

Two-Eyed Seeing in Business Scholarship: A Framework for Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Research

C. Lynn Kendall

Memorial University of Newfoundland, Grenfell Campus, Corner Brook, Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada

lkendall@mun.ca

Abstract This paper explores the concept of Two-Eyed Seeing, a guiding principle for integrating Indigenous and Western knowledge systems, in business research. By viewing the world through both perspectives, researchers can foster a more inclusive understanding of complex issues. This paper employs a framework established by Reid et al (2021) to explore Indigenous and non-Indigenous research. Engaging business scholarship with a Two-Eyed Seeing approach provides opportunities to enhance cultural competence, generate innovative insights, and contribute to reconciliation efforts, promoting ethical practices and meaningful collaborations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities.

Keywords Two-Eyed Seeing, Business Research, Indigenous Methodologies, Reconciliation, Decolonisation

1. Introduction

The concept of Two-Eyed Seeing is a guiding principle for integrating Indigenous and Western ways of knowledge creation. This paper explores the application of Two-Eyed Seeing within business scholarship. Two-Eyed Seeing encourages researchers to view the world through both Indigenous and Western perspectives, recognising the strengths of each (Bartlett, et al, 2012). This approach fosters a more inclusive understanding of complex issues, particularly those involving cross-cultural and interdisciplinary contexts.

The historical context of research involving Indigenous peoples has been fraught with ethical challenges and exploitation. Eurocentric research paradigms often dismissed Indigenous epistemologies, leading to biased portrayals and reinforcing colonial narratives. Smith (2021) critiques how Western academia constructs hierarchies of knowledge that prioritise positivist, empirical, and objective knowledge, while dismissing relational, narrative, spiritual, or place-based Indigenous epistemologies as less rigorous or unscientific. In response, Indigenous scholars have advocated for decolonising research methodologies that prioritise Indigenous voices and knowledge systems (Kovach, 2021; Wilson, 2008). Challenging and transforming the ways knowledge is traditionally produced, validated, and used—especially within Eurocentric academic frameworks so that they are more inclusive of and accountable to Indigenous ways of knowing, being, and doing promotes the decolonisation of academic research (Wilson, 2008). The contextualisation of employing Two-Eyed Seeing in business scholarship discussed in this paper contributes to academic research on decolonisation and reconciliation.

2. Locating Myself in Research

Kovach (2021) believes that researchers must assert their positionality when conducting Indigenous research and Indigenous researchers, in particular, must state how we are connected to our community. In Mi'kmaq, Msit No'kmaq translates to 'all my relations' and this concept holds me accountable to reflect on who I am as Mi'kmaw and how my Indigeneity shapes the way I experience and engage with my community. It calls on me to honour all my relations, including my ancestors, community and all living and non-living things (Samms Hurley & Jackson, 2020). As I navigate my work, Msit No'kmaq reminds me that our relational worldview is not just a personal guide but an essential research framework. It affirms the significance of Indigenous knowledge systems and relationality in shaping meaningful and ethical scholarship.

I am of mixed Mi'kmaq/European ancestry and a member of Qalipu First Nation. I grew up in Elmastukewek (Bay of Islands) in Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada. I inherit my Mi'kmaw ancestry from both parents. I am connected to community through my volunteer work and I am often invited to speak at conferences as a Mi'kmaw business owner. In my role as an Assistant Professor, I am recognised as a Mi'kmaw scholar, and I often speak on topics such as the experience of an Indigenous faculty member navigating a colonial institution and Indigenising business curriculum.

I am also a Chartered Professional Accountant (CPA), yet my business ownership in the tourism sector inspired me to explore research in the field of Indigenous tourism. The dichotomy of my career choice as a CPA and my embrace of my Mi'kmaw heritage led me to explore how research can help Indigenous communities. Employing

Indigenous methodologies, including Two-Eyed Seeing, in my research further helps my community and informs other researchers of the versatility of this inclusive approach to scholarship.

