"It's Not Just a Picture When Lives are at Stake: Ethical Considerations and Photovoice Methods with Indigenous Peoples Engaged in Street Lifestyles".

Robert Henry, Métis
University of Saskatchewan

Chelsea Gabel, Métis
McMaster University

ABSTRACT: Photovoice is an arts-based, participatory research method in which participants take photographs to document their understanding of the research question. It engages participants in a process of creating and sharing photographs and dialogue, supports connections with others and can be a key tool for policy change advocacy. This method has grown in popularity over the years and has been heralded as ideal for research with Indigenous communities and other marginalized populations. While photovoice offers clear benefits, little research has considered the ethical dilemmas that can arise from this method from an Indigenous specific lens. This paper describes the photovoice approach and its benefits, notably its engagement and empowerment aspects. We then explore the ethical challenges photovoice raises drawing on a recent study that investigates the ways in which Indigenous men engage in street lifestyles. We conclude by offering lessons learned to guide the work of researchers using photovoice with Indigenous peoples or other marginalized populations.

Keywords: Indigenous Peoples; Research Ethics; Community-Based Participatory Research; Visual Methods; Photovoice; Street Lifestyles

RÉSUMÉ: Photovoice est une méthode de recherche participative lié aux arts dans laquelle les participants prennent des photos pour documenter leur compréhension d'une question de recherche. Cette méthode engage les participants dans un processus de création et de partage de photographies et de dialogue, soutient leurs relations avec les autres et

peut constituer un outil essentiel pour les changements politiques. Cette méthode a gagné en popularité au fil des ans et a été proclamée idéale pour la recherche avec les communautés autochtones et autres populations marginalisées. Bien que Photovoice offre des avantages évidents, peu de recherches ont porté sur les dilemmes éthiques de cette méthode pour les Autochtones. Cet article décrit l'approche et ses avantages, notamment ses aspects d'engagement et de responsabilisation. Nous explorons ensuite les défis éthiques que Photovoice soulève en nous appuyant sur une étude récente portant sur la manière dont les hommes autochtones s'engagent dans les habitudes de vie de rue. Nous concluons avec des leçons apprises pour guider les travaux des chercheurs utilisant Photovoice avec les peuples autochtones ou d'autres populations marginalisées.

Mots-clés: Peuples autochtones, éthique de la recherche, recherche participative basée sur la communauté, méthodes visuelles, Photovoice, habitudes de vie de rue

Introduction

Over the last decade, there has been growing interest in using visual methods for addressing and preventing complex health and social problems in Indigenous communities in Canada (Poudrier & Thomas-MacLean, 2009; Castleden, Garvin, & Huu-ay-aht First Nation, 2008). The use of images or objects to promote conversation and reflection has been shown to be effective in Indigenous research projects (Lavallee, 2009). Photovoice is one method utilized in Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) where participants are provided cameras and asked to take photographs to represent how their lived experience relates to the research questions (Wang, Morrel-Samuels, Hutchison, Bell, & Pestronk, 2004; Wang & Burris, 1997). This strengths-based method is ideal for research with Indigenous peoples because it has been shown to embrace creative, imaginative and emotional ways of knowing that lend to richer knowledge mobilization when it is grounded in the culture(s) of the community.

The use of photovoice with Indigenous communities has been steadily growing and scholars have highlighted its many strengths and benefits (Brooks, Poudrie, & Thomas-McLean,

2008; Casteldon, et al., 2008; Gabel, Pace, & Ryan, 2016; Helm, Lee, Hanakahi, Gleason, McCarthy, & Haumana, 2015; Henry, et al., 2016). However, there is little in the way of rigorous discussion that addresses the challenges, specifically the ethics of photovoice and the ways in which Indigenous participants fulfill the objectives of photovoice. Participants often have difficulty making ethical decisions in collecting images of identifiable people, places, and things, or may lack the time and resources to actively participate in a meaningful way.

Our contribution to this special issue dedicated to the ethics and integrity in educational contexts is threefold. First, we assess the advantages and overall strengths of photovoice approaches by drawing on Indigenous research in Canada. Specifically, we discuss what is involved in photovoice research and its importance, including the inherent tradeoffs and distinctive contributions to knowledge photovoice presents. Our second aim is to consider the challenges and ethical dilemmas of photovoice, particularly in the context of our own work with Indigenous communities and street lifestyles. Finally, we conclude the paper by offering lessons learned to guide the work of those engaging in Indigenous research and others who use, or are considering the use of photovoice as a research method.

