme is the use of *Equitable Partnerships*. *Equitable Partnerships* is the inclusion of outside researchers and resources to support the deliberation. Each Tribe is going to be different in the

degree partnerships are used but for the first deliberation, partners were critical in each step of the deliberation process. Creating a deliberative event like CNHD's requires meticulous attention to details and decision making. The deliberation was not possible without the community and their researchers. The same is true for the academic partners.

In 2018, there was not a deliberation like this about Genomics and Biobanking with an Indigenous community. Being first comes with pros and cons:

> INTERVIEWER: I mean this is. This is the first. The first deliberation done with.

> CO-FACILITATOR: Yes, yes, yeah. And then that made it even more Nerve wracking because we were the first Tribe.

Equitable partnerships were discussed heavily in previous literature because it is integral for community based participatory research and ethical research practices. Going first came with setting the bar but also charting unknown waters. Chickasaw Nation has a specific experience and relationship with their community. Building relationships that champion equity is not an idealistic approach but a necessary precaution:

> DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: We want research, we want good research that benefits our people. How do you balance that? How do you balance that with protection and yet still try to engage in research and not exclude

Tribes from research that's beneficial or potentially beneficial? How do you find that balance? It's tough.

This is one of the more difficult themes to enact since it requires partners beyond the community. Developing relationships and responsibilities in a research group take time and resources. Historical helicopter research taints the idealistic aspirations of partners that have the community's interests at heart. The need and desire are there and at each step, community researchers and academic partners engage in communication and decision-making.

Pre-deliberation

Relationships predate the current deliberation or research. Developing relationships is not a single instance of research or event. Long-lasting relationships take maintenance and are built over time. Time cannot be fabricated. Previous research can set a basis of developing future projects. The Co-facilitator discussed the conversations following the cognitive surveys.

CO-FACILITATOR: So, then I was able to go back. And work with [Academic Partner] and the ELSI team and to pull questions together to you know, that kind of guided our deliberations.

Developing new relationships does take time and it is not impossible to create new relationships. The need is in willing partners to put in the time. *Equitable Partnerships* require a mutual respect that is proven over time. I went through this process in my tenure with CEIGR as I engaged in research, conversations,

meetings, and trainings. Before this dissertation, I was building relationships with the community researchers. The intent was not academic notoriety but the drive to build community driven research. I learned a lot from these partners and it is through previous engagement and continued conversations that relationships grow. The egregious error that historically occurs when the researcher disappears when their needs are met. If needs are situated in the community, then relationships will need room for extension and growth.

I include the next example in the pre-deliberation, but it was a constant thread through the deliberation process. Relationships built from the deliberation and those established before were committed to the community focus:

> DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: Because I feel very much that we had a research team here, an equal team that we came up with. Chickasaw Nation folks came up with the research questions. They weren't delivered to us by our academic partners, right? We're the ones that came up with them, because these were areas of interest for the Chickasaw nation.

Community needs are the focus, and it is facilitated with partners. This speaks to research in general and answers calls to action in CBPR literature. *Equitable Partnerships* as a theme permeated each step of the deliberation process.

Power dynamics shift when partnerships are equitable. Moving forward into the planning phase of the deliberation reveals more examples of *equitable*

partnerships. Equitable partnerships theme exists on a scale, and it changes based upon the needs of the community.

Deliberation Preparation, decision to deliberate.

We are introduced to a variety of important partners that participate in the planning. The deliberation expert that will facilitate is one of the important actors in the deliberation. As conversation developed and deliberation was decided upon as the path forward, partner communication increases over video conference, in-person meetings, emails, phone calls, and text messages. With community as the focus, decisions with partners followed a consistent pattern in the planning phase:

> INTERVIEWER: And so you're part of that formation of what questions were going to be presented in the deliberation?
>
> CO-FACILITATOR: [OU partner] came down and I gave [them] that part. And then [OU partner 2]. Yeah, [OU partner] and [OU partner 2] started working on the questions, and they would send it to us, and then we would, you know, send it back to them, kind of like an IRB. Things to make sure those questions were asked right, and what we thought would be culturally acceptable.

Collaborative communication and planning consistently enacted the *equitable partnerships* theme. The difference between this theme and *deliberant support* is that this support was for the community researchers. Support was facilitated through the respectful partnerships and balancing responsibilities; the efforts were

tied to the interest of the community. Communication back and forth is critical for equitable relationships and driving a collaborative project forward.

Supporting community researchers is a transformative theme since both parties grow in capacities they did not intend. Partners each brought something to the table and the community researchers did too. The research team, all parties included, shared expertise, provided insights, and participated in capacity building:

> INTERVIEWER: Was anything else that you were involved with--?
>
> CO-FACILITATOR: --because I didn't have a clue about how to moderate a deliberation. -- I had done talking circles and focus groups, but I knew deliberations was totally different. It was new to me. We had a lot of back and forth just between [the facilitator] and myself about what role, who would do what, and we worked on the introduction. I mean, it's something as simple as that and -- as we moved closer to the deliberations, I mean we just prepared the whole deliberation piece, each part of it.

Capacity building is generating the skills and training for personnel to do the research that partners had to come in and do. Capacity building is increasing the capabilities of a team and establishing a base for future practice. Capacity building was a goal of CEIGR and GEN when I was working with them. Each meeting built skills, forged networks, but also created a supportive climate to

122

grow. Growth in strengthening community researchers in requested areas is part of the *equitable partnerships* theme.

The facilitator was in constant communication before the deliberation. Building capacity and maintaining relationships do overlap in efforts and outcomes. One requires the other and they expedite the process. Seeking the community, the facilitator worked with the co-facilitator:

> CO-FACILITATOR: She called me because we would just do a lot of emailing. So, then she called me, and she said 'I know because we had a CEIGR meeting in Seattle. We went out to her and during that little-- They had brought up how the [Community Expert] and myself, were always dressed professionally--.

Each decision was to make the deliberants as comfortable as possible. Each small decision culminated in the deliberation's success. Understanding a community and adhering to their social expectations is a basic tenet when working in a community. The facilitator wanted to know how to meet the deliberants where they were. Meeting people on their level takes effort and collaborative research should include this as the baseline. Even down to the smallest detail:

> CO-FACILITATOR: So [the facilitator] called me about that and she said so. I know that she said 'so how should I dress?' Even down to her shoes. And I said, well, just, you know very is business casual.

Expertise in one field does not necessitate expertise in another. Facilitators

exchange expertise and insights to best support the deliberants and one another.

The pressure behind providing each expert in each role is mitigated when

the responsibility is shared. Indigenous Deliberation is not about prioritizing the

researchers but the needs of the community. Facilitating support for community

researchers is through the partnerships in the research team:

> DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: It was a new methodology to me.
>
> Fortunately, we have experts here in our team that have done this before,
>
> but it was a new methodology to me. It sounds like a very sound and solid
>
> approach to engage in the Community to get Community input.

I used trust before since the deliberation relied upon everyone doing their part.

Expectations were given and fulfilling those roles shifted to those able to meet

those responsibilities. The planning phase is a particularly important enactment of

equitable partnerships. Find partners to trust. Develop communication lines to

collaborate and share responsibilities and roles. Support the research team by

increasing capabilities in needed skills, trainings, and networks.