Through my research I have found myself on a personal journey of reconnection. Engaging with my research has enriched my academic understanding and opened a path for me to become more involved in my own Mi'kmaw community. This process has helped me uncover parts of my identity that I had previously kept at a distance, allowing me to embrace and celebrate this side of myself. I am building relationships, participating in cultural events, and finding a sense of belonging that is grounding and transformative. My research isn't just shaping my academic work – it is reshaping how I see myself in the world.

3. Context

Research involving Indigenous peoples has a troubling history, characterised by unethical practices and exploitation. Researchers have historically approached Indigenous communities as subjects rather than partners, extracting knowledge without consent (David-Chavez & Gavin, 2018; Emanuel and Bird, 2022) and using it in ways that have perpetuated negative stereotypes and colonial agendas (Barton et al, 2024; Emanuel and Bird, 2022). Other ethical issues include data collected without consent, data used for purposes other than what was originally stated, and failure to provide credit to the Indigenous participants (Barton et al, 2024; David-Chavez & Gavin, 2018; Guede & Guimarães, 2020). This history reveals a pattern of exploitation and misrepresentation rooted in power dynamics. It has also created a legacy of mistrust and trauma within Indigenous communities (Smith, 2021).

Researchers often viewed Indigenous cultures as primitive and uncivilised, and felt entitled to enter Indigenous communities without informed consent or respect for Indigenous autonomy. This extractive approach led to biased or incomplete portrayals that reinforced colonial narratives of Indigenous inferiority and primitivism (Smith, 2021). Studies were also conducted to justify the assimilation of Indigenous peoples into dominant society. Researchers, often funded by colonial governments, framed traditional practices as obstacles to civilisation and progress, pathologising Indigenous cultures in the process (Milloy, 1999).

Western research paradigms have often dismissed Indigenous epistemologies, framing them as anecdotal or unscientific. This epistemic injustice has contributed to the erasure of Indigenous contributions to fields such as environmental stewardship, medicine, and social governance (Smith, 2000).

The legacy of epistemic injustice has had lasting negative impacts on Indigenous communities, creating a deep mistrust of research institutions and researchers. This mistrust makes it difficult to conduct ethical research that could benefit Indigenous communities. In response to these historical injustices, Indigenous scholars and communities have advocated for decolonising research methodologies (Chilisa, 2020; Kovach, 2021; Wilson, 2008). Smith (2021) emphasises the importance of research approaches that prioritise Indigenous voices, knowledges, and self-determination. Ethical research practices now increasingly involve community-based research which fosters collaborative relationships and ensures that research benefits Indigenous communities. Many research institutions have developed guidelines and protocols to ensure that research is conducted in a respectful and culturally sensitive manner (Tri-Council Policy Statement – 2, 2022). Consequently, where once research was conducted unethically on Indigenous Peoples, it is now acceptable to engage in research *with* or *for* Indigenous Peoples which requires the consent, knowledge co-creation, and dissemination of Indigenous Peoples to ensure the research is conducted ethically and appropriately (Smith, 2021).

4. *Etuaptmumk* - Two-Eyed Seeing

Etuaptmumk - Two-Eyed Seeing was proposed by Mi'kmaq Elder Albert Marshall and his wife, Elder Murdena Marshall, "to see from one eye with the strengths of Indigenous knowledges and ways of knowing, and from the other eye with the strengths of Western knowledges and ways of knowing ... and learning to use both these eyes together, for the benefit of all." (Two-Eyed Seeing, n.d.). The core principles of Two-Eyed Seeing — recognising the strengths of both knowledge systems, emphasising interconnection and relationality, and supporting inclusivity and reciprocity — make it particularly suited for addressing interdisciplinary and cross-cultural issues. By employing Two-Eyed Seeing, scholars can generate innovative insights and contribute to reconciliation by valuing Indigenous knowledge systems and addressing historical inequities (Bartlett, et al, 2012).