A Poor History

Research undertaken on Indigenous peoples and lands has resulted in the phenomenon that Indigenous peoples are the most researched peoples in the world (Smith, 1999; Ormiston, 2010). Historically, research within Indigenous communities has been problematic in that it has focused on top down, outside-in approaches. Ultimately, research is done on the relatively powerless by the relatively powerful whereby research – qualitative, quantitative, and clinical – is used to justify the disempowerment of Indigenous peoples. Until recently, most of this research has been conducted on Indigenous people, culture and lands without the permission, consultation, or involvement of the people being researched (Ormiston, 2010; Smith, 1999). There has also been an assumption of open access to research where Indigenous peoples bear the risks, but not the benefits. Research activities often cause community members to feel that they have been "researched to death", without benefit to their community resulting in 'research fatigue'. Moreover, the ethical conduct

of some researchers has been questionable and too many times in the past, with many arguing that it is continuing in more subtle ways, researchers have used their role of authority or position of power to oppress those they research disregarding the community's cultural, traditional, and shared knowledge (Battiste, 2001; Brubacher, 2007; Castellano & Reading, 2010; Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2008). Researchers provide their own (often false) explanations of what people have shared (Ormiston, 2010). Canadian food historian Ian Mosby (2013) revealed that at least 1,300 Indigenous peoples — most of them children — were used as test subjects in the 1940s and 1950s by researchers probing the effectiveness of vitamin supplements (p. 147). As such, Maori researcher Linda Smith notes that "the word 'research' is probably one of the dirtiest words in the Indigenous world's vocabulary" (1999, p. 1).

Of critical importance to Indigenous research then is that it benefits Indigenous peoples, communities, and nations. Given the historical context described above, all researchers working in an Indigenous context have an ethical responsibility and obligation toward Indigenous people, their cultures, and the environment. Research that is grounded in principles of community-based involvement, control and ownership is essential and should be a key consideration in the research approach that is adopted with Indigenous peoples. Israel, Shulz, Parker, and Becker (1998) define CBPR as a partnership between the researcher and community members where expertise is mutually shared in order to develop a more enhanced understanding of the research topic, and to integrate knowledge and action in order to benefit the community. The Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS2) further defines participatory research as "a systematic inquiry that includes the active involvement of those who are the subject of the research" (CIHR 2010, p. 124). In CBPR, the community has complete control over the development, facilitation, and dissemination of the research (Powell, 2014). Thus, CBPR is different from other methodologies in that it creates bridges between researchers and communities, through the use of shared knowledge and experiences and establishes a mutual trust that enhances both the quality and the quantity of data collected. The key benefit from these collaborations is a deeper understanding of a community's unique circumstance and a more accurate framework for adapting 'good practices' to the community's

need (Jackson, 1993; Mitchell & Baker, 2009; Porsanger, 2004). Decolonizing and Indigenous frameworks are also critical in Indigenous research which can be defined as research by and for Indigenous peoples, and using techniques and methods drawn from the traditions and knowledges of those peoples (Kovach, 2010; Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2008). Decolonizing and Indigenous frameworks values Indigenous ways of knowing, honours Indigenous values and principles, and uses culturally relevant methods that are grounded in local knowledge (Lavallee, 2009). In many cases decolonizing or Indigenous frameworks overlaps with CBPR and focuses on process rather than product, there is an explicit expectation that research relationships will be long-term and ongoing, and it supports the use of arts-based or creative approaches (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Evan et al., 2009; Smith, 1999). The use of visual approaches, specifically photovoice and the unique contributions to knowledge photovoice presents for Indigenous research, is the next issue we address.

From Participatory Photography to Photovoice: Moving Beyond Pictures

Photovoice is a qualitative, arts-based, participatory method in which research participants take photographs to record and represent their lived experience (Poudrier & Mac-Lean, 2009; Wang, et al., 2004). It blends a grassroots approach to photography and social action where those peoples most impacted by social policies have an opportunity to inform policy-makers and/or professionals about their lived realities. The photovoice process typically involves four stages: 1) participant recruitment and training, 2) a photography assignment, 3) individual interviews, 4) a final focus group. The interviews and focus groups are used to elicit rich descriptions of participant photos and experiences (Poudrier & Mac-Lean, 2009). Participants benefit from photovoice, as they are able to speak about the issues that are bothering them, connect with others in their community, and advocate for change. At the same time, they learn basic marketable skills including photographic technique, working with digital images, and the process of creating an art exhibit or final product. The process requires that from the outset planners bring policy makers and other influential people to the table to serve as an audience.

Photovoice was developed by Caroline Wang and Mary Ann Burris in the mid-1990s to describe their work with the Yunnan Women's Reproductive Health and Development Program in China with three goals: 1) enabling participants to record strengths and concerns within their community; 2) facilitating critical thinking and dialogue about community issues in small and large group settings; and 3) making research visible to policymakers (Wang & Burris, 1997). Photovoice has the potential to build capacity among research participants relating to photography and the research process (Corbie-Smith et al., 2004). It also contributes additional richness to the research data and leads to a concrete outcome (photos) that can be extremely valuable as part of the knowledge mobilization process.

Photovoice as a methodology is based on the underpinning theoretical foundations of empowerment education, feminist theory and documentary photography (Wang & Burris, 1997). Adopting Paulo Freire's approach to education for critical consciousness, empowerment education considers and seeks to act upon, the historical, institutional, social, and political conditions that contribute to personal and community problems (1973/2002). Photovoice draws from a position in feminist theory described by historian Griselda Pollock which is meant to empower marginalized populations, acknowledge individual experiences and local expertise, and take into account patriarchal power and representation (1996). Finally, documentary photography suggests that providing a camera to those who would not otherwise have access to one, will empower them to make change in their communities. Photography then can be considered a tool of social and policy change (Rose, 1997).