Deliberation Day

The event came and we see a symbiotic relationship between the

facilitators. The interplay between the deliberants and the facilitators is an

incredible example of equitable relationships. Partnerships build one another. The

facilitators would bolster their counterpart as well as cover in areas of deficiency.

Growth and capacity building was happening in real time as the deliberation unfolded. The facilitator and co-facilitator supported and learned from one another:

> CO-FACILITATOR: I was really nervous about that. But once again, like once it got started, I mean, I just felt comfortable and it just it was so smooth and, you know, just watching [the other facilitator], I learned so much from just watching her and how she knows how to work. She knows how to handle crowds. She knows how to get people talking.

Respectable partnerships recognize strengths and behaviors were mirrored as the deliberation transpired. The deliberation transcripts showed the co-facilitator adopting communicative strategies employed by the facilitator. Supportive settings are not one-sided and create a synergistic learning environment.

Learning from one another, the preparations helped support the deliberation. The actions and decisions leading up to the event is what improved the relationship and facilitator synergy.

> CO-FACILITATOR: I guess from working with [the facilitator] and [academic partner] and just really getting tuned into deliberations, I was prepared. I mean I had a good idea of what was going to happen. And so, as things just kind of fell into place and I and [the facilitator] again, I'm telling you, she's just amazing because the conversation just kept flowing

and she knew how to guide them with their answers and help them explain

what they're trying to say-

The co-facilitator was a consistent factor in the deliberation. Preparation is

important for deliberations. The chemistry between the facilitators is something

that takes time and trust to cultivate. Recognizing one another's strengths and

building on what they bring to the table is part of a healthy relationship. The

community researchers and the academic partners needed buy-in to the project,

like the deliberants. Building relationships during the deliberation was a special

thing to witness in the transcripts but also to see it reiterated in the conversations

with the co-facilitator.

Post Deliberation

The post deliberation is another departure from problematic research.

Creating an *equitable partnership* and maintaining it extends beyond the

deliberative event. Deliberation works to add to the cycle of democracy and

dialogue. Maintaining research relationships post the deliberation is important for

what happens next:

INTERVIEWER: What about post deliberation? What happened after?

CO-FACILITATOR: OK. When we were finished, that was Saturday,

after they all left, immediately we all Debriefed about what we thought

was good, what we thought was Bad, people's reactions, and did we

handle that? OK. How we thought the deliberation itself went. Were we

prepared? Just you know all those little conversations. And so that was

good because I felt like we had them. I felt like the Chickasaw Nation, we

really went in strong. I mean, we had everything and set up and we were

ready to go.

Academic partners were there to support the community researchers. Evaluation

post deliberation is common practice in deliberative theory. The first deliberation

on a topic in this community set a precedence for future deliberations. The

partners here and community researchers combined deliberative theory with a

community that flourished in the process. The combined efforts of the CEIGR

research consortium set a bar to be met. Chickasaw Nation met the new process

head on with their partners and blazed a trail for future deliberations.

Measuring the success of the deliberation can look different, depending on

the theoretical lens. From the perspective of the community researchers, the

deliberation as a success:

CO-FACILITATOR: You know how it was ran. How every little detail

was taken care of. There were things that we had to do in order. Consents,

making sure all that was in place, all the communication back and forth

between us. I felt like I learned so much from just being a part of that and

just the little things that you have to do.

The words of the community researchers is more poignant then my summation.

The Dual-Role Researcher added:

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: We all each brought something to the

table that needed to be there. But it was just different things. It was

different things that are needed to make it all happen. But we all brought

something different to it, and I felt very equal. I didn't feel like the

deliberation experts said that you can't do that. You know you can't do that

in deliberation. No, it's got to be done this way. You know, I felt like there

was a lot of flexibility. I felt like we stayed within deliberation

methodology, but they allowed us to be flexible on how, as you

mentioned, how do we adapt it to work here. So, we had a ton of input,

and I don't know anything that we suggested or that we asked they do it

this way. I don't recall anything that they said: 'No, you can't do that,

That's not deliberation in your community. Let's see how that goes.' Very

open to see, you know. OK, maybe that's not how I've done in other

places, but let's see how That works in your community.

Expert in the process and together the whole team helped facilitate the best way to

apply the process to the community. Indigenous Deliberation is not about

changing fundamental communicative practices but bolstering existing lines of

communication in a structured manner. The way Indigenous Deliberation was

possible was because of this final theme. Being equal in a partnership mitigates

power distances and puts the emphasis on the community. The funding came from

outside Chickasaw Nation but the research questions, the implementation, and the

evaluation was all within Chickasaw Nation. Communities dictating what needs and topics that are important is integral to Indigenous Deliberations. Supporting those communities should be a goal of this type of research.

The final example of equitable relationships is the community:

CO-FACILITATOR: It's just, I mean, like you said, they just all fit together and our group, because we have been working on the ground together for a while, I felt comfortable. As a tribal member going into these deliberations with them and based on what we were talking about, it went back to those cognitive interviews and what we based those off what we were hearing from those interviews. They[academic partners] didn't try to change it, they didn't try to manipulate it anyway, they were like, 'well, how about how about we try this?' It was truly what our people in our community wanted.

The development of the deliberation was founded upon *equitable partnership*. The partnership is not neatly balanced in cost and benefits. The cost analysis would situate the community as having the most to lose if the deliberation was unsuccessful. *Equitable partnerships* foster mutual respect of persons and is a commitment to make the research work in a way that fulfills the need of the community. Partnerships and equity, historically, were lacking but we see a solid example of two worlds coming together. One is not dominating the other, and both are benefiting from the relationship.

Intermixed Indigenous Deliberation Themes

The importance behind the Indigenous Deliberation themes is not found in individual examples but the combination of them. The themes work together to provide a space and place for deliberation in this Indigenous context. The changes to deliberation could not happen without the community researchers and the deliberation without the academic partners. I give a few examples of the intertwined themes.

Community Contextualization with Deliberant Support

This is an integral part of Indigenizing Deliberation. Deliberation as future practice on different levels offers ways to engage the community and contextualize future topics: findings topics, and building upon topics:

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: You know some of the strengths that you see in our community are resiliency factors. You know, I think that deliberation could be a really good tool to collect some of this information from community members that perhaps if we could train our prevention folks to do it on a on a less large scale than what we did but put some of those deliberation principles into effect. It might be a nice way we could use in almost any of our community events to where we need to elicit input from the community members.

Future deliberation events and practices can help seek ways to support the community. Not only seek community needs, but it could be utilized to engage

with a strength-based mindset. Research is not always effective when trying to fix a community. Community driven research can build upon already established strengths. Supporting the community and future deliberants goes together with identifying important future contexts deliberation or community research may need to go.

Equitable Partnerships with Community Contextualization

The two community researchers I interviewed had a hand in both the formation, training, and implementation of the cognitive surveys. One community researcher even traveled to another CEIGR partner's site to receive training in conducting the surveys. *Equitable partnerships* focused on capacity building. The purpose behind the training was to better assess the community's thoughts and needs. Community researchers were finding ways to engage in *community contextualization.* The research conducted and the community needs are not positioned as competing stakes but are interwoven as both guardians of meaningful, and effective research.

One theme informs the other and is a vehicle to seek community focused research. Each tribe is different and applying Indigenous Deliberation themes is not a one-to-one copy. Chickasaw Nation deliberation maintains transferable practices and approaches to help begin conceptualizing topics within different Tribal community. Part *Community Contextualization* and *Equitable partnerships*:

INTERVIEWER: How do you think deliberation was adapted for

Chickasaw Nation?