The former Institute for Integrative Science and Health (IISH) at Cape Breton University in Cape Breton (Unamaki), Nova Scotia, the home of several Mi'kmaq communities, assisted Elder Albert and Elder Murdena to

cultivate their concept of Two-Eyed Seeing. Elder Albert acknowledges the challenges some scholars may have with accepting Two-Eyed Seeing:

Two-Eyed Seeing is hard to convey to academics as it does not fit into any particular subject area or discipline. Rather, it is about life: what you do, what kind of responsibilities you have, how you should live while on Earth ... i.e., a guiding principle that covers all aspects of our lives: social, economic, environmental, etc. The advantage of Two-Eyed Seeing is that you are always fine tuning your mind into different places at once, you are always looking for another perspective and better way of doing things (Bartlett et al, 2012, p.336).

Elders Marshall do not seek to blend Western and Indigenous perspectives into a single view. Instead, Two-Eyed Seeing encourages researchers to appreciate the distinct strengths of each approach and to use them in conjunction with one another to gain a more comprehensive understanding. It acknowledges that each perspective has its own unique insights and limitations, and that by bringing them together, scholars can achieve a more complete understanding of their research. The foundations of Two-Eyed Seeing lie with the teachings of Chief Charles Labrador who states: "Go into a forest, you see the birch, maple, pine. Look underground and all those trees are holding hands. We as people must do the same" (Trees holding hands n.d.)

The IISH created an image (Figure 1) of two eyes placed upon connected pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. This image is based upon Elder Albert's emphasis that Mi'kmaw knowledge is just one piece of a multitude of Indigenous knowledge systems. Elder Albert further emphasises that "the two jig-saw puzzle pieces help remind us that, with respect to Aboriginal Traditional Knowledges [Indigenous knowledges], no one person ever has more than one small piece of the knowledge. There is a need to recognise that Traditional Knowledges draw upon the community of Elders and other Knowledge Holders (i.e., the knowledge is collective), as well as the collective consciousness of the people. So, here too, one might wish to talk about multiple-eyed seeing." (Two-Eyed Seeing, n.d.).

Figure 1: Representation of Two-Eyed Seeing by the Institute for Integrative Science and Health

Reid et al (2021) proposed a framework for applying Two-Eyed Seeing in research (Figure 2). This framework, centred on Two-Eyed Seeing, proposes a circular, stepwise co-learning process that begins with a mutual research interest, then proceeds to identifying research tools. The partners must co-develop the research program and together achieve validation from the community. Within this framework, all partners must receive recognition and in turn, a long-term relationship is established.

Figure 2: A framework for applying Two-Eyed Seeing in research by Reid et al (2021).

Embracing Indigenous methodologies is particularly relevant for research in Canada, where reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples is a priority for the country. The historical experience of encounters with European settlers has had a long-lasting impact upon Indigenous communities in Canada. The legacy of colonialism resulted in then-Prime Minister Harper officially apologising to Indigenous Peoples for the harm caused by colonial policies, particularly the residential school system (Statement of apology to former students of Indian Residential Schools, 2008). The federal government established a Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) whose mandate was to hear the stories of residential school survivors and establish mechanisms for reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples. The TRC delivered their final report in 2015 and included 94 Calls to Action, compelling all facets of Canadian society to engage in reconciliation. The TRC Report specifically recommends academic research and calls for the business sector to commit to reconciliation (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015). Since the TRC's report, the public discourse has broadened to include economic reconciliation that declares the importance of opportunities for Indigenous participation in the Canadian economy (Hilton, 2021). The TRC's call for academic research and the public prioritisation of reconciliation provides ample opportunities for the merging of Indigenous methodologies within business research.

Two-Eyed Seeing has been embraced by many disciplines in Canada, such as nursing (McFadden et al, 2023); fisheries science (Reid et al, 2021), and education (Bardwell & Woller-Skar, 2023; Cirkony, et al, 2023). Business scholarship, however, has not yet adopted Two-Eyed Seeing despite having opportunity in fields, such as management decision-making, social responsibility, and business ethics, that lean towards engaging with Indigenous methodologies. Harmonising Western research frameworks with Indigenous methodologies can bridge the gap between knowledge systems. Such an integration supports the processes of reconciliation and decolonisation that will help level power imbalances within academic scholarship.