While the use of participatory photography and visual methods have been an accepted research method since the 1920s (Collier & Collier, 1967; Gold, 2004), photovoice itself as a research method has only gained popularity in the last two decades. It has been applied in a number of research contexts including health as a way to empower vulnerable individuals of health systems in an effort to create social change (Casteldon et al., 2008). Photovoice has also been used with marginalized and ethnically diverse populations including African American and Latinx communities (Lopez, Eng, Randall-David, & Robinson, 2005; Streng et al., 2004). Women's groups have used photovoice to document their health and social issues in their communities (Lykes, Terre

Blanche, & Hamber, 2003; Wang et al., 1996). Photovoice has also been used to explore homelessness (Radley, Hodgetts, & Cullen, 2005), health and aging (LeClerc et al., 2002), immigrant and refugee experiences (Bender, Harbour, Thorp, & Morris, 2001; Lenette and Body, 2013), and people living with chronic conditions such as cancer and HIV/AIDS (Yi and Zebrack, 2010; Hergenrather, Rhodes, & Clark, 2006). The overarching goal is that photovoice as a research method will create social and policy change for individuals and their communities (Casteldon et al., 2008).

Strengths and Benefits

Photovoice has emerged as a critical method in the last decade for Indigenous research and has been hailed as an ideal approach for working with Indigenous peoples and communities (Castledon et al., 2008; Gabel et al., 2016; Henry, 2015; Poudrie & Mac-Lean, 2009). Photovoice is intended to foster trust, provide community members ownership over research data, and shift the balance of power to community members; consistent within a CBPR paradigm (Casteldon et al., 2008; Fals-Borda & Rahman 1991; Hyett, Margerrison, & Gabel, 2018; Minkler 2004; Reason & Bradbury, 2001). Indigenous specific projects using the photovoice method have focused on a range of issues including Indigenous health (Adams et al., 2012); the well-being of Indigenous women and girls (Moffitt & Vollman, 2004; Poudrier, & Thomas, 2009; Shea, Poudrier, & Thomas, 2013); Indigenous ecologies (Casteldon et al., 2008); and Indigenous youth and intergenerational relationships (Jennings & Lowe, 2013; Tremblay, Baydala, Littlechild, Chiu, & Janzen, 2018; Gabel, Pace, & Ryan, 2016). One of the strengths of applying photovoice in an Indigenous context is that is consistent with Indigenous ways of knowing, both visually and verbally, by providing an opportunity for storytelling. Individuals can share their stories with impacts that extend beyond their communities as they are able to relay findings in multiple platforms. When photovoice is embedded within local Indigenous culture(s), it provides the community a platform to inform broader policy and program initiatives to enhance well-being through their perspectives (Brooks, Poudrier, & Thomas-MacLean, 2008; Helm, Lee, Hanakahi, Gleason, McCarthy, & Haumana, 2015). Thus, photovoice enables those who are often silenced gain a voice, allowing

them to record and reflect on their experiences and their communities' conditions, both positive and negative.

Challenges and Concerns

Despite the many benefits of photovoice for addressing important research questions and community issues, there are challenges with the method that are necessary to address. These potential challenges include participant retention (i.e., multi-step, time commitment), use of photos in dissemination (Petrucka, 2008), growing concern around scholarly rigor (Gubrium & Harper, 2013) and ethics (i.e., anonymity and confidentiality in photographs) (Wang & Redwood-Jones 2001). Wang and Redwood-Jones (2001) provide guidelines on what they consider to be the minimum requirements when it comes to the ethics of photovoice. These include:

1. Getting informed consent from both the participant and the subject(s) of the photographs. Here, the authors advocate a series of consent forms for participants and those they photograph, prior to taking the photographs, at the time of taking the photographs, and after to release prints for publication. They also suggest that written material should be available to the participants outlining the project, method, and who to contact;

2. Ensuring that ethical issues are discussed with individual participants at the time they are briefed and trained in taking photographs;

3. Providing letters of information about the research and the method where photographs will be taken;

4. Providing prints to the participants to give to those they photographed (Harley, 2012).

Despite these guidelines and photovoice specific manuals (see Photovoice Hamilton, 2007; Helm et al., 2016) that have been developed on the method, there is still a lack of discussion of the ethics of photovoice. For example, Anne Harley looks specifically at studies including participants who would normally be viewed as 'high risk', where studies that focused on children, individuals with chronic conditions, refugees, abused women, and addicts noting that, "[s]ome of these studies do not report at all on the process of informed consent or of discussing ethical issues with participants, which does not mean this was not done, of course, but does suggest that the researchers did not experience any kind of

ethical dilemma during the course of the research process" (2012, p. 332).

Thus, scholars have started to question the ethical validity of photovoice. For example, Prins argues that some studies give few details about how researchers actually used the method, and she suggests that they "present a somewhat romanticized view of participatory photography's transformative results" (2010, p. 427), whereby they undervalue the risks and challenges of photovoice. She is critical of the way the technology is presented as acultural and instead vehemently argues that photovoice shapes and is shaped by the particular sociocultural setting within which it is used (Harley, 2012). She raised the following concerns: 1) the role the method plays in raising hostility, controversy, and in-group tensions; 2) the potential for the method to increase the visibility of individuals, thus subjecting them to the scrutiny/surveillance of others; and 3) the potential for violating local social norms. While acknowledging the often reported strengths of the method for Indigenous research, there is little in the way of rigorous discussion that addresses these concerns. Drawing on our own research using the method with Indigenous men engaged in street lifestyles, we focus next on a careful discussion about power and ethics through an Indigenous lens.

