This is the author-created version of the following work:

McDowall, Ailie (2023) *Preparing postgraduate research students to research Indigenous topics.* **Innovations in Education and Teaching International, . (In Press)**

Access to this file is available from:

Please refer to the original source for the final version of this work:

https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2022.2157857

Preparing postgraduate research students to research Indigenous topics

Dr Ailie McDowall

Indigenous Education and Research Centre

James Cook University

ailie.mcdowall@jcu.edu.au

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4737-3563

Abstract

When Indigenous and non-Indigenous postgraduate research students start researching Indigenous topics, how can we best prepare them for the task ahead? In this article, I describe the approach taken by one regional Australian university to support research students with Indigenous topics through a Master of Philosophy (Indigenous). Drawing on Nakata's cultural interface theory, the program is designed to grow students' capacities to both negotiate the intersection between Indigenous and Western knowledges and successfully complete a research thesis. This article outlines the pedagogical underpinnings of the program and describes some of the practices used throughout one-week intensives.

Preparing postgraduate research students to research Indigenous topics

Indigenous and non-Indigenous postgraduate research students (henceforth, students) and supervisors who work with Indigenous research topics have a complex task before them. There is a history of problematic research undertaken on Indigenous communities by outsiders, leading participants and researchers alike to be wary of the intentions and effects of research projects (Tuhiwai Smith, 2011). Students must navigate not only these representations of Indigenous people in the texts they read, but also negotiate multiple methodologies and theories that respond to this history. How can universities support postgraduate research students to work within the interface of Indigenous and Western knowledge traditions, and to negotiate the limits and complexities of these? And how can we use pedagogy to develop students' understandings of Indigenous research, dispositions, and capacities—technical and otherwise—to allow them to better navigate this "complex and contested terrain" (Nakata et al., 2012, p. 120)?

These questions guide the reflections on practice shared here. In this article, I suggest that an interface approach to research education for Indigenous topics can better prepare postgraduate research students to both engage in critical scholarship and complete the primary task of their research degree, that is, a major research thesis. In doing so, I will share some of the work we have been doing in one such program in a regional Australian university, a Master of Philosophy (Indigenous). Bringing students together for a series of one-week intensives (encompassing lectures, workshops, and work sessions) throughout the program allows us to move beyond the supervisor-student relationship to work more systematically to prepare students for their research.

The broader field of research education highlights the complex demands made of postgraduate research students. Ranging from small-scale descriptions of practice to large

quantitative studies, studies cover ground as diverse as the student-supervisor relationship (McCallin & Nayar, 2012), the development of reading (e.g. McAlpine, 2012), writing (e.g. Ma, 2021), and research (e.g. Bamgboje-Ayodele et al., 2016) capabilities, student subjectivities (e.g. Mantai, 2018), factors impacting retention and completion (e.g. van Rooij et al., 2021), threshold concepts (Kiley, 2009; Kiley & Wisker, 2009) and more recently, a focus on student well-being (Schmidt & Hansson, 2018). This research includes observational studies as well as descriptions of programs that develop students' capacities to successfully complete a research thesis.

In comparison, the literature on support for students with Indigenous research topics is small. There has been a focus on engaging Indigenous students' prior knowledge, incorporating both traditional knowledges and lived experiences. Supervisors are advised to be open to the integration of Indigenous knowledge within students' thesis work (e.g. Trudgett, 2011), support Indigenous students in developing Indigenous methodological approaches (e.g. Wilson, 2017), and to prime students' understanding of their own origins (Manathunga et al., 2021). Indigenous students' needs include social, financial, and academic support (e.g. Barney, 2013, 2018; Moreton-Robinson et al., 2020; Trudgett, 2010; Uink et al., 2021). Similar to undergraduate studies, non-Indigenous students are positioned as needing to examine their own positions of privilege or carve out a space as allies (e.g. Snow, 2018). There is little research that works beyond the binary of Indigenous/non-Indigenous students to instead focus on the task that these students have before them, that is, working with research projects related to Indigenous peoples and communities.