CO-FACILITATOR: I said there was a lot of discussion between the

whole group [CEIGR], and I knew that --all tribes are different. You

know, we're all so different. I knew that they were trying to get things

correct for our part, for our Tribe. And so just describing to them, I sent

something to her[facilitator] to read about. The Chickasaw Nation, this is

how we are? Everything was geared towards the Chickasaw Nation and

our Community, and this is how you talk to us. Even like the dress code.

This is how we dress. This is, you know, this is what will make them feel

comfortable too.

The relationship between the facilitators developed knowledge and skills that was

designed to help the deliberants engage with the topic. The deliberation was

designed to fit the Chickasaw Nation deliberants and to build upon the relevance

previously established. Through the communication and facilitator collaboration,

we see both themes bolstered as they are enacted. Indigenizing the deliberation

space is like building within the community. The goals and partnerships dictate a

narrative about what is important.

Developing community contextualization was not conducted in a silo. The

crystallization behind the research questions and topics required a group effort:

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: From the very beginning, those two questions that we had addressed, the Biobank and the genetic research genetic medicine questions, those came from us, right? We spent a long time with talking to [academic partner] and to [academic partner 2]. You know, who were both kind of involved in that piece of hashing out what those questions were going to be.

Community driven but developed together. The back and forth is an example of how *community contextualization* and *equitable partnerships* work in tandem together, not competing.

Each interviewee mentioned the power and importance of the theoretical scenarios.

The small group session included hypothetical scenarios that contain situations surrounding the topics. The scenarios were a tool developed to engage the deliberants in a unique capacity but also creatively resituate the topic in a different light.

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: We needed that research question from our priorities and our question. The other thing that we did that we worked very hard on were the scenarios. They presented some scenarios to the to the deliberant based around these topics. We really worked a long time on developing those scenarios together so that they made sense to our Chickasaw deliberants. You can't create a scenario that's in Oklahoma City

or wherever, it has to be situated so that the deliberants can relate to this

scenario in their own community, in their own minds, and we spent a long

time doing that.

The scenarios represent the overlapping efforts of *community contextualization*

and *equitable partnerships.* The scenarios needed to be relatable to the deliberants

and meaningful to their community. The process creating the scenarios took

community and CEIGR partners multiple conversations to situate the topic

appropriately and effectively. The scenarios generated conversation in the small

groups and persisted in the larger group deliberation. The merit behind the

scenarios is further seen in the use in future deliberations conducted by CEIGR

post the Chickasaw Nation deliberative event.

Deliberant Support with Equitable Partnerships

The manifestation of this combined pairing was found in the deliberation

transcripts. The shared responsibility between the facilitators. Four different

communicative support subthemes manifested in the deliberation transcripts and

confirmed through the interviews: humor, honesty, gratitude, and turn-taking. The

deliberant support was not always facilitated by community researchers.

Facilitators combined effort provided support communicative and physical needs

of deliberants.

Turn-taking was a common occurrence with communicative strategies

used by *equitable partners*. Noticing deliberants that dominated the conversation

but drawing upon other deliberants with phrases that invited building off of the dominant voices. In group settings, sometimes a few will be talkative, but facilitators still need to address the communicative needs of all participants. Responsibilities are shared among the researchers, community and academic. Deliberant needs must be met and having a team to cover those physical and communicative needs is a powerful component of Indigenous Deliberation. The facilitators could approach deliberants in different capacities but still support one another. The multiple entry points allowed a larger net to be cast when addressing needs.

Honesty is another component that showed a complimenting combination. Honesty took different forms between the facilitators and community expert. Honesty is not only in providing information and admitting not knowing something, but it includes accurate summaries and connections between deliberants. The facilitator, in the deliberation transcripts, was a master in providing detailed summations when sustaining the conversation. Accurate summations and connections were also coupled with member checking during the deliberation. The facilitators would double check with participants if summaries were accurate or needed to be augmented. The group effort in supporting the deliberants' voices and questions is a potent enactment of the combined themes.

All three working together.

Indigenous Deliberation in its totality is how we can approach future deliberations in Indigenous contexts and communities. Building upon community needs while adding to the deliberative cycle is productive integration. Deliberation is based within citizen experience and democratic ideologies of participatory rhetoric. Stemming from western ideas of dialogue can be adapted to fix specific contexts. Thankfully, it is not only the flexibility of deliberation but also the willingness of partners to prioritize the community. Indigenous Deliberation can situate the topic in the community needs, build on those needs and community understanding to bolster deliberants in their dialogue while working with partners within communities and without.

> CO-FACILITATOR: The deliberations really opened my eyes. We're getting some really heavy-duty information from our people, and you know it's just rich and I mean our feedback was just incredible. The way that they interacted, they asked questions, and it was everybody.

This is the results of combing each theme in Indigenous Deliberation. The deliberation worked and was the beginning to several deliberant events.

> INTERVIEWER: What advice or insight would you give to other tribes utilizing this method of inquiry? Now I know. Like tribes are very specific, but is there anything from your experience that? You would that. You would suggest or advise or insight.

DUAL-ROLE RESEARCHER: I would say you know to be open to do something different, maybe new even if it's a little bit uncomfortable. That the other thing I would say, you know, if you're going to do this kind of stuff and you don't have, if you're going to do deliberation and you don't have the expertise in that area then you engage with partners that are knowledgeable in deliberation, but also have worked with Tribes already. You know, I think it's very important to have folks that are coming from that perspective and are not just hardcore deliberation scientists that say 'this is the way it's done and this is how it should be done.' I think you need to have folks that are your deliberation experts also need to be comfortable adapting things and being willing to give and to listen and to allow that kind of organic deliberation. How does that work in that Tribe and not only does the Tribe need to be open to it and try and say we're willing to do this, but the people they engaged need to say, 'well, we're willing to work with you to make this-- Just to see if it fits in your Tribe.' And so I think that's really important to have that team in place. That equal team that is willing to work together to make it work or to see if it works.

Deliberation might not be for every Tribe but it should be adaptable to meet the needs of Tribes. The flexibility in the methodology and the community partners is how we can contextualize the topic to/from the community, and support deliberants. The cycle of Indigenous Deliberation requires constant growth of

roles and a need for creating and sustaining relationships. The themes, like the

partnerships, all play part.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION AND THE PATH FORWARD

I was attending a virtual conference, the Alaska Indigenous Research

Program (AKIRP), the May before I submitted my preproposal. The two weeks I

attended was an incredible exploration of Indigenous scholarship and

networking. During one of the Zoom calls, the conversation was opened to each

participant to detail their path that got them here to the conference. Each person

shared varying amounts about their journey and the difficulties they faced getting

here. Whether it was family issues, terrible wi-fi, or academic setbacks, we were

all there. We persisted.

The time I was given, I shared parts of my journey that I had just recently

started to reconcile. Even in Academic circles, I was ostracized and

disenfranchised. In my recounting of my path, I mentioned how I was half-native.

I belonged in neither world but had a foot in Western and Native circles. The

division in my identity was a constant. I always found it painfully poetic that my

academic journey was like how I felt growing up. I was supposed to separate and

disavow parts of me to appease historical precedent. I was to fit into the crowd,

not stand out because that would make other uncomfortable.