Researching within Street Spaces and the Ethical Implications of Photovoice

In his work with Latinx and black male street gangs in Los Angeles, Victor Rios (2011) challenges researchers, specifically sociologists who look to engage in street gang research to move beyond the "savior trope". Rios states that when writing about or working with street gang members, researchers often become rogue sociologists, where they come to report back stating, "I got lost in the wild, the wild people took me in and helped me, made me their king, and I lived to tell civilization about it" (2011, p. 14). He explained that, "this self-aggrandizing narrative, perpetuate[s] the flawed policies and programs and public understanding[s] of the urban poor as creatures in need of pity and external salvation" (2011, p. 14). To take up this challenge, we propose that researchers must be conscious about their actions when working in partnership with Indigenous peoples engaged in street lifestyles, and even more so when

photovoice methods are utilized as the primary research method.

The use of visual research methods in street gang research is an emerging way to engage participants to explain their lived realities (Henry, 2015; Kontos, Brotherton, & Barrios, 2006). Most research on Indigenous street gangs has been quantitative and focused on second-hand accounts (see Grekul & LaBoucane-Benson, 2008; Grekul & LaRocque, 2011; Hautala, Sittner, & Whitbeck, 2016). However, in the last two decades, scholars have turned to visual research methods such as photovoice as a way to develop thick descriptions of local factors leading and pulling individuals into and out of street gang lifestyles. Although visual research is slowly making its way into street gang studies, the use of photographs in research is not a new or novel approach, but it has often been subjected as a secondary tool used to elicit information or to create a vivid imagery of a specific issue (Castleden et al, 2008; Davidson, 2002). Images taken in street gang and lifestyle research are most often not taken by the participants themselves, but by others, thus remaking the images within an anthropological gaze of looking into a space that is different or abnormal, often essentializing the lives of those living in such spaces (see Boogie, 2002; Bourgois & Schonberg, 2009).

With lifestyles and connections to illegal activities and underground economies, Indigenous street gangs look to remain hidden in plain sight. Those who are engaged in street gangs need to keep themselves hidden as their livelihoods on gaining economic capital are dependent on their ability to move across geographies unnoticed (Henry, 2019). Through street codes (Anderson, 1999), street gangs look to find ways to be known to the local community through colours, tagging, clothing, and hand signs. Street codes are used by street gangs to mark their territories and communicate through non-verbal cues. In order to maintain a presence that is both open and closed to outsiders, street gangs look to keep many of these codes secret, in order to avoid being noticed. It is these secrets that continue to intrigue researchers from outside street spaces to engage in research that examines, what are believed to be violent, dangerous, and out-of-place spaces in relation to other urban spaces.

Examples of the violence that Indigenous peoples face is a reality that few settler Canadians will ever experience, but it is not only physical violence that is overtly experienced.

When examining Indigenous life in the Prairie Provinces of Canada, one can also see violence being administered and maintained by the state through the fragmentation of families within the child welfare system, as Indigenous children are vastly overrepresented, with over 70% of those in child welfare settings on the Prairies being Indigenous (Tait, Henry, & Lowen-Walker, 2018). Most often Indigenous children are removed not for reasons of abuse, but due to racialized poverty (Blackstock & Trocmé, 2005; Comack, Deane, Morrissette, & Silver, 2013; Sinclair & Grekul, 2012; Tait et al., 2018). Some Indigenous gang members have expressed that the child welfare system was their first experience of incarceration (Henry, 2015). It is because of this that Sinclair and Grekul (2012) and Stewart and Laberge (2019) have called such processes a pipeline to the prison industrial complex, therefore increasing the probability of street gang involvement.   These examples illustrate the complexity of Indigenous peoples' experiences.

The creation of Indigenous peoples as violent is a colonial legacy (Crosby & Monahagn, 2018; LaRocque, 2010; Razack, 2015) that continues today and is reflected in the representation of the Indigenous 'gangster' who is violent, uncontrollable, and unpredictable (Comack, 2012; Comack, et al., 2013). As Richard Rodriguez states with his work on Latinx street gang members:

> Very few images stick in the mind as much as that of the young Latin[x] gang members with a menacing look and a gun. This image, endlessly repeated, takes on an iconic status that also affects the way gang members look at themselves. (Kontos et al., 2005, pg. xv)

Media outlets further utilize the image of the gangster (Rodriguez, 2005, pg. 256), as a political tool that is often shaped by the photographers personal connections to the imagery, subjects, and community. Because of this, many images that have been generated to influence broader social understandings, as well as street gang members themselves, may not actually be a reflection of the reality of street gangs in the community. It should also be noted that street gang members themselves are not immune to these constructions of the media gangster, and may take photographs as a way to accentuate their status. The result then is the increased focus on violence, guns, drugs, and a 'tough' pose. This continues to be a symbolic representation of ethnic urban minorities and cultures (Cacho, 2013; Hagedorn, 2008; Henry, 2015; Kontos

et al., 2005; White, 2009), and has the possibility to continue to support policies of surveillance under the guise of protection for the broader community, leading to further marginalization of Indigenous peoples.