5. Business Scholarship

Business research, as with all academic knowledge creation, is shaped by the philosophical position of the researcher and the discipline within which they are studying. The epistemological, ontological, axiological, and methodological foundations of a research program underpin the worldviews of the researcher, their values, and perspectives of reality. Basic business research aims to expand knowledge, while applied business research focuses on solving specific problems (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Cooper and Schindler (2014) state that business research can be of an applied nature by answering questions that aid in managerial decision-making, or pure research, which does not directly impact policy or performance decisions, but rather involves creating new knowledge. As such, business scholarship relies heavily on the Western predominance of research paradigms.

The nature of business involves numerous sub-fields such as finance, marketing, organisational behaviour, entrepreneurship, human resource management, and strategy. The broad nature of the field of business research provides opportunities to utilise Two-Eyed Seeing as a means of respectfully engaging with Indigenous methodologies in scholarship.

6. Understanding Indigenous Methodologies

Indigenous methodologies are a research approach rooted in the cultural, spiritual, and relational worldviews of Indigenous peoples. These methodologies prioritise the interconnectedness of all beings, the importance of community, and the responsibility of researchers to honour the knowledge systems and traditions of the communities with which they engage. Indigenous scholars have been instrumental in advancing research methodologies, highlighting the significance of relational accountability, reciprocity, responsibility, and decolonisation in research (Chilisa, 2020; Kovach, 2021; Wilson, 2008).

Indigenous epistemologies reflect how Indigenous peoples produce knowledge. A key element of these epistemologies is the belief that knowledge is relational, involving relationships among people, spirituality, and the natural world. Unlike Western epistemologies, Indigenous knowledge systems are holistic, emphasising both the metaphysical and pragmatic within an animate language structure and contextualised within place and land-based knowing and teachings. These knowledges are generated from worldviews, histories, spiritualities, cultural practices, and ceremonies (Kovach, 2021; Wilson, 2008).

Indigenous epistemologies are embedded within a relational axiology that emphasises relational accountability, and respectful representation during the research process. These values are rooted in Indigenous cultural and spiritual practices and are essential for conducting ethical research with Indigenous communities. Relational accountability involves understanding the relationships among all aspects of the research process and the fact that the researcher is accountable to the communities they work with, prioritising community needs and concerns. Respectful representation requires researchers to honour the dignity, knowledge, perspective, and experiences of Indigenous peoples, extending respect to the community, ancestors, and the natural and spiritual worlds (Chilisa, 2020; Kovach, 2021; Wilson, 2008).

Indigenous research paradigms are grounded in decolonisation and Indigenisation. Decolonisation in research involves dismantling power structures and colonial epistemologies, recognising the historical and ongoing impacts of colonisation on Indigenous peoples and their knowledge systems. Indigenisation focuses on affirming Indigenous knowledge systems by incorporating Indigenous methodologies, research questions, and ethical frameworks into the research process. Indigenous research centres the lived experiences and perspectives of Indigenous communities, prioritising knowledge that is relevant and beneficial to their needs (Chilisa, 2020; Kovach, 2021).

The foundation of Indigenous methodologies is relational accountability, which highlights that knowledge resides within the context of relationships between individuals, communities, the land, and the cosmos. Researchers are not merely objective observers but active participants within a network of relationships. This perspective requires researchers to engage with Indigenous communities with respect, reciprocity, and responsibility. Respect involves honouring the knowledge holders and adhering to cultural protocols. Reciprocity ensures that researchers give back to the community in meaningful ways, transforming research from an extractive process to a collaborative and mutually beneficial exchange. Responsibility extends beyond individual ethics to encompass a broader obligation to the community, the environment, and future generations. Researchers must ensure the integrity of the community's knowledge systems is maintained, being transparent, accountable, and responsive to the needs and concerns of the community throughout the research process (Kovach, 2021; Wilson, 2008).