One other listener immediately followed the silence from my story with a

reassuring sentence that shook the division I had clung to, "Dalaki, you're all

Native. You are all YOU. You are not fractioned or fractured. Every part of you

makes you the person here today and you belong here." Watered eyes turned to

gentle sobs.

The dissertation I wanted to do sought to see that space where both can

exist: Western and Indigenous. Historically, the relationship has been tenuous,

but I had to see this deliberation. I needed to see this phenomenon where I could

be Native and an academic.

Circling Back

The dissertation was the accumulation of 4 years of meetings,

consultations, and trainings. A preproposal to a proposal, and finally this

dissertation. Two IRBs, OU's and CN's, were required to conduct this research.

The interviews and access to the deliberation transcripts is an extension of

evaluating deliberation post the deliberative event. This case study is integral to

perpetuating Indigenous deliberation scholarship. The CN deliberation set the

tone for future deliberations and partnerships. While being planned in tandem

with other deliberations with CEIGR, it was the first to be conducted. Chickasaw

Nation was the forerunner in using deliberative theory in this capacity. Being first

is both freeing and terrifying.

The Chickasaw Nation Health Department Deliberation was not only the

forerunner to other deliberative events of a similar topic and nature, but it was

also an example of Tribally Driven Participatory Research (TDPR). We see

CNHD exemplify calls to action collaborative research as well. The deliberation was different from other western applications of deliberation by prioritizing the Tribe's needs (Mariella & Carter, 2009). The jurisdiction and responsibility were held and maintained by Chickasaw Nation. Academic partners supported CNHD. I argue that the collaborative partnership satisfies Dutta's (2007) critique of CBPR. The formative parts of health research come from the tribe. The Tribe's sovereignty was enacted through how they wanted to identify, address, and report the deliberation. The power and the voice remain with the Tribe.

I utilized two interviews with key community researchers that were integrated at each step of the deliberation process. I coupled their interviews in this imperative case study with the deliberation transcripts from 2018. I looked at the community researcher roles and the Indigenizing deliberation themes throughout the deliberation process. The deliberation took over a year of prep before the two-day event. Afterwards, summary findings were distributed to deliberants and to the various stakeholders within the community and administration, as well as academic partners. With extended interviews with the community collaborators and deliberation interviews, I found three overarching themes that Indigenized Deliberation to fit community needs. Due to the flexible nature of deliberation and partners, the process was edifying to the process.

In the CN deliberation, I ascertained three themes of collaborative Indigenous Deliberation: *community contextualization, deliberant support,* and

equitable partnerships. Deliberation can be adopted and altered to fit community

needs but it is through these three themes that deliberation is Indigenized. The

community focus from creation to completion is a driving force and foundation to

the deliberative event's success.

    Community contextualization was bi-directional in situating the

community. The Indigenous deliberation was contextualized through community

perspectives and queries. The formation of the deliberation was founded in the

community. The topic was relevant to the worries, and concerns of the

community.

    The other capacity in which *community contextualization* was pursued was

in the buy-in of genomic research and biobanking for the deliberants. The

deliberative event was a new methodology used by Chickasaw Nation and is

robust in planning and implementation. The deeper discussions engaged in the

deliberation required contextualizing the topic for the community. The need was

there but to what extent did it apply to the deliberants, their family, essentially to

their lives. Deliberation provided a deeper prolonged conversation about Genomic

Research and Biobanking. Seeing oneself in research is an understandable pursuit

to find a connection to topics that could affect one's community.

    Deliberant support covered both physical needs and communicative

needs, an important theme in regulating conversation. The structure deliberation

offers requires physical needs be met: food, a place to stay, or even the physical

space to conduct the deliberation. Supporting deliberants and covering basic needs is an aspect that might be glazed over in most contexts. Supporting deliberants so their focus can be about the topic is a simple measure that enriches the rest of the experience. Communication needs were also met in this deliberative forum. The support was often facilitated through the facilitator and co-facilitator interaction. People want to be heard. Communicative acts like gratitude, summary of statements, and connecting conversations together are several instances in which facilitators provided support.

Equitable partnerships are the gold standard Indigenous Deliberations are built upon. Building the deliberation around the deliberants and supporting them required community researchers' constant involvement. A single person could not successfully conduct this deliberation. Because deliberation is meticulous in design and implementation, a slew of partners were needed to learn, teach, develop tools, and shape the research. Deliberative events like this one takes extended amount of time and resources. Relationships develop with constant interaction and planning.

The themes were enacted through decisions made with partners, both community and academic researchers. Through communication, Indigenous Deliberation was edified through the themes listed above. The dual-role/community researchers had a hand at each step of the deliberative process. Through constant involvement, I observed intentional tailoring to fit the

community. The reiterated focus on community-centered deliberation is deeply needed because of problematic historical research.

We need partnerships and to be partners that build one another up instead of competing. Community is built upon mutual goals and respect of persons. A community developed with this deliberation that would stretch to include future in-person deliberations, other collaborations, and the basis of a dissertation. A community of partners dedicated to community driven practices. The relationships formed amongst community and university partners is a microcosm of the trend of community-driven research. This was the first deliberation conducted in this manner. The Indigenous Deliberation planning hit three important areas: *community contextualization, deliberant support,* and *equitable partnership.* The deliberation structure provides a vehicle to engage with the community. The driver needed to be community. The combined efforts of community and academic partners created the structure to support the deliberation.

Challenges

Covid was a disruptive event that was arduous for communities. Chickasaw Nation was not exempt from the impacts Covid had on health and community. The rollout of additional deliberations and action on findings was waylaid as greater needs came to attention. The repercussions of Covid continue to disrupt and changes how we meet, interact, and connect with community. A

144

little over a year after the deliberation, Covid hit. This project and future in-person deliberations were put on hold but slowly but surely, time has given a perspective to the deliberation process. From the difficulties during the pandemic, there is need of future scholarship in post-covid research that combines the lessons learned and the research conducted before. The connective tissue between the two is already growing.

One of the most difficult challenges to this dissertation was trying to do research as an individual that is meant to be done in a consortium. Working with Chickasaw Nation is an honor and blessing of this project. I know this dissertation was not possible without several individuals insight, constant conversations, and guidance from CEIGR members, and colleagues. I will not iterate further those mentioned in the acknowledgements, but this speaks to the importance of forming relationships with those we do research. Future deliberations and community-driven research requires filling roles with people equipped or willing to learn.

Before this project was even an abstract, it started with the conversations at Q&As, trainings with GEN and CEIGR, and a trip to Ada, Oklahoma. The path forward is not always a simple or straight journey, but it still needs to be stepped. This type of work requires multiple people in multiple spaces to be ethical, effective, and efficient. Navigating Tribal IRB was made possible with clear communication and emails. Going through the proper channels for this project

took a lot of consultations and conversations. I put this in the challenge part of the project because it is a learning curve that takes time.

Doing research with communities, I know it runs on a different clock. The research runs on a different agenda. The challenge here was knowing the right questions to ask. Just as suggested in *Equitable Partnerships*, I saw relationships grow as we navigated the parameters of this project.