There are, however, deep and long-recognised epistemological differences between Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledges (Agrawal, 1995; Nakata, 2007), as well as differences between traditional knowledge and knowledge of lived experience. The move to integrate Indigenous experience and knowledge into the curriculum of higher degrees by

4

research requires consideration of the limits and possibilities of the interface between Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledges (Nakata et al., 2012). The cultural interface is a proposition to work along the limits of Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledges (Nakata, 2007). As a theory, the cultural interface recognises that over centuries, outsiders (academics, governments, missionaries, the media) have produced a body of knowledge *about* Indigenous people, which shapes how Indigenous knowledges and peoples are understood. For example, the anthropological concept of 'culture' has become a dominant way that Indigenous and non-Indigenous people alike make sense of 'who Indigenous people are' – as cultural people (Nakata, 2007). This argument extends to concepts such as 'reconciliation' which often shape the goals of educational statements. The cultural interface asks us to question our collective loyalties to such approaches and whether they serve the interests of Indigenous people, and asks what other concepts may better recognise Indigenous agency.

As such, this paper follows Nakata's departure from decolonising (Nakata, 2018) or decolonial (Nakata et al., 2012) theories which call for researchers, educators, and students to critique Western knowledges and replace these with Indigenous knowledges (e.g. Mignolo, 2009). The discontinuities caused by colonial interference mean that there is no 'pure' Indigenous knowledge which can be uncovered and reinstated, or even re-made, within a research thesis. Rather, recognising Indigenous agency requires a recognition that Indigenous people have a long history of observing and analysing the ruptures caused by colonisation, and re-making their own understandings as they face new predicaments. These patterns of continuities and discontinuities limit the usefulness of a simplistic Indigenous/non-Indigenous binary to "re-build Indigenous lives and communities" (Nakata et al., 2012, p. 124).

Recently, there has been a move to evaluate how research can deliver tangible benefits for Indigenous people and communities. In Australia, reviews of both health (Bainbridge et al.,

2015) and educational (Burgess et al., 2019) research have established that there is little evidence on how to improve outcomes for Indigenous people. Leading educational researcher and Torres Strait Islander academic Professor Martin Nakata has propositioned that universities can play a role in growing "thinkers who can negotiate and deal with complex convergences of Indigenous and Western systems of thought" (2018, p. 7), and as such, work with a range of different conceptual and methodological tools that may be able to provide benefit to Indigenous communities and in service of Indigenous agendas for self-determination. It is in this line of thinking that the Master of Philosophy (Indigenous) has been developed. The work that I describe here focuses on the elements of learning that might grow students' capacity to utilise the tools of research within this "complex and contested knowledge terrain" (Nakata et al., 2012, p. 120).

The Master of Philosophy (Indigenous) is a two-year full-time program where students undertake a smaller-scale research project to produce a thesis. The program's design was led by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Indigenous Education and Strategy) at James Cook University together with myself as the postgraduate research coordinator and the Indigenous Studies teaching team. It is published with the permission of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor. The program builds on previous work undertaken by Nakata et al. (2019) that focuses on building academic capacities to change Indigenous students' educational outcomes. The Master of Philosophy (Indigenous) extends this work into postgraduate research, and extend the current research on support for Indigenous students to include non-Indigenous students working with Indigenous topics. We are continually reflecting on and adjusting the program as students' needs emerge, however the work presented here brings together the complexity of working with Indigenous research topics with theories of how to grow open and inquiring learners.

I will first outline some of the elements that informed the program's design, before describing the one-week intensive that prepares students to commence their thesis. A second intensive, held approximately six months later, focuses on methodology and interpretive frameworks, however, is outside of the scope of this paper to describe.

The elements include:

- theoretical frameworks to negotiate Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledge standpoints;

- manageable projects that correspond to the scale of the degree;

- reading and writing to support not just research, but the reading of the corpus;

- a strong academic community;

- proactive supervisory practices; and

- self-efficacy and belief in one's capacity to undertake the work.

Theoretical frameworks

A research thesis (as opposed to knowledge which is held and produced in different arenas, including traditional knowledges and lived experience) must include argumentation and locate research findings and data within relevant theoretical frameworks (Kiley & Wisker, 2009). Articulating how one's research sits within a field and the contributions made to theoretical concepts is a challenging aspect for many research students, and may lead to students feeling 'stuck', unable to move forward in their research (Kiley, 2009). Given the complexity of the knowledge terrain that students researching Indigenous research topics are working within, the cultural interface (described above) provides a theoretical framework to understand the continuities and discontinuities of Indigenous and non-Indigenous concepts and traditions of thought, and the implications for Indigenous people today. The cultural

interface has oft been interpreted as a framework to guide the inclusion of Indigenous ideas into traditionally non-Indigenous spaces (e.g. Yunkaporta & McGinty, 2009). These approaches can risk simplicity. Instead, here I am using the cultural interface as a call to focus on the locale of the people that research seeks to serve, whereby students may need to interrogate their assumptions about the approaches that can positively impact the life circumstances of Indigenous people (Nakata, 2018). This includes questioning how non-Indigenous systems of thought have shaped much of what is known about Indigenous ideas in the public sphere.