Building meaningful relationships with Indigenous communities is essential to recognising their right to guide the research agenda. Participatory and emancipatory research methods are crucial for decolonisation, contributing to community empowerment. Ethical considerations are paramount in Indigenous research, including obtaining informed consent, establishing ownership of data, and adhering to cultural protocols. Researchers must also use culturally appropriate methods and tools, such as storytelling and sharing circles (Kovach, 2021; Wilson, 2008).

Storytelling is central to Indigenous methodologies as it conveys cultural values, histories, and worldviews. Storytelling is not just a communication tool but an epistemological framework that preserves the wisdom and experiences of ancestors. Through stories, knowledge is transmitted across generations, maintaining the continuity of cultural traditions. Indigenous methodologies are holistic, integrating physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual dimensions of knowledge. This approach contrasts with the compartmentalised nature of Western research methodologies. Storytelling allows for multiple perspectives and honours participants' voices, validating Indigenous ways of knowing, and challenging dominant Western narratives in academic research (Iseke, 2013; Kovach, 2021).

Sharing circles are a key Indigenous research method rooted in traditional practices that emphasise relationality, respect, and community engagement. Sharing circles create a safe, inclusive space where participants can share their experiences and perspectives without fear of judgment. The method aligns with Indigenous worldviews by prioritising oral traditions and collective knowledge construction (Lavallée, 2009).

In sharing circles, participants typically sit in a circle, symbolising equality and unity, and often follow protocols such as the use of a talking piece, which is passed around to ensure everyone has an opportunity to speak. This structure fosters active listening and mutual respect, encouraging participants to reflect on the topics discussed. Lavallée (2009) highlights that this method, in addition to a means of collecting data, also serves as a form of empowerment for participants, as their voices are validated within the research process.

In examining Two-Eyed Seeing in business scholarship, I propose that integrating Indigenous and Western methodologies enhances the depth and breadth of business research and encourages a more inclusive academic environment. By valuing and incorporating Indigenous perspectives, business researchers can address historical inequities caused by unethical research practices and contribute to the broader goals of reconciliation, Indigenisation, and decolonisation.

7. Operationalising Two-Eyed Seeing in Business Scholarship

Two-Eyed Seeing can be incorporated into business research to create a supportive opportunity for Indigenous scholarship. Whether conducting research *with* or *for* Indigenous communities, or using Indigenous methodologies in Western-focused studies, the principles of Two-Eyed Seeing can be implemented in business research.

Recognising the significance of Indigenous participation in the economy (Hilton, 2021), as well as the TRC's calls for academic institutions to engage in reconciliation research provides the justification for business researchers to co-create knowledge with Indigenous Peoples. Since business has yet to embrace Two-Eyed Seeing as an approach to research, I outline how a co-learning approach can be undertaken using two business organisations: one with Indigenous ownership and another is a non-Indigenous social enterprise. I selected these organisations because they are well-known in Eastern Canada and both have significant community impact.

Clearwater Seafoods Incorporated is one of the largest fully integrated seafood corporations in North America. In 2021, Clearwater was acquired by a Mi'kmaq-owned coalition and Premium Brands Food of British Columbia for \$1 billion. The acquisition represents the largest investment in the seafood industry by an Indigenous group in Canada. For the Mi'kmaq First Nations, a 50% ownership in Clearwater embodies an opportunity to become notable participants in the commercial fishery, gain ownership of lucrative offshore fishing licenses, and advance the economic prosperity of their communities. For Premium Brands, it provides an opportunity to expand its seafood portfolio and leverage Clearwater's global distribution network and expertise (Doucette & Stack, 2024).

Shorefast Foundation is a social enterprise located on Fogo Island, off the northeast coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. Conceived by three siblings from Fogo Island, the Foundation constructed a luxury inn as a response to the economic and social challenges faced by Fogo Islanders following the collapse of the cod fishery, with the goal of regenerating the local economy without sacrificing identity, culture, or ecological integrity (Shorefast.org). The Fogo Island Inn is a model of place-based development. Every aspect of the Inn, from its architecture and furniture to its food and programming, reflects the traditions and stories of the island. Local

artisans, fishers, and community members are integral to its operations (Slawinski et al, 2019). Profits from the Inn are reinvested into the community through initiatives in art, business, and heritage preservation, aligning with the Foundation’s principle of "economic nutrition", a transparent approach to understanding where money goes and who benefits (Shorefast.org).