I am not a member of this community. I am an Indigenous scholar so different subtexts and contexts were explored because of similarities. As stated in the interviews, each tribe has their own needs. The challenge here is coming into this project with flexibility. Doing this kind of work, I am the one that needs to change to make the project work. When I set out to do this dissertation, it was challenging to relay intricacies to academic colleagues. A foundation was missing to discuss sovereignty, Tribal needs, and Indigenous methods. I found myself teaching concepts I knew but only gained the words to talk about it while at OU. I needed to grow and I sought mentorship from CEIGR partners. Capacity building is a critical step forward to making this research commonplace, instead of nuanced.

The challenges I faced mainly surrounding meeting needs that were not my own. Need for more evaluation is a driving force for this dissertation and that comes with a responsibility that can be daunting to engage. Need for engaging entire line of support is a challenge for future deliberations. I know engaging with

146

experienced partners can be anxiety inducing but that was mitigated through CEIGR partners' and their mentorship. I saw this need for partnerships being fulfilled as why challenges were surmountable. The biggest challenge now would be not pursuing this research line.

Looking Forward

After analyzing the interviews and deliberation transcripts of the Indigenous deliberation, this project could lead to several new research avenues, for example, the possible implications behind the community co-facilitator, the scenarios, and capacity building with other Indigenous deliberations. The path forward is ripe for inquiry.

I want to expand on the role of the community co-facilitator and the concept of dual-role researchers. The next steps would be to work with a group of the CEIGR partners to continue this analysis of deliberation adaptations to Indigenous contexts in the other CEIGR affiliated deliberations. The work requires more than myself moving forward and the goals behind those analyses will be dependent upon the needs and wants of the different sites. This case study is highly applicable to The Chickasaw Nation and it is impossible to prescribe these findings to each Tribe. The goal was never for prescriptive themes to check boxes but a transferable framework to engage partners in important conversations with clarity.

Another project stemming from this dissertation is a larger meeting for a virtual talking circle. A talking circle is a space created to share experiences, emotions, thoughts, and ideas. Differing from a focus group, a degree of openness is encouraged and welcomed. A holistic approach to the talking circle is more than bouncing ideas off participants but creating an experience where ceremony can happen (Wilson, 2008). One way I want to expound Indigenous methods would be using talking circles. Talking circles can be used for discussion, problem solving, and/or decision making. The basic intent is to create a safe, nonjudgmental place where each participant has an opportunity to contribute to the discussion of important and/or difficult issues (Running Wolf & Rickard, 2003). The project would draw upon CEIGR partners as a base, past and present, to explore the deliberative and community driven choices made to help other communities engage in deliberative applications. Deliberation is not monolithic and is clearly adapted to fit community needs.

I would expand the conversation with various community collaborators across different sites and other Indigenous Deliberation community collaborators beyond the scope of CEIGR to the larger meeting to discuss the process, the perceived benefits and drawbacks, and the application to their respective communities. The meeting would include at least four different deliberation sites and those community partners. The virtual talking circle facilitation would be informed by the findings from this project to help create questions and follow-up

inquiries while the group discusses Indigenous deliberation. The online talking-circle would allow for large-scale discussion and potential breakout sessions to be recorded and evaluated. Moving forward with Indigenous led research, we can start expounding on evaluation criteria for Indigenous deliberations.

Future research in deliberations, especially in community-driven events, needs expounding on evaluation on longitudinal benefits. The singular Chickasaw Nation deliberation is difficult to measure the longer impacts from the collected lasting impressions. A path needed is expounding evaluation material to measure larger ramifications behind the deliberative event. We are looking at an event 5 years ago but with this dissertation, we see potential benefits and further needs of deliberation's impact over time.

A 2-day deliberative event is not for every community. There are multiple ways to conduct a deliberation and a multitude of alterations a researcher can make to approach the community. Future deliberations could be used in surrounding any topic that the community desires: mental health, substance abuse, environmental initiatives, etc. Deliberation theory offers itself to apply wherever citizens might need.

Calls to action span a widely and deeply. We need more Indigenous deliberation scholarship. Due to the nature of community-engaged research, interdisciplinary is almost a pre-requisite when conducting deliberation with Tribal Nations. The capacity building CEIGR has perpetuated with their

partnership model is an integral part to future deliberation community-driven research.

I know historical trauma caused by academic and government entities is a prevalent, and unfortunately not extinct, reality. To combat these problematic origins and move towards mending broken trust, the first layer to address these issues is researchers that care more about the community than a publication. Dual-role researchers' outcomes tie back to helping their community. Stakeholders founded in the community hold a priority in CBPR and required to move towards better practices.

The next call to action is a degree higher than the individual researcher. Academia's publish or perish model does not provide adequate support for community research. The timelines and metrics that determine tenure and prestige can overlook the important progress creating working relationships with communities. I know part of this change starts slowly and may happen with one retirement at a time but creating new criteria that elevates and equitably measures community engaged research is a floor to be established. I am grateful this project was a step towards transforming reality where Indigenous methodology, and Deliberation theory scholarship are progressed at the same time.

A call to action for researchers and academic departments, creating relationships takes time and the hierarchy of junior and senior faculty can ward important younger scholars from engaging in community-based research. Tenure

as requisite to engage in community-based research is a relic of the past that maintains repercussions across western universities. Capacity building is developing self-sustaining practices to build, grow, and expand skills and methodologies. Like the call to be open to deliberation as a methodology, departments will need to adapt how they conceptualize accepting and supporting different approaches to research that do not fall into the post-positivist, critical, or interpretive paradigms.

Unfortunately, deliberation is saturated with terminology that can be isolating and daunting to approach. This analysis was a step towards engaging deliberation theory from a different standpoint. The lessons garnered in this deliberation probably already influences how deliberation is discussed within partnership meetings, but these conversations need to extend beyond the conference rooms and Zoom calls. Deliberation theory and practice is similar to indictments from strangers that claim a communication scholar needs to be better at communication. Theory and practice are not a 1 to 1 translation, though they inform one another. The more deliberative events are implemented, the verbiage will grow and adapt. Deliberation buy-in is a sound methodology but can be daunting to individuals not familiar with the theory. Indigenous Deliberation is an incredible way to conduct community driven forums and build dialogue surrounding important topics.

Indigenous Deliberation is a combination that offers a structure for future collaborative deliberative events. Each Tribe and topic require interactive conversations with stakeholders, and deliberation can be adapted to fit the needs and context of a community. Deliberative theory was developed outside of Indigenous contexts and specific Indigenous ways of knowing are rooted in their community. Two different origins can join in an equitable endeavor. Spaces historically oppressive can be repurposed, recalibrated, and reinvented. Deliberation built on citizen engagement is not a far cry from Tribes wanting community engagement. Similarities is what brought the methodology and community together, but it is through the differences that we can improve Indigenous Deliberations. Like this project, I can be two things driven to help my community.

REFERENCES

Airhihenbuwa, C. O. (1995). *Health and culture: Beyond the Western paradigm*.
Sage.

Anderson, J. A., & Baym, G. (2004). Philosophies and Philosophic Issues in
Communication, 1995-2004. *Journal of Communication*, *54*(4), 589-615.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2004tb02647.x

Anderson, R. N., Copeland, G., & Hayes, J. M. (2014). Linkages to Improve
Mortality data for American Indians and Alaska Natives: A new model for
death reporting. *American Journal of Public Health*, *104*(Suppl 3), 258-
262. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301647

Apker, J., & Eggly, S. (2004). Communicating professional identity in medical
socialization: Considering the ideological discourse of morning report.
Qualitative Health Research, *14*, 411-429.
https://doi.org/doi:10.1177/1049732303260577

Archibald, J.-a. (2008). *Indigenous Storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body,
and spirit*. UBC Press.