Students with Indigenous research topics must carefully navigate the interface of Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledges, concepts and ideas, deciphering the corpus of academic knowledge that has been produced about Indigenous people from outsiders, and ordered according to the rules and interests of academic disciplines (Nakata, 2007). In both reading others' research and constructing their own projects, students must consider how concepts have come to be understood as Indigenous in the first place. Similarly, when Indigenous concepts and knowledges are brought into academic texts such as research theses, they are inherently changed. There are many such examples of this complexity. In a study of traditional owners' rich knowledge about Saltwater Country in the Kimberley (a remote desert region in Western Australia), the authors note that the knowledge produced about Country could not be separated from the people who hold it, and their practices and beliefs about living with and caring for Country (Austin et al., 2017). Aware of the limitations of their own approach, the authors describe their practice of 'stock-taking knowledge' as transforming the data into "western scientific knowledge of Indigenous knowledge" (p. 20). This example of ordering Indigenous knowledge into the rules of disciplinary conventions demonstrates the challenge for students presenting Indigenous ideas within a research thesis, which must adhere to its own logics to pass examination.

Indigenous standpoint theories provide an avenue through which research students with Indigenous research topics have engaged this complexity. Standpoint theories stem from feminist and Marxist traditions (Pohlhaus, 2002), with one's social location (often interpreted as class, gender, and race) shaping what can be known, as do the everyday struggles which are encountered from this position. Standpoint theories ask us to engage with the questions of how knowledge is produced both from and about Indigenous and non-Indigenous positions (Nakata, 2007). An Indigenous standpoint does not simply replace problematic Western knowledges with unproblematised Indigenous knowledge. Instead, Indigenous standpoint theory can be used to evaluate what concepts, theories, and advancements can support outcomes for Indigenous communities. A critical understanding of Indigenous standpoint can assist students to understand a thesis as an argument, and vice-versa.

Manageable projects

Given the conceptual complexity of Indigenous research topics, it is all the more important that research students are supported to design theses that are inherently manageable, scoped to be completed in the time available in the degree. Institutional definitions of degree scope, such as 'generating original knowledge' (Australian Qualifications Framework Council, 2013), do not provide much guidance for an inexperienced researcher, who is more likely to look to their supervisors for direction on developing a project. Misalignments between institutional and student understandings of postgraduate research (such as a highly collaborative process, or action-based projects) can make it difficult for students to successfully complete (McCormack, 2004).

Additionally, researchers face a challenge across health and other sectors: developing research that has real and continuing benefit for Indigenous communities has recently been

raised (Bainbridge et al., 2015). Supervisors must take into account the student's own motivations for undertaking research, the epistemological complexity of the field (and the time it takes to immerse one's self in the relevant theory), and the complexities of research with Indigenous communities. Many Indigenous and some non-Indigenous research students have strong community connections. Nonetheless, community-based participatory research approaches often take many years to develop (Dunbar & Scrimgeour, 2006; Kwaymullina, 2016; Sherwood & Kendall, 2013). Negotiating shared protocols, intellectual property arrangements, return of information to community, permission to undertake research, extensive consultation and gaining institutional ethics all take extensive time, growth, and support to prepare a researcher, creating challenges for students undertaking research for the first time.

Allowing postgraduate research students space and time to delve into the assumptions that underpin their field rather than racing to commence collaborative research may at first sound counter-intuitive. However, as a first step in building a workforce who can expertly navigate the complexities of Indigenous research, research projects that allow the student to deeply understand their field and the intersections of Indigenous and non-Indigenous priorities may better prepare future researchers to design larger projects that can positively impact Indigenous people's everyday lives later.