Table 1 presents a comparison of how Two-Eyed Seeing can be operationalised in research involving an Indigenous-led and a non-Indigenous organisation. Using the elements proposed in Reid et al’s (2021) framework, this comparison illustrates that Two-Eyed Seeing is applicable to business research, including non-Indigenous businesses. It may seem apparent that Clearwater Seafoods, an Indigenous-led business, is apt for application of Two-Eyed Seeing. Less obvious, however, is employing this concept in non-Indigenous organisations such as Shorefast Foundation. Each element of Reid et al (2021) is discussed from an Indigenous, (or in the case of Shorefast, a local/community level) perspective, and Western perspective, and Two-Eyed Seeing.

Table 1: Comparison of Operationalising Two-Eyed Seeing in an Indigenous-led business and a non-Indigenous social enterprise.

Two-Eyed Seeing Framework Element (Reid et al., 2021)	Clearwater Seafoods	Fogo Island Inn (Shorefast Foundation)
Mutual Research Interest	<p>Indigenous Eye Interest in reclaiming stewardship over marine resources and asserting economic sovereignty.</p> <p>Western Eye Interest in corporate investment, profitability, and sustainable resource management.</p> <p>Two-Eyed Seeing The acquisition becomes an intersection of Indigenous values of stewardship and Western business practices.</p>	<p>Indigenous/Local Eye Preserving culture, place-based knowledge, and community prosperity.</p> <p>Western Eye Interest in innovative models of rural economic development, sustainable tourism, and social enterprise.</p> <p>Two-Eyed Seeing Aligning goals to explore how social enterprise can regenerate local economies while centering community values and environmental stewardship.</p>
Identification of Required Tools	<p>Indigenous Tools Traditional ecological knowledge, community engagement, relational accountability.</p> <p>Western Tools Corporate finance, due diligence, supply chain management.</p> <p>Two-Eyed Seeing The partnership required both sets of tools to secure funding and develop long-term governance structures that respect Indigenous values.</p>	<p>Local/Traditional Tools Oral history, lived experience, community storytelling, traditional artisanship.</p> <p>Western Tools Business modelling, social return on investment, tourism analytics.</p> <p>Two-Eyed Seeing Use both financial tools and narrative-based evaluation to understand success and sustainability from multiple lenses.</p>
Research Co-development	<p>Two-Eyed Seeing The acquisition was co-developed by Mi’kmaq leaders and corporate partners, ensuring Indigenous priorities shaped business outcomes.</p>	<p>Two-Eyed Seeing Research processes can be co-developed with stakeholders including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shorefast Foundation • Local artisans, fishers, and elders • Policy-makers and rural development scholars <p>Ensures that the research is not extractive, but rooted in respect and reciprocity, consistent with both Indigenous and community-based research ethics.</p>
Co-evaluation & Community Validation	<p>Indigenous Perspective Validation by Mi’kmaq communities—whether they see this acquisition as aligned with their goals.</p> <p>Western Perspective Metrics such as ROI, supply chain efficiency, market expansion.</p> <p>Two-Eyed Seeing: Success is defined both by community empowerment and by economic indicators.</p>	<p>Local/Indigenous Perspective Validation through pride, storytelling, local well-being, cultural continuity, and youth engagement.</p> <p>Western Perspective Metrics like employment numbers, global tourist visits, profitability, awards won.</p> <p>Two-Eyed Seeing Success is measured by both impact on GDP and impact on the community.</p>