With the complex realities that Indigenous peoples involved in street gangs face, there are a number of ethical questions and considerations that researchers need to consider when embarking on photovoice as the primary research method. For instance, what happens with the photographs once they are shared with the researcher so that they are not used to create familial fragmentation (i.e., removal of children through child welfare)? What if the images depict places where illegal activity occurs and this becomes public knowledge (see Fitzgibbon & Stengel, 2018)? What is the impact on the individuals themselves if they are seen as breaking local street codes for taking such photographs and sharing the information? In other words, how do researchers work with individuals who at one time were engaged in street lifestyles in a way that is ethical, where individuals are not exploited or become further marginalized due to their connections to the street lifestyle? How do researchers look to modify photovoice methods in order to meet the needs of research participants when they have limited mobility either from poverty or conditions resulting from criminal charges? How do researchers navigate such complexities and support their participants so that thick descriptions can be ascertained and reflect the knowledge and lived experiences of the participants? In order to address these complex questions, we briefly detail one project conducted with Indigenous males engaged in street gangs and the street lifestyle. This project embodies a photovoice approach and the rich benefits and challenges this method can deliver for researchers, communities and other partners.

Modifying Photovoice to Fit: Lessons Learned

As previously stated, photovoice is an emancipatory research endeavor where participants and researchers embark in a transformative process of knowledge sharing. The problem for many researchers and their projects is the time needed to build ethical relationships for reciprocal and transformative research to occur. Researchers are asking, at times, for participants to take intimate pictures and share their knowledge in ways that conflict with local street cultures of 'trust'. But, trust takes time and many researchers are under

time restrictions based on funding timelines and/or programs of study. This is accentuated in street gang research due to street gang members' general lack of trust with community outsiders.

Indigenous street gang members are taught to be cautious in the way they speak with those from outside of their communities and to those they do not know. Thus, the engagement and ultimate partnership with STR8 UP, 10,000 Steps to Healing, was carefully developed over a six year period. Throughout the discussions, the research process engaged in the development of a model of relational accountability (see Louis, 2009; Wilson, 2008), where respect, relevance, reciprocity, and responsibilities were outlined within an ethical space (see Ermine, 2007) of engagement (Henry et al., 2016). The importance of relationships and trust was paramount, as participants explained during their interviews that interactions with those from outside their communities were not to be trusted. As Baldhead explained:

> Well, because it was like, I wouldn't say all white people, but just white people that were with the law—anything, Social Services, cops, security guards, people like that. You just don't talk to them. You don't trust them. That's just how I was raised. (Henry, 2015)

By working with STR8 UP, trust was established through the support of the founder, Father André Poiliévre as he supported the project and was present throughout the initial meetings and discussions with the participants.

Two challenges that became apparent very early on for participants in relation to the photovoice process was that of time and mobility. Photovoice methods differ from traditional qualitative interviews as researchers ask participants to take time out of their lives to take photographs that might be shared with the larger community. At the onset, participants stated that they were excited to engage with the photovoice method and talked about what they would like to show others. However, because participants' lives were complex as they sought to exit their street gangs and stabilize their lives (i.e., addictions programs, education programs, job training, and familial reengagement), time was a premium. The project quickly moved to the bottom of their daily priorities as daily survival became the focus. To accommodate, the researcher worked with STR8 UP coordinators to continuously talk to participants about the project in order to remind them of their

commitment to the sharing of knowledge to support STR8 UP.

Mobility was the second factor that impeded participants' full participation in the project. During follow-up conversations participants explained that they were limited in where they could go. The limited mobility was a result of three issues: 1) lack of monies for transportation; 2) potential violence of entering old neighbourhoods; and 3) systemic barriers resulting from probation and parole criteria. To accommodate mobility, the researcher worked with STR8 UP to provide transportation for some of the participants to capture local photographs during business hours (9-4). Outside of these hours, it was decided by STR8 UP and participants that the researcher would drive with the participants to take their photographs, which challenges traditional photovoice methods. Photovoice methods state that researchers cannot influence the taking of photographs, and this is why the photographs need to be taken without the researcher being present. However, in this case, some participants asked for the researcher to be with them while they took their photographs so that they had the mobility to move across and through neighbourhoods. At times, the researcher took participants to other communities over 230 km away so that they could go back to where their street lifestyle and introduction into street gangs began. The researcher told participants that they had to direct them where they wanted to go and spent time conversing with individuals as they took photographs about their time in the street gang. These conversations were not recorded or used in the research, rather they were used by the researcher to create a deeper understanding of the complexities of masculinity and its relation to street gangs.

Photograph by Dave: This photograph was taken when Dave and the researcher went to his old neighbourhood that he had not returned to in 6 years. After struggling to capture the 'right' photographs, Dave instructed the researcher that they were going to walk in the neighbourhood to take some photographs. Dave and the researcher were confronted by 3 members of a rival street gang (Dave was wearing a black hooded sweater). The altercation took approximately 15 minutes to come to a point that Dave and the researcher were allowed to walk through the neighbourhood for 10-15 minutes to take the photographs that Dave had wanted. The individual posing in this photograph from a rival gang stated that he would pose for Dave to show gang posturing if it would be used as the cover for the final product – Brighter Days Ahead (Henry, 2013).