Reading and Writing

Another important aspect of navigating the complexity of Indigenous research relates to students' academic reading and writing. Australian research degrees are assessed mostly through a written thesis. The continued and sustained development of ideas within a written thesis requires high-level written language. More than technical skills, academic reading and

writing allow postgraduate research students to join a discourse community (Wisker, 2015), situating themselves within the research and contributing to conversations of the topics they study. Diamond and Anderson (2019) report the anxieties that many Indigenous students experience in trying to situate themselves within academic conversations and texts as students learn to work within new modes of writing such as proposals and thesis chapters. Anderson reflects on the role of written language in forming his own identity as an Indigenous academic. This of course is a challenge faced by postgraduate research students worldwide. Learning to write at the standard required in a research degree is a socially mediated practice, where students learn to write academic through feedback from supervisors (Cotterall, 2011; Odena & Burgess, 2017), writing groups (Aitchison & Lee, 2006), or in workshops (Chatterjee-Padmanabhan et al., 2019). A concerted focus on writing develops both argumentation (González-Ocampo & Castelló, 2018; Maher, 2014; Wisker, 2015) and one's own identity as an emerging scholar (Aitchison & Lee, 2006). 80% of Indigenous research students rank 'writing' as a key concern (Diamond & Anderson, 2019).

Additionally, doctoral writing pedagogies often overlook the role of reading, whether technically (how to structure large swathes of academic reading), in the development of identity (as a scholar and fellow researcher), or in learning the discursive practices of the research community (McAlpine, 2012). For students with Indigenous topics, the contentious nature of the field and the need to engage with the corpus of knowledge that exists about Indigenous people makes strong foundations in academic reading and writing essential. First, students need to be able to read the conceptual and interpretive frameworks that other readers draw on. Many disciplines and schools of thought intersect with Indigenous topics. Students' academic literacies must enable them to situate and ask questions of each of these standpoints, and to assess the claims made as to the outcomes made by possible by the interpretive position. If the purpose of Indigenous higher education—and by extension,

Indigenous higher degrees by research—is to contribute to Indigenous communities and their self-determination (Nakata, 2018), then this critical reading of researchers' claims is paramount. Students with Indigenous research topics must both familiarise themselves with the general field, and understand how the Indigenous 'sub-fields' sit in relation to the whole.

Having read the arguments in the field, students must learn to put forward these positions and consider the relationships between them, and with their own research. Whilst all research students learn this process, it is important to support students working with Indigenous research topics to write with care and avoid polemic statements. Learning to deconstruct and write about the corpus requires a degree of distance to texts and a curiosity in understanding how this particular idea came to be. Discourse communities can assist students to find language to explain how such text operates.

Strong Academic Community

Much has been written about the need for strong academic and non-academic community support for Indigenous students (e.g. Barney, 2018; Ryan et al., 2020). Rather than reiterating these arguments, I want to extend the conversation to consider the role of academic communities in growing students' language to discuss the complex knowledge entanglements that they work with. Previous case studies suggest that structured writing and reading workshops assist students to learn not just the conceptual and technical elements of thesis writing, but also to practice speaking about research in supportive environments, and to examine how others deploy language (e.g. Chatterjee-Padmanabhan et al., 2019). Providing students with Indigenous research topics with a rich academic community where others discuss and debate approaches to Indigenous research will enable students to observe, shadow and develop their own vocabulary to discuss the topics they grapple with.

Proactive Supervision

Previous research has clearly established the role of quality supervision in the success of Indigenous postgraduate research students (Barney, 2018; Laycock et al., 2009; Moreton-Robinson et al., 2020; Trudgett, 2011). In each of these studies, 'quality' is described through strong and supportive relationships with supervisors who have respect and understanding for Indigenous students' experiences and knowledge. Additionally, Indigenous students also comment on the importance of disciplinary expertise, availability, having space to explore their topics and experience with Indigenous research topics (Moreton-Robinson et al., 2020; Trudgett, 2011). Many of these ideas reflect the broader research literature on 'good' supervision: regular individualised supervision to ensure that students progress through their thesis (Manathunga, 2007). Other ideas focus more explicitly on the specific position of Indigenous postgraduate research students as knowledge holders and call for culturally appropriate supervision to create a culturally safe environment for research students (Trudgett, 2011).

Moreton-Robinson et al. (2020) note that the "link between [understanding Indigenous worldviews and knowledge] and producing the dissertation is not self-evident" (p. 28). Instead, supervisors need to be prepared to navigate the epistemological and ontological boundaries of Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledge positions. This interface approach to supervision extends the discourse on culturally appropriate supervision. Understanding the complexity of the cultural interface and experience with community-based research will allow supervisors to better support their students in negotiating these complexities.