Austen, I. (2021). With Discovery of Unmarked Graves, Canada's Indigenous
Seek Reckoning. *New York Times*.
https://www.nytimes.com/2021/06/26/world/canada/indigenous-
residential-schools-grave.html

Basso, K. (1996). *Wisdom Sits in places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache*. University of New Mexico Press.

Belone, L., & Werito, V. (2022). K'é Bee 'Ahił Na'anish:Mentorship whilte utilizing a Diné-Centered, Community-Based Participatory Research Approach. In P. V. V. Werito (Ed.), *Transforming Diné Education: Innovations in Pedagogy and Practice* (pp. 85-99). The Univeristy of Arizona Press.

Blacksher, E., Hiratsuka, V. Y., Blanchard, J. W., Lund, J. R., Reedy, J., Beans, J. A., Saunkeah, B., Peercy, M., Byars, C., Yracheta, J., Tsosie, K. S., O'Leary, M., Ducheneaux, G., & Spicer, P. G. (2021). Deliberations with American Indian and Alaska Native People about the ethics of genomics: An adapted model of deliberations used with three tribal communities in the United States. *American Journal of Bioethics Empirical Bioethics*, *12*(3), 164-178. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/23294515.2021.1925775

Bombay, A., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2013). The intergenerational effects of Indian Residential Schools: Implications for the concept of historical trauma. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, *51*(3), 320-338. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1363461513503380

Boyatzis, R. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Sage.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2008). Using thematic anlaysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Thematic Anlaysis. In *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences* (pp. 843-860). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5251-4_103

Braveman, P., & Gruskin, S. (2003). Defining Equity in Health. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, *57*, 254-258.

Burhansstipanov, L. (1998). *83*, 8, 1849-1855. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0142(19981015)83:8+<1849::AID-CNCR37>3.0.CO;2-W

Business, N. (2004). *An overview of the Navajo Nation- Demographics*. The Navajo Nation. http://navajobusiness.com/fastFacts/demographics.htm

Cameron, C. M., Kelton, P., & Swedlund, A. C. (2015). *Beyond Germs: Native Depopulation in North America*. The University of Arizona Press.

Carson, L., & Hartz-Karp, J. (2005). Adapting and combining deliberative designs: Juries, Polls, and forums. In J. Gastil & P. Levine (Eds.), *The deliberative democracy handbook: Strategies for effective civic engagement in the twenty-first century*. Jossey Bass.

Cattelino, J. (2008). *High Stakes: Florida Seminole gaming sovereignty*. Duke University.

CDC. (2015). Adolescent and school community health and program services

    (CHAPS): Health disparities among racial/ethnic populations.

    https://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/disparities/

CDC. (2021). *The U.S. Public Health Service Syphilis Study at Tuskegee*.

    https://www.cdc.gov/tuskegee/timeline.htm

Chambers, S. (2003). Deliberative Democracy Theory. *Annual Review of Political*

    Science, *6*, 307-326.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory*. Sage.

Chatwood, S., Paulette, F., Baker, R., Eriksen, A., Hansen, K. L., Eriksen, H.,

    Hiratsuka, V., Lavoie, J., Lou, W., Mauro, I., Obinski, J., Pabrum, N.,

    Retallack, H., & Brown, A. (2015). Approaching Etuaptmumk –

    introducing a consensus-based mixed method for health services research.

    International Journal of Circumpolar Health, *74*(1).

    https://doi.org/10.3402/ijch.v74.27438

Christopher, S., Watts, V., McCormick, A., & Young, S. (2008). Building and

    Maintaining Trust in a Community-Based Participatory Based Research

    Partnership. *American Journal of Public Health*, *98*(8), 1398-1406.

    https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2007.125757

Cohen, J. (1989). Deliberation and democratic legitimacy. In J. Bohman & W.

    Rehg (Eds.), *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics*. MIT

    Press.

Cresswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2 ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Daase, C., & Deitelhoff, N. (2018). Opposition and dissidence: Two modes of resistance against international rule. *Journal of International Political Theory*, *15*(1). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1755088218808312

Dahl, R. A. (1989). *Democracy and its critics*. Yale University Press.

Dennison, J. (2012). *Colonial Entanglements: Consuming a twenty-first century Osage Nation.* University of North Carolina Press.

Denscombe, M. (2008). Communities of Practice: A Research Paradigm for the Mixed Methods Approach. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *2*(3), 270-283. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689808316807

Diamond, J. (1997). *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The fates of human societies*. W. W. Norton.

Diop, W. (2000). From Government Policy to Community-Based Communication Strategies in Africa: Lessons from Senegal and Uganda. *Journal of Health Communication*, *5*, 113-117. https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730508956572

Dutta, M. (2008). *Communicating Health: A culture-centered approach.* Polity Press.

Dutta, M., & Basu, A. (2017). Subaltern resistance narratives and the culture-centered approach: Inverting public health discourse. In N. Bulled (Ed.),

Thinking through resistance: A study of public oppositions to contemporary global heatlh practice (pp. 22-38). Routledge.

Dutta, M. J. (2006). Theoretical Approaches to Entertainment Campaigns: A Subaltern Critique. *Health Communication*, *20*(3), 221-231. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327027hc2003_2

Dutta, M. J. (2007). Communicating about culture and health: Theorizing culture-centered and cultural sensitivity appraoches *Communication Theory*, *17*(3), 304-328. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.007.00297.x

Dutta, M. J. (2011). Culture, communication, and health: A Guiding framework. In T. L. Thompson, R. Parrott, & J. F. Nussbaum (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of health communicaiton* (2nd ed., pp. 320-334). Routledge.

Dutta, M. J. (2012). *Voices of resistance: Communication and social change*. Purdue University Press.

Dutta, M. J., Anaele, A., & Jones, C. (2013). voices of hunger: Addressing health disparities through the culture-centered approach. *Journal of Communication*, *63*(1), 159-180. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12009Dutta,

Ehlrich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Oryx Press.

Fisher, P. A., & Ball, T. J. (2002). The Indian Family Wellness Project: an
Application of the Tribal Participatory Research Model. *Prevention
Science*, *3*, 235-240. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1019950818048

Fisher, P. A., & Ball, T. J. (2003). Tribal Participatory Research: Mechanisms of
Collaborative Model *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *32*(3-
4), 235-240.

https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1023/B:AJCP.0000004742.39858.c5

Fishkin, J. S. (1991). *Democracy and deliberation: New directions for democratic
reform*. Yale University Press.

Fung, A. (2003). Survey article: Recipes for public spheres: Eight institutional
design choices and their consequences. *Journal of Political Philosophy*,
11, 338-367.

Gartner, D. R., Wilbur, R. E., & McCoy, M. L. (2021). "American Indian" as a
Racial categoryin public Health: Implications for Communities and
Practice. *American Journal of Public Health*, *111*(11), 1969-1975.
https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2021.306465

Gastil, J. (2000). *By popular demand: Revitalizing representative democracy
through deliberative elections*. University of California Press.

Gastil, J. (2018). The lessons and limitaitons of Experiments in Democratic
deliberation. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, *14*, 271-291.