For individuals who were not permitted to leave the community due to probation and parole criteria, the researcher engaged in one on one discussions with them. These conversations focused on the photographs that the individuals would like to take, where, and how. For example, one participant explained that he needed to go and take some photographs in and around the Prince Albert Federal Penitentiary. The researcher then went and took multiple photographs described by the participant and

brought them back to the participant. The participant then went through the photographs choosing the ones that he felt best represented what he wanted to show. All other photographs were then deleted prior to the participant's interview.

Photograph by Bones: Bones instructed the researcher of where and how he wanted to take photographs at the Prince Albert Penitentiary where he had spent a large part of his life. The researcher drove to Prince Albert, which was actually his home community, and took multiple photographs for Bones. Bones asked for a copy of this photograph as a way to explain that the correctional system is failing Indigenous peoples, which is reflected in the leaning observation tower.

Finally, the photovoice process itself of conducting a final focus group with participants was simply not possible for this project. The participants explained that they did not want to engage in a focus group setting. The reason for this was primarily time, but also because many of the discussions focused on the construction of masculinity and the participants were simply not ready to speak to others who were engaged in the lifestyle to know what they were saying.

What the participants did state though was that their photographs could be shared to help others frame their thoughts with the project. In doing it this way, the participants were still willing to share their images with others as some of the participants showed emotional responses that they did not want others to see because they needed to maintain their street status and reputation as being hard, tough, and emotionless.

Conclusion

Photovoice has become a popular arts-based method of qualitative CBPR as a way for researchers to engage participants and create a transformative research process. Photovoice has the potential to build relationships, by allowing the researcher to provide space and authority to participants and as a way to convey their knowledge around local issues. Despite the uptake of photovoice research, we still caution its usage, when working with Indigenous peoples, and specifically those engaged in street lifestyles. Although this paper focuses on one specific marginalized population (i.e. Indigenous peoples and street gangs), our argument remains that researchers need to be more open and cognizant to the limitations and ethical concerns that arise during the photovoice process, as a opposed to the perceived transformational outcomes.

Due to the history of colonization and continued settler colonialism, Indigenous peoples continue to be marginalized and their knowledge exploited. With photovoice providing an opportunity to 'see what the participants wish others to see', this becomes ever important in the ethics of such research. Projects that focus on Indigenous issues have the potential to be used to fragment families further entrenching Indigenous peoples as deviant, violent, and immoral. Therefore, the question needs to be asked, can the research and the photovoice method cause more harm once the photographs are made public?

In a similar vein, because photovoice research has historically focused on marginalized communities, there has been oversight on issues related to mobility and financial responsibilities of the researcher to compensate for participants time in taking photographs. In the example provided on Indigenous street gangs, we state that in order to understand such complex issues, most often overlooked by researchers and ethics committees that those looking to

engage in photovoice research look to build ethical relationships with participants or respected community partners. In doing so, the researcher will be able to create a fluidity to the photovoice method that allows participants to engage in the process in a way that is respectful, relevant, reciprocal, and responsible (Henry et al., 2016; Louis, 2009; Wilson, 2008). This does not mean that the method is compromised or invalid, rather the fluidity to adapt to local issues is the essence of photovoice, to work where people are at, while respecting their lived realities in an effort to make positive social change.

REFERENCES

Adams, K., Burns, C., Liebeitz, A., Ryschka, J., Thorpe, S., & Browne, J. (2012). Use of participatory research and photovoice to support urban Aboriginal healthy Eating. *Health and Social Care in the Community, 20*(5), 497-505.

Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral of life of the inner city.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Battiste, M. & Henderson, J. (2000). *Protecting Indigenous knowledge and heritage.* Saskatoon SK: Purich.

Bender, D., Harbour, C., Thorp, J., & Morris, P. (2001). Tell me what you mean by ''Si'': perceptions of quality of prenatal care among immigrant Latina women. *Qualitative Health Research, 11*(6), 780 - 794.

Boogie. (2006). *It's all good.* Brooklyn, NY: Powerhouse Books.

Bourgois, P., & Schonberg, J. (2009). *Righteous dopefiend.* Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Brooks, C., Poudrier, J., & Thomas-MacLean, R. (2008). Creating collaborative visions with aboriginal women: A photovoice project. *In Doing Cross-Cultural Research*, 193–211.

Brubacher, D., Gladu, J.P., & Bombay, H. (2002). *First Nations governance and forest management: a discussion paper.* National Aboriginal Forestry Association, Ottawa, ON.

Cacho, L.M. (2012). *Social death: Racialized rightlessness and the criminalization of the unprotected.* New York: NYU Press.

Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social

Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (2010, December).

Castleden, H., Garvin, T., & Huu-ay-aht First Nation. (2008). Modifying photovoice for community-based participatory Indigenous research. *Social Science & Medicine, 66*(6), 1393-1405.

Castellano M. B. & Reading, J. (2010). Policy writing as dialogue: Drafting an Aboriginal chapter for Canada's Tri-Council policy statement: Ethical conduct for research involving humans. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal, 1*(2).