Self-efficacy

As students develop their projects and hone their reading and writing skills, our attention turns to factors such as maintaining motivation over the course of a research degree. In previous research, Indigenous postgraduate research students identified the importance of persistence, motivation and internal drive when completing research degrees (Barney, 2018). Social-cognitive theories of learning can provide clues as to how to develop this internal motivation. Academic self-efficacy, for example, is a core driver of internal motivation and academic outcomes (van Dinther et al., 2011), including for Indigenous students (Martin et al., 2021). Students with higher self-efficacy—that is, those who perceive that they have the capacity to achieve a certain outcome (Bandura, 1993)—can drive the behaviours that maintain motivation and increase academic success: visualising successful outcomes, self-regulating their emotions, persisting longer with challenging tasks, and expecting that the effort they put into a task will result in a beneficial outcome.

Self-efficacy might help to explain one facet of the importance of a strong research community for Indigenous students (Barney, 2018). Students develop self-efficacy through a range of methods, including social learning (observing others). In this case, observations of peers' approach to persisting with and mastering challenging tasks, such as working with unfamiliar concepts, may provide a support of internal persistence. Further, practices that support autonomy such as being encouraged to ask questions, be open about ideas, and to have input in the development of the project predict greater research self-efficacy for doctoral research students (Overall et al., 2011). Trudgett (2011) reports that one of the strongest themes in her interviews with Indigenous students was "the need for supervisors to give their students some room to move, to find their feet, to explore" (p. 1040).

The Master of Philosophy (Indigenous)

The Master of Philosophy (Indigenous) program at James Cook University is a small contribution to systematically changing outcomes for Indigenous communities. The program admits postgraduate research students on an annual basis, and students complete a substantial research thesis (40 000-60 000 words) within their two-year candidature. We have focused on a Master by research degree to prepare students who may later enroll in a doctorate.

Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous students enroll in the program, including full-time employees and full-time students, parents, and students from remote and regional areas. Their experience with previous research ranges from an undergraduate Bachelor with methodology units to students who have completed a Master by coursework, including minor theses. What the students have in common is their desire to contribute to real change for Indigenous communities. Given the limited scope of a Master degree, we focus on growing their scholarship. This means growing postgraduate research students who can navigate the boundaries of Indigenous and Western ideas, who interrogate popular positions, who can identify scholarship that might contribute to changed outcomes, and who have the courage to work in the unknown. The supervisors are both Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars, ranging from early career to university leadership, and all with experience working with Indigenous research topics.

In their first year, all students complete two one-week residential intensives. Here, I share some of the learning engagements that support the development of the capacities described above.

Navigating the problematic body of knowledge

The first intensive is bookended by the concept of the 'problematic body of knowledge'. To commence their week, students attend a lecture on the cultural interface, and the corpus; and

finish the week discussing personal and popular examples of the corpus in action. This lecture has several purposes. It introduces research as a scholarly endeavour and challenges students to think about the complexity of their topics. It also provides students with a framework to make sense of Indigenous and Western knowledge positions, and to challenge what they assume to be an 'Indigenous' or 'Western' complex beyond a simplistic binary. They learn and refine language that they can use to explain how concepts which appear 'wrong' operate under the surface. In doing so, students start to read more critically, and to ask questions about the frameworks used to describe Indigenous people in previous scholarship. Finally, by talking about the problematic body of knowledge that has shaped research about Indigenous people, and developing students' capacities to identify arguments, we frame research as working in a field of inquiry, rather than working within pre-set ideas (Nakata et al., 2012). Whilst staff work with students to design manageable projects, our students are encouraged to approach their topics by questioning the assumptions they may bring about how these ideas operate.

Annotations

Continuing the scholarly focus, throughout the intensive students learn to read and write about a text's argument. Students practice reading research articles and writing short annotations, which are read out loud to the group. Throughout the week, the articles increase in difficulty as the reading time is shortened. Students also move from annotating general research articles to annotating papers relevant to their topic. This practice prepares students to get across a mass of relevant literature in their first months of candidature by developing the skills and confidence to work independently after the intensive, promoting self-efficacy. Within the intensives, supervisors give students instant feedback on their writing. In addition

to giving supervisors a benchmark of their students' writing, the feedback process normalises the role of responding to critique and feedback throughout the MPhil thesis process. Learning to accept feedback on writing is a difficult but critical process for many postgraduate research students (Aitchison & Lee, 2006). The group environment allows this process to be taught in a supportive and normalizing way (Chatterjee-Padmanabhan et al., 2019). Additionally, students working in this group environment listen to others' approaches and learn through observation. Social cognitive theories of learning to write suggest that when students observe others' writing, they dedicate more cognitive capacity to the learning process than when practicing writing themselves (Braaksma et al., 2004).