Gastil, J., Knobloch, K., & Kelly, M. (2012). Evaluating Deliberative Public

Events and Projects. In T. Nabatchi, J. Gastil, G. M. Weiksner, & M.

Leighninger (Eds.), *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and

Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement* (pp. 205-231). Oxford

University Press.

Gastil, J., Knobloch, K. R., Reedy, J., Henkels, M., & Cramer, K. (2017).

Assessing the Electoral Impact of the 2010 Oregon Citizens' Initiative

Review. *American Politics Research*, *46*(3), 534-563.

https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X17715620

Gaudry, A., & Lorenz, D. (2018). Indigenization as inclusion, reconciliation, and

decolonization: navigating the different visions for indigenizing the

Canadian Academy. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous

Peoples*, *14*(3), 218-227.

https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180118785382

Gershon, L. (2021, July 2021). Life in Indigenous Boarding Schools. *JSTOR

Daily*. https://daily.jstor.org/life-in-indigenous-boarding-schools/

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Aldine

Publishing.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Simon

& Schuster, Inc.

Gone, J. P., & Trimble, J. E. (2012). American Indian and Alaska Native Mental health: Diverse perspectives on enduring disparities. . *Annual review of clinical psychology*, *8*, 131-160. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032511-143127

Habermas, J. (1975). *Legitimation Crisis*. Beacon.

Harper, A., & Pratt, B. (2021). Combatting neo-Colonialism in Health Research: What can Aboriginal Health Research Ethics and Global Health REsearch Ethics Teach Each Other? *Journal of Empircal Research on Human Research Ethics*, 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1177/15562646211058253

Him, D. A., Aguilar, T. A., Frederick, A., Larsen, H., Seiber, M., & ANgal, J. (2019). Tribal IRBs: A framework for understanding research oversight in American Indian and Alaska Native Communities. *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research*, *26*(2), 71-95. https://doi.org/10.5820/aian.2602.2019.71

Hiratsuka, V. Y., Beans, J. A., Blanchard, J. W., Blacksher, E., Lund, J. R., & Spicer, P. G. (2020). An Alaska Native community's views on genetic research, testing, and return of results: Results from a public deliberation. . *PLoS One*, *15*(3). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0229540. eCollection 2020.

Hodge, F. S., Fredericks, L., & Rodriguez, B. (1996). American Indian women's talking circle: A cervical cancer screening and prevention. *Cancer*, *78*,

1592-1597. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0142(19961001)78:7+<1592::AID-CNCR13>3.0.CO;2-0

Igalla, M., Edelenbos, J., & Meerkerk, I. V. (2019). Citizens in action, what do the accomplish? A systematic literature review of citizen initiative, their main characteristics,outcomes, and factors. *Voluntas*, *30*, 1176-1194. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-019-00129-0

Israel, B. A., Coombe, C. M., Cheezum, R. R., Schulz, A. J., McGranaghan, R. J., Lichtenstein, R., Reyes, A. G., Clement, J., & Burris, A. (2010). Community-based participatory research: A capacity-building approach for policy advocacy aimed at eliminating health disparities. *American Journal of Public Health*, *100*(11), 2094-2102. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.170506

Israel, B. A., Coombe, C. M., Cheezum, R. R., Schulz, A. J., McGranaghan, R. J., Lichtenstein, R., Reyes, A. G., CLement, J., & Burris, A. (2011). Community-Based Participatory Research: A Capacity-Building Approach for Policy Advocacy Aimed at Eliminating Health Disparities. *American Journal of Public Health*, *11*, 2094-2102. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.170506

Israel, B. A., Lachance, L., Coombe, C. M., Lee, S.-Y. D., Jensen, M., WIlson-Powers, E., Mentz, G., Muhammad, M., Rowe, Z., Reyes, A. G., & Brush, B. L. (2020). Measurement Approaches to Partnership Success: Theory

and Methods for Measuring Success in Long-Standing CBPR

Partnerships. In *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research,*

Education and Action (Vol. 14, pp. 129-140).

Jacob, M. (2014). *Yakama Rising: Indigenous cultural reviatalization, activism,*

and healing. University of Arizona Press.

Ketchum, S., & Meyers, R. (2018). Recognizing and Respecting Tribal IRBs.

Anthropology News, *59*, 100-103. https://doi.org/10.1111/AN.908

Kim, J.-N. (2010). Mapping health communication scholarship: Breadth, depth,

and agenda of published research in health communication. *Health*

Communication 25(6), 487-503.

https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2010.507160

Kinney, B. (2012). Deliberation's Contribution to Community Capacity Building.

In T. Nabatchi, J. Gastil, G. M. Weiksner, & M. Leighninger (Eds.),

Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative

Civic Engagement (pp. 163-180). Oxford University Press.

Knobloch, K. R., Barthel, M. L., & Gastil, J. (2019). Emanating Effects: The

Impact of the Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review on Voters' Political

Efficacy. *Political STudies*, *68*(2), 426-445.

https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321719852254

Knobloch, K. R., Gastil, J., Feller, T., & Jr., R. C. R. (2014). Empowering Citizen

Deliberation in Direct Democratic Elections: A Field Study of the 2012

Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review. *Field Actions Science Report*, *11*, 1-10.

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts*. University of Toronto Press.

Kreps, G., & Thornton, B. C. (1992). *Health communication theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Waveland.

Kreps, G. L. (1989). Setting the agend for health communication research and development: Scholarship that can make a difference. *Health Communication 1*, 11-15.

Levy, D. T., & Friend, K. (2000). Gauging the effects of mass media policies: What do we need to know? *Journal of Public Health Managaement and Practice*, *6*(3), 95-106.

Littlejohn, S. W., & Foss, K. A. (2011). *Theories of Human Communication* (10 ed.). Waveland Press, Inc.

Lupton, D. (1994). Toward the Development of Critical Health Communication Praxis. *Health Communication*, *6*(1), 55-67. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327027hc0601_4

Macaulay, A. C., Delormier, T., McComber, A. M., Cross, E. J., Potvin, L. P., Paradis, G., Kirby, R. L., Saad-Haddad, C., & Desrosiers, S. (1998). Participatory Research with Native COmmunity of Kahnawake creates

innovative code for research ethics. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*,
89, 105-108. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03404399

Macaulay, A. C., Jagosh, J., Seller, R., Henderson, J., Cargo, M., Greenhalgh, T.,
Wong, G., Salsberg, J., Green, L. W., Herbert, C. P., & Pluye, P. (2011).
Assessing the benefits of participatory research: a rationale for a realist
review. *Global Health Promotion*, *18*(2), 45-48.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1757975910383936

Mariella, P., & Carter, E. B. M. (2009). Tribally-Driven Participatory Research:
State of the practice and potential strategies for the future potential
strategies for the future *Journal of Health Disparities Research and
Practice*, *3*(2), 41-58. https://doi.org/
https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/jhdrp/vol3/iss2/4

Mishler, E. G. (1984). *Discourse of Medicine: Dialectics of medical interviews*.
Ablex.

Nabatchi, T. (2012). Putting the "Public" Back in Public Values Research:
Designing Participation to Identify and Respond to Values. *Public
Adminstration Review*, *72*(5), 699-708.
https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2012.02544.x

Nez, V. (2018). *DINÉ EPISTEMOLOGY: SA'AH NAAGHÁI

BIK'EH HÓZHÓÓN TEACHINGS* [Dissertation, University of New Mexico].
University of New Mexico.