Collier, J., & Collier, M. (1967). *Visual anthropology: Photography as a research method.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Comack, E. (2012). *Racialized policing: Aboriginal people's encounters with the police.* Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Comack, E., Deane, L., Morrissette, L., & Silver, J. (2013). *Indians wear red: Colonialism, resistance, and Aboriginal street gangs.* Winnipeg: Fernwood Press.

Corbie-Smith, G., Moody-Ayers, S., & Thrasher, A. (2004). Closing the circle between minority inclusion in research and health disparities. *Archives of Internal Medicine,* 164, 1362 - 1364.

Crosby, A., & Monahagn, J. (2018). *Policing Indigenous movements: Dissent and the security state.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Press.

Denzin, L.N., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2008). *The landscape of qualitative research, (3rd ed).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Evans, M., Hole,R., Berg, L.D.,Hutchinson, P., & Sookraj, D. (2009). Common insights, differing methodologies: Toward a fusion of Indigenous methodologies, participatory action research, and white studies in an urban Aboriginal research agenda. *Qualitative Inquiry, 15*(5), 893-910.

Fals-Borda, O., & Rahman, M. A. (1991). *Action and knowledge: Breaking the monopoly with participatory action-research.* New York: Apex Press.

Fitzgibbon, W. & Stengel, C.M. (2018). Women's voices made visible: Photovoice in visual criminology. *Punishment & Society, 20*(4), 411-431.

Freire, P. (1973/2002). *Education for critical consciousness.* New York, NY: Continuum.

Gabel, C., Pace, J., & Ryan, C. (2016). Using photovoice to intergenerational influences on health and well-being in a southern Labrador Inuit community. *International Journal of Indigenous Health, 11*(1), 75-91.

Gold, S.J. (2004). Using photography in studies of immigrant Communities. *American Behavioural Scientist, 47*(1), 1551-1572.

Grekul, J. & LaBoucane-Benson, P. (2008). Aboriginal gangs and their (dis) placement: Contextualizing recruitment, membership, and status. Canadian *Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice 50*(1), 59-82.

Grekul, J. & LaRocque, P. (2011). "Hope is absolute": Gang-involved women perceptions from the frontline. *Aboriginal Policy Studies, 1*(2), 132-160.

Gubrium A. & Harper K. (2013). *Participatory visual and digital methods.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Hagedorn, J.M. (2008). *World of gangs: Armed young men and gangsta culture.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Harley, A. (2012). Power, ethics and politics in using photovoice. *The International Journal of Qualitative Methods,11*(4), 320-339.

Hautala, D.S., Sittner, K. J., & Whitbeck, L.B. (2016). Prospective childhood risk factors for gang involvement among North American Indigenous adolescents. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 14(4*), 390-410.

Helm, S., Lee, W., Hanakahi, V., Gleason, K., & McCarthy, K. (2015). Using photovoice with youth to develop a drug prevention program in a rural Hawaiian community. *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research (Online), 22*(1), 1-26.

Henry, R. (2013). *Brighter days ahead.* Saskatoon, SK: Hear My Heart Press.

Henry, R. (2015). *Through an Indigenous lens: Understanding Indigenous masculinity and street gang involvement.* Dissertation. Saskatoon, SK: University of Saskatchewan.

Henry, R. (2019). "I claim in the name of…": Indigenous street gangs and politics of recognition in prairie cities. In H. Dorries, R. Henry, D. Hugill, T. McCreary, & J. Tomiak (Eds.). *Settler city limits: Resurgence and colonial violence in the urban prairie west.* Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.

Hergenrather, K., Rhodes, S., & Clark, G. (2006). Windows to work: exploring employment-seeking behaviors of persons with HIV/AIDS through photovoice. *AIDS Education and Prevention, 18*(3), 243 - 258.

Hyett, S., Marjerrison, S., & Gabel, C. (2018). Improving health research among Indigenous peoples in Canada. *Canadian Medical Association Journal, 190*(20), E616-E621.

Isreal, B.A., Shulz, A.J., Parker, E.A., Becker, A.B. (1998). Review of community-based research: assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health 19*(1), 173-202.

Jackson, T. (1993). A way of working: Participatory research and the Aboriginal movement in Canada. In P. Park (Ed.), *Voices of change: Participatory research in the United States and Canada,* (pp. 47-64). London, UK: Bergin and Garvey.

Jennings, D., & Lowe, J. (2013). Photovoice: Giving voice to Indigenous youth. Pimatisiwin: *A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health, 11*(3), 521–537.

Kontos, L., Brotherton, D.C., & Barrios, L. *Gangs and society.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

LaRocque, E. (2010). *When the other is me: Native resistance discourse 1850-1990.* Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.

Lavallee, L. F. (2009). Practical application of an Indigenous research framework and two qualitative Indigenous research methods: Sharing circles and Anishnaabe

symbol-based reflection, *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(1), 21-40.

LeClerc, C., Wells, D., Craig, D., & Wilson, J. (2002). Falling short of the mark: tales of life after hospital discharge. *Clinical Nursing Research, 11*(3), 242 - 263.