Work sessions with supervisors

The third learning approach that I share here is a simple one – having students work with their supervisors throughout the week. This model is different to the usual conception of a workshop, where a core facilitator might be responsible for hosting the week, with guest speakers giving segments. Throughout the week, students work with their research supervisors in a variety of settings: as a whole group, several students with their shared supervisor, and one-on-one student and supervisor meetings. Rather than generic sessions, a large portion of time is spent working on the students' individual projects.

Given the importance of the supervisor-student relationship, particularly for Indigenous students (Trudgett, 2011), this variety allows relationships to grow in the space of a one week. Students hear about their supervisors' own experiences with Indigenous research and how they navigate complexities, building students' self-efficacy in their capacity to undertake research with Indigenous topics. Through the intensive model, supervisors can assess students' strengths and determine where more support is needed. In conversation, supervisors

can quickly check and refine students' comprehension of key concepts. In one session, for example, a student was sorting empirical research papers from conceptual and opinion pieces. A quick scan of the student's work showed that whilst the student had mostly sorted the papers correctly, they had labelled the piles incorrectly. In a traditional supervision model, such an error may have taken months to fully realise. By working closely with the students, however, the supervisor was able to quickly check and correct the student's understanding of the term and explain the difference. Finally, in the first week, students and supervisors are able to refine the project's scope and agree to a work schedule for the first few months.

Reflections on the Master of Philosophy (Indigenous) intensive

At the time of writing, the Master of Philosophy (Indigenous) program has been running for three years, and we have been able to test and refine the model. Here, I share my experience of what has worked well in the program.

First and foremost, the intensives allow us to put scholarship at the core of students' candidature. In a highly regulated education system that is structured through milestones, meetings, and candidature management, the importance of starting with passion, research, and scholarship cannot be understated. The students in our programs are passionate about promoting positive change for Indigenous communities. By starting the program with scholarship, rather than an induction into the administrative processes of completing a research degree, we were able to motivate and excite students, and encourage them to think more critically about their projects.

Following on from this, the focus on scholarship allows us to help students to design their own interface projects, as fitting a Master of Philosophy (Indigenous). The supportive scholarly atmosphere, coupled with opportunities to work closely with students on their

projects, gives supervisors scope to encourage students to move beyond approaches that have been tried before, or reflect the majority of the research in the field. Instead, we encourage students to ask critical questions about the types of research that can improve the political and cultural self-determination of Indigenous peoples (after Nakata, 2018).

This model is not a silver bullet for the everyday work of developing Indigenous and non-Indigenous postgraduate research students' abilities to thoughtfully navigate research at the interface of Indigenous and non-Indigenous ideas. We have found that several months after the intensive, students require different types of support as they finalise their literature review and commence their proposals. However, the model is a shift beyond student support issues, to more fully consider the pedagogical aspects of preparing students to work with Indigenous research topics.

Conclusion

I argued at the beginning of this article that Indigenous and non-Indigenous postgraduate research students and supervisors who work with Indigenous research topics have a complex task before them, warranting further consideration of suitable pedagogical approaches. The Master of Philosophy (Indigenous) program is an initial demonstration of the learning engagements that can support students to develop their understandings of Indigenous research, their own capacities, and their belief in their abilities to do the work. Personal experience and anecdotal evidence offer a starting point to extend the discussion of support for Indigenous (and non-Indigenous) research students from observation and individual experiences to more deeply consider the educational elements that support high-quality scholarship and student success. It would be productive to pursue further research to investigate whether and how students develop the capacities described here. Further research

could also canvass the sticking points in developing these capacities, and how students successfully navigate these.

There are very real and very complex issues that Indigenous communities around the world experience, given the impacts of hundreds of years of colonisation. A workforce of Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers who can work across the cultural interface to support Indigenous communities' goals will be vital to contribute to positive change. To grow this workforce, we must consider how we prepare research students for complex and contested work, growing their dispositions for learning and inquiry.

The author reports there are no competing interests to declare.