Noar, S. M. (2006). A 10-year Retrospective of Research in Health Mass Media

    Campaigns: Where do we go from here? . *Journal of Health*

    Communication, *11*(1), 21-42.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730500461059

Olufowote, J., & Livingston, D. J. (2021). The Excluded Voices from Africa's

    Sahel: Alternative Meanings of Health in Narratives of Resistance to the

    Global Polio Eradication Initiative in Northern Nigeria. *Health*

    Communication, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2021.1895416

Ornetzeder, M., & Rohracher, H. (2013). Of solar collectors, wind power, and car

    sharing: Comparing and understanding successful cases of grassroots

    innovations. *Global Environmental Change*, *23*(5), 856-867.

Orr, R. I. (2017). *Reservation Politics*. University of Oklahoma Press.

Orr, R. I., Reedy, J., Livingston, D. J., & Spicer, P. G. (2021). American Indian

    Genes in the Media: Representations of the Havasupai Indian Tribe in

    Their Case against Arizona State University. *American Indian Culture and*

    Research Journal, *45*(2), 65-80.

    https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17953/aicrj.45.2orr_etal

Pincock, H. (2012). Evaluating the practice of deliberative civic engagement In T.

    Nabatchi, J. Gastil, G. M. Weiksner, & M. Leighninger (Eds.), *Democracy*

    in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic

    Engagement (pp. 135-162). Oxford University Press.

Powder, J. (2021). Keys to the Navajo Nation's COVID-19 Vaccination Success. *Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health*. https://publichealth.jhu.edu/2021/keys-to-the-navajo-nations-covid-19-vaccination-success

Quinless, J. M. (2022). *Decolonizing Data: Unsettling conversations about social research methods*. University of Toronto Press.

Ransom, J. W., & Ettenger, K. T. (2001). 'Polishing the Kaswetha': A Haudensosaunee view of environmental cooperation. *Environmental Science & Policy*, *4*(4), 219-228. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1462-9011(01)00027-2

Reedy, J., Blanchard, J. W., Saunkeah, B., Peercy, M. T., Byars, C., Spicer, P. G., & Blacksher, E. (2020). Deliberations about Genomic Research and Biobanks with Citizens of Chickasaw Nation. *National Frotnier Genetics*, *11*, eCollection. https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2020.00466

Reedy, J., Orr, R., SPicer, P. G., Blanchard, J. W., Hiratsuka, V. Y., Ketchum, T. S., Saunkeah, B., Wark, K., & Woodbury, R. B. (2020). Deliberative democracy and historical perspectives on American Indian/Alaska native political decision-making practices. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *7*(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-020-0506-4

Richard, L. (2021, July 13, 2021). More than 160 additional Indigenous Graves have been found in Canada. *NPR*. https://www.npr.org/2021/07/13/1015823457/more-than-160-additional-indigenous-graves-have-been-found-in-canada

Romenofsky, A. (2010). Native American disease history: Past, present and future directions. *World Archeaology*, *35*(2), 241-257. https://doi.org/10.1080/0043824032000111407

Rundall, T. T., & Bruvold, W. H. (1988). A meta-analysis of school-based smoking and alcohol use prevenation programs. . *Health Education Quarterly*, *15*, 317-334.

Running Wolf, P., & Rickard, J. A. (2003). Talking circles: A Native American approach to experiential learning. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *31*(1), 39-43. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2003.tb00529.x

Sears, A. (1992). 'To teach them how to live': The politics of public health from tuberculosis to AIDS. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, *5*, 61-83.

Sheridan, C. L., & Radmacher, S. A. (1992). *Health psychology: Challenging the biomedical model*. Wiley.

Shrider, E. A., Kollar, M., CHen, F., & Semega, J. (2021). *Income and Poverty in the United States:2020*. US Government. Retrieved 3/20/2021 from https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2021/demo/p60-

273.html#:~:text=Median%20household%20income%20was%20%2467%2C521,median%20household%20income%20since%202011.

Siu, A., & Stanisevski, D. (2012). Deliberation in Multicultural Societies: Addressing Inequality, Exclusion, and Marginalization. In T. Nabatchi, J. Gastil, G. M. Weiksner, & M. Leighninger (Eds.), *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement* (pp. 83-102). Oxford University Press.

Skloot, R. (2010). *The Immortal life of Henrietta Lacks*. Picador Australia.

Sprain, L., Carcasson, M., & Merolla, A. J. (2014). Utilizing "On Tap" Experts in deliberative forums: Implications for design. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *42*(2), 150-167. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2013.859292

Sprain, L., & Reinig, L. (2018). Citizens Speaking as Experts: Expertise Discoure in Deliberative Forums. *Environmental Communication*, *12*(3), 357-369. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2017.1394894

Stevenson, H. M., & Burke, M. (1991). Bureaucratic logic in new social movement clothing: The limits of health promotion research. . *Health Promotion International*, *6*(4), 281-289.

Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative ANalysis for Social Scientists*. Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Technique* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Swedlund, A. C. (2015). Contagion, Conflict, and Captivity in Interior New England: Native American and European Contacts in the Middle Connecticut River Valley of Massachusetts, 1616-2004. In *Beyond Germs* (pp. 146-173). The University of Arizaon Press.

Taylor, V. (1990). Heatlh Education-- A theoretical mapping. . *Health Education Journal*, *49*, 13-14.

Torri, M. C., & Martinez, A. (2011). Gender Empowerment and Equality in Rural India: Are Women's Community-Based Enterprises the Way Forward? . *Journal of International Women's Studies*, *12*(1), 157-176. https://doi.org/https://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol12/iss1/13

Tracy, S. J. (2013). *Qualitative Research Methods*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Tsosie, K. S., Yracheta, J. M., Kolopenuk, J. A., & Geary, J. (2021). We have "gifted" enought: Indigenous Genomic Data sovereignty in precision medicine. *The American Journal of Bioethics*, *21*(4), 72-75. https://doi.org/ https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2021.1891347

Weiksner, G. M., Gastil, J., Nabatchi, T., & Leighninger, M. (2012). Advancing the Theory and Practice of Deliberative Civic Engagement: A Secular Hymnal In T. Nabatchi, J. Gastil, G. M. Weiksner, & M. Leighninger

(Eds.), *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement* (pp. 261-273). Oxford University Press.

Werito, V., & Vallejo, P. (2022). The State of Navajo Education. In P. Vallejo & V. Werito (Eds.), *Transforming Diné Education: Innovations in Pedagogy and Practice* (pp. 3-13). The University of Arizona Press.

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is Ceremony*. Fernwood Publishing.

Zoller, H. M., & Dutta, M. J. (2008). *Emerging perspectives in health communication: Meaning, culture and power*. Routledge.

APPENDIX A

Semi-structured Interview Questions

1. How were you involved with the deliberation process?

    a. What challenges did you face in your role of these deliberations?

2. What were your impressions about the deliberation process?

3. Any changes you would make to the process?

    a. The worries that you had, how were they addressed?

4. Did anything surprise you about the deliberation process?

    Implementation? Evaluation?

5. Are there other topics you believe deliberation could be helpful?

6. What advice or insight would you give to other Tribes using enclave

    deliberation?

7. Is there anything else you want to talk about regarding what we have been

    talking about?