Lenette, C. & Boddy, J. (2013). Visual ethnography and refugee women: nuanced understandings of lived experiences. *Qualitative Research Journal, 13*(1), 72-89.

López, E. D. S., Eng, E., Randall-David, E., & Robinson, N. (2005). Quality of life concerns of African American breast cancer survivors within rural north: Blending the techniques of photovoice and grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(1), 99–115.

Louis, R. P. (2007). Can you hear us now? Voices from the margin: Using indigenous methodologies in geographic research. *Geographical Research, 45*(2), 130-139.

Lykes, M., Blanche, T. M., & Hamber, B. (2003). Narrating sur-vival and change in Guatemala and South Africa: The politics of representation and a liberatory community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 31*(1e2), 79 - 90.

Mitchell, T., & Baker, E. (2005). Community building vs. career building research: The challenges, risks, and responsibilities of conducting participatory cancer research with Aboriginal communities. In J. Gould, S. Keller-Olaman, & J. Nelson (Eds.), *Cancer on the margins: Method and meaning in participatory research,* 56-74. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Moffitt, P., & Vollman, A. R. (2004). Photovoice: Picturing the health of Aboriginal women in a remote northern community. The *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research, 36*(4), 189–201.

Mosby, I. (2013). Administering colonial science: Nutrition research and human biomedical experimentation in Aboriginal communities and residential schools, 1942–1952, *Histoire sociale/Social history, 46*(91), 145-172.

Ormiston, N. (2010). Re-conceptualizing research: An Indigenous perspective. *First Peoples Child & Family Review, 5*(1), 50–56.

Petrucka, P. (2008). *Project: ocanku duta amani: paths to living well. Research Proposal.* Retrieved from Community-Based Health Research Summer Institute: Weaving the Tapestry, November 2011.

Photovoice Hamilton. (2007). *Photovoice Hamilton manual and resource kit.* Hamilton, ON: Hamilton Community Foundation.

Pollock G, ed. *Generations and Geographies in the Visual Arts*. London, England: Routledge; 1996.

Porsanger, J. (2004). An essay about Indigenous methodology. *Nordlit, 8*(1), 105-120.

Poudrier, J. & Mac-Lean, R.T. (2009). We've fallen into the cracks": Aboriginal women's experiences with breast cancer through photovoice. *Nursing Inquiry, 16*(4), 306-317.

Powell, A. (2014). *Addressing Inequalities: Aboriginal Health Access Centers in Urban Ontario.* Dissertation. Hamilton, ON: McMaster University.

Prins, E. (2010). Participatory photography: A tool for empowerment or surveillance? Action Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(4), 426-443.

Radley, A. & Taylor, D. (2003). Images of recovery: a photo elicitation study on the hospital ward. *Qualitative Health Research, 13*(1), 77 - 99.

Razack, S. (2015). *Dying from improvement: Inquiries and inquests into Indigenous deaths in custody*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice*. London: SAGE.

Rios, V. (2011). *Punished: Policing the lives of Black and Latino boys*. New York: NYU Press.

Rose, G. (1997) Spatialities of 'community', power and change: The imagined geographies of community arts projects. *Cultural Studies, 11(*1), 1-16.

Shea, J. M., Poudrier, J., Chad, K., & Atcheynum, J. R. (2011). Understanding the healthy body from the perspective of First Nations girls in the Battlefords Tribal Council region: A photovoice project. *Native Studies Review, 20*(1), 27–57.

Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples.* Dunedin, NZ: University of Otago Press.

Streng, J.M., Rhodes, S.D., Ayala, G. X., Eng, E., Arceo, R., & Phipps, S. (2004). Realidad Latina: Latino adolescents, their school, and a university use photovoice to examine and address the influence of immigration. *Journal of Interprofessional Care, 18*(4), 403-415.

Tait, C., Henry, R., & Loewen Walker, R. (2013). Child welfare: a social determinant of health for Canadian First Nations and Métis children? Pimatisiwin: *A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health, 11*(1), 39-53.

Tremblay, M., Baydala, L., Littlechild, R., Chiu, E., & Janzen, T. (2018). Promoting the strengths and resilience of an Indigenous community through photovoice. *Pediatrics & Child Health, 23*(4), 247-254.

Wang, C. C. & Burris, M. A. (1997). Photovoice: Concept, methodology, and use for participatory needs assessment. *Health Education & Behavior, 24*(3), 369-387.

Wang, C. C. & Redwood-Jones, Y. A. (2001). Photovoice ethics: Perspectives from Flint photovoice. *Health Education & Behavior 28*(5), 560-572.

Wang, C., Morrel-Samuels, S., Hutchison, P., Bell, L., & Pestronk, R. (2004). Flint photovoice: Community building among youths, adults, and policymakers. *American Journal of Public Health,* 94, 911–913.

White, R. (2009). Indigenous youth and gangs as family. *Youth Studies Australia, 28*(3), 47-56

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing.

Yi, J. & Zebrack, B. (2010). Self-Portraits of families with young adult cancer survivors: using photovoice, *Journal of Psychosocial Oncology, 28*(3), 219-243.

Address for Correspondence
Dr. Robert Henry
University of Calgary
Email: robert.henry1@ucalgary.ca