References

Agrawal, A. (1995). Dismantling the divide between Indigenous and scientific knowledge. *Development and Change*, *26*(3), 413–439. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.1995.tb00560.x

Aitchison, C., & Lee, A. (2006). Research writing: Problems and pedagogies. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *11*(3), 265–278. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680574

Austin, B., Dobbs, R., Lincoln, G., Oades, D., Wiggan, A., & Balanggarra, Bardi Jawi, Dambimangari, Karajarri, Nyul Nyul, Wunambal Gaambera & Yawuru Traditional Owners. (2017). *Navigating knowledge currents through Kimberley Saltwater Country*. Kimberley Marine Research Program, Western Australian Marine Science Institution. https://wamsi.org.au/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2019/07/Final-Report-WAMSI-KMRP-KSSP-Navigating-Knowledge-Currents-Austin-et-al.pdf

Australian Qualifications Framework Council. (2013). *The Australian Qualifications Framework Second Edition* [Text]. Australian Qualifications Framework Council. https://www.aqf.edu.au/framework/australian-qualifications-framework

Bamgboje-Ayodele, A., Ye, M., Almond, H., & Sakulwichitsintu, S. (2016). Inside the minds of doctoral students: Investigating challenges in theory and practice. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, *11*, 243–267. https://doi.org/10.28945/3542

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, *28*(2), 117–148. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3

Barney, K. (2013). 'Taking your mob with you': Giving voice to the experiences of Indigenous Australian postgraduate students. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *32*(4), 515–528. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2012.696186

Barney, K. (2018). Community gets you through: Success factors contributing to the

retention of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Higher Degree by Research (HDR)

students. *Student Success*, *9*(4), 13–23. https://doi.org/10.5204/ssj.v9i4.654

Braaksma, M. A. H., Rijlaarsdam, G., van den Bergh, H., & van Hout-Wolters, B. H. A. M.

(2004). Observational Learning and Its Effects on the Orchestration of Writing

Processes. *Cognition and Instruction*, *22*(1), 1–36.

https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690Xci2201_1

Burgess, C., Tennent, C., Vass, G., Guenther, J., Lowe, K., & Moodie, N. (2019). A

systematic review of pedagogies that support, engage and improve the educational

outcomes of Aboriginal students. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, *46*(2), 297–

318. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-019-00315-5

Chatterjee-Padmanabhan, M., Nielsen, W., & Sanders, S. (2019). Joining the research

conversation: Threshold concepts embedded in the literature review. *Higher

Education Research & Development*, *38*(3), 494–507.

https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2018.1545747

Cotterall, S. (2011). Doctoral students writing: Where's the pedagogy? *Teaching in Higher

Education*, *16*(4), 413–425. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2011.560381

Diamond, Z., & Anderson, P. (2019). Indigenous doctoral literacy in the humanities and

social sciences. In *Literacy education and Indigenous Australians: Theory, research

and practice* (Vol. 19, pp. 127–145). Springer.

Dunbar, T., & Scrimgeour, M. (2006). Ethics in Indigenous research – connecting with

community. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry*, *3*(3), 179–185.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s11673-006-9018-1

González-Ocampo, G., & Castelló, M. (2018). Writing in doctoral programs: Examining

    supervisors' perspectives. *Higher Education*, *76*(3), 387–401.

    https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0214-1

Kiley, M. (2009). Identifying threshold concepts and proposing strategies to support doctoral

    candidates. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *46*(3), 293–304.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290903069001

Kiley, M., & Wisker, G. (2009). Threshold concepts in research education and evidence of

    threshold crossing. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *28*(4), 431–441.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360903067930

Kwaymullina, A. (2016). Research, ethics and Indigenous Peoples: An Australian Indigenous

    perspective on three threshold considerations for respectful engagement. *AlterNative:*

    An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples, *12*(4), 437–449.

    https://doi.org/10.20507/AlterNative.2016.12.4.8

Laycock, A., Walker, D., Harrison, N., & Brands, J. (2009). *Supporting Indigenous*

    researchers: A practical guide for supervisors. Cooperative Research Centre for

    Aboriginal Health. https://www.lowitja.org.au/page/services/resources/health-

    services-and-workforce/workforce/Supporting-Indigenous-Researchers

Ma, L. P. F. (2021). Writing in English as an additional language: Challenges encountered by

    doctoral students. *Higher Education Research and Development*, *40*(6), 1176–1190.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2020.1809354

Maher, M. (2014). Transparent transactions: When doctoral students and their supervisors

    write together. In *Writing Groups for Doctoral Education and Beyond*. Routledge.

Manathunga, C. (2007). Supervision as mentoring: The role of power and boundary crossing.

    Studies in Continuing Education, *29*(2), 207–221.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/01580370701424650

Manathunga, C., Qi, J., Bunda, T., & Singh, M. (2021). Time mapping: Charting transcultural and First Nations histories and geographies in doctoral education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *42*(2), 215–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2019.1603140

Mantai, L. (2018). "Feeling more academic now": Doctoral stories of becoming an academic. *Australian Educational Researcher*, *46*(1), 137–153. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-018-0283-x

Martin, A. J., Ginns, P., Anderson, M., Gibson, R., & Bishop, M. (2021). Motivation and engagement among Indigenous (Aboriginal Australian) and non-Indigenous students. *Educational Psychology*, *41*(4), 424–445. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2021.1879994

McAlpine, L. (2012). Shining a light on doctoral reading: Implications for doctoral identities and pedagogies. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *49*(4), 351–361.

McCallin, A., & Nayar, S. (2012). Postgraduate research supervision: A critical review of current practice. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *17*(1), 63–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2011.590979

McCormack, C. (2004). Tensions between student and institutional conceptions of postgraduate research. *Studies in Higher Education*, *29*(3), 319–334. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070410001682600

Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *26*(7–8), 159–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409349275

Moreton-Robinson, A., Anderson, P., Blue, L., Nguyen, L., & Pham, T. (2020). *Report on indigenous success in higher degree by research: Prepared for Australian*

Government Department of Education and Training. Indigenous Research and

Engagement Unit, Queensland University of Technology.

https://www.qut.edu.au/?a=921040

Nakata, M. (2007). *Disciplining the savages, savaging the disciplines*. Aboriginal Studies

Press.

Nakata, M. (2018). Difficult dialogues in the south: Questions about practice. *The Australian

Journal of Indigenous Education*, *47*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2017.22

Nakata, M., Nakata, V., Keech, S., & Bolt, R. (2012). Decolonial goals and pedagogies for

Indigenous studies. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1), 120–140.

Odena, O., & Burgess, H. (2017). How doctoral students and graduates describe facilitating

experiences and strategies for their thesis writing learning process: A qualitative

approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, *42*(3), 572–590.

https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1063598

Overall, N. C., Deane, K. L., & Peterson, E. R. (2011). Promoting doctoral students' research

self-efficacy: Combining academic guidance with autonomy support. *Higher

Education Research & Development*, *30*(6), 791–805.

https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2010.535508

Pohlhaus, G. (2002). Knowing communities: An investigation of Harding's standpoint

epistemology. *Social Epistemology*, *16*(3), 283–293.

https://doi.org/10.1080/0269172022000025633

Ryan, T., Ewen, S., & Platania-Phung, C. (2020). 'It wasn't just the academic stuff, it was life

stuff': The significance of peers in strengthening the Indigenous health researcher

workforce. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, *49*(2), 135–144.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2020.14

Schmidt, M., & Hansson, E. (2018). Doctoral students' well-being: A literature review. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being*, *13*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/17482631.2018.1508171

Sherwood, J., & Kendall, S. (2013). Reframing spaces by building relationships: Community collaborative participatory action research with Aboriginal mothers in prison. *Contemporary Nurse*, *46*(1), 83–94. https://doi.org/10.5172/conu.2013.46.1.83

Snow, K. (2018). What does being a settler ally in research mean? A graduate student's experience learning from and working within Indigenous research paradigms. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *17*(1), 1609406918770485. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918770485

Trudgett, M. (2010). Supporting the learning needs of Indigenous Australians in higher education: How can they be best achieved? *The International Journal of Learning*, *17*(3), 351–361.

Trudgett, M. (2011). Western places, academic spaces and Indigenous faces: Supervising Indigenous Australian postgraduate students. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *16*(4), 389–399. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2011.560376

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2011). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. Zed Books.

Uink, B., Hill, B., Day, A., & Martin, G. (2021). 'Wings to fly': A case study of supporting Indigenous student success through a whole-of-university approach. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, *50*(1), 10–19. https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2019.6

van Dinther, M., Dochy, F., & Segers, M. (2011). Factors affecting students' self-efficacy in higher education. *Educational Research Review*, *6*(2), 95–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2010.10.003

van Rooij, E., Fokkens-Bruinsma, M., & Jansen, E. (2021). Factors that influence PhD candidates' success: The importance of PhD project characteristics. *Studies in Continuing Education*, *43*(1), 48–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2019.1652158

Wilson, D. (2017). Supervision of Indigenous research students: Considerations for cross-cultural supervisors. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *13*(4), 256–265. https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180117729771

Wisker, G. (2015). Developing doctoral authors: Engaging with theoretical perspectives through the literature review. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *52*(1), 64–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2014.981841

Yunkaporta, T., & McGinty, S. (2009). Reclaiming aboriginal knowledge at the cultural interface. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, *35*, 55–72.