Two-Eyed Seeing Framework Element (Reid et al., 2021)	Clearwater Seafoods	Fogo Island Inn (Shorefast Foundation)
Shared Recognition & Co-benefits	<p>Indigenous Perspective Self-determination, economic participation, job creation for community members.</p> <p>Western Perspective Business growth, enhanced reputation, sustainable practices.</p> <p>Two-Eyed Seeing Recognition of different forms of value (cultural, economic, social) and deliberate sharing of those benefits.</p>	<p>Local/Indigenous Perspective Recognition of traditional knowledge, crafts, and community leadership.</p> <p>Western perspective Recognition of Shorefast as a global leader in social innovation.</p> <p>Two-Eyed Seeing Co-benefits include job creation and cultural renewal; profits are reinvested in the community, not extracted.</p>
Long-term Relationship	<p>The acquisition represents more than a business transaction, it is part of a long-term relational commitment to Indigenous resurgence, stewardship, and capacity building.</p> <p>A Two-Eyed Seeing approach can examine the participation of this Indigenous-led firm within a multi-billion-dollar business dominated by non-Indigenous participants.</p>	<p>Shorefast emphasises "economic nutrition" and long-term community vitality.</p> <p>A Two-Eyed Seeing approach highlights how long-term place-based relationships (to land, sea, and one another) underpin the enterprise.</p>

Reid et al.'s (2021) framework for operationalising Two-Eyed Seeing in research provides a structured approach to integrating Indigenous and Western scholarly perspectives. For instance, a research project might evaluate the impact of an Indigenous-led firm within a predominantly non-Indigenous business sector, or examining how a non-Indigenous organization's traditional knowledge, crafts, and community leadership contribute to its success. This examination could highlight co-benefits such as job creation and cultural renewal, and profit reinvestment in the community for sustained growth.

In Table 1 of Reid et al.'s framework, various dimensions of Two-Eyed Seeing are outlined, demonstrating how long-term relational commitments to Indigenous resurgence, stewardship, and capacity building can be fostered within business research. For example, the framework can be applied to study the practices of Shorefast, an organisation that prioritises "economic nutrition" and community vitality. The framework can also be used to explore the Clearwater acquisition from Indigenous and Western perspectives. Applying Two-Eyed Seeing in these research contexts supports scholarly insight and bolsters community capacity-building and resilience, thereby promoting ethical engagement and comprehensive understanding that transcends traditional research boundaries.

8. Conclusion

Two-Eyed Seeing offers a transformative approach to research by emphasising the integration of Indigenous and Western knowledge systems to encourage reconciliation and Indigenisation in business scholarship. Responding to the TRC's call for academic institutions to engage in reconciliation research, incorporating Two-Eyed Seeing in business research serves as a means of addressing the historical injustices caused by unethical research practices. Two-Eyed Seeing is not only relevant for Indigenous research but is also applicable to incorporating Indigenous methodologies into Western research processes. In doing so, applying Two-Eyed Seeing in business research exemplifies a respectful path forward by engaging in collaborations that benefit both Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities.

Ethical Declaration

Ethics approval was not required for this paper.

AI Declaration

Artificial intelligence tools, specifically ChatGPT and elciti.ai, were used for editing, language refinement, and to search for sources relevant to my topic. The AI-generated content was carefully reviewed by the author to ensure adherence to academic standards.

References

- Bardwell, B. and Woller-Skar, M.M. (2023). Challenges and successes of using Two-Eyed Seeing to teach Indigenous science at a predominantly white institution, *Journal of Great Lakes research*, 49(1), pp. S78-S83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jglr.2023.01.003>.
- Bartlett, C. et al. (2012). Two-Eyed Seeing and other lessons learned within a co-learning journey of bringing together indigenous and mainstream knowledges and ways of knowing. *Journal of environmental studies and sciences*, 2 (4), pp. 331–340. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13412-012-0086-8>
- Barton, K. S., Porter, K. M., Mai, T., Claw, K. G., Hiratsuka, V. Y., Carroll, S. R., Burke, W., & Garrison, N. A. (2024). Genetic research within Indigenous communities: Engagement opportunities and pathways forward. *Genetics in medicine*, 26(7), 101158-. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gim.2024.101158>
- Bryman, A. and Bell, E. (2015). *Business research methods*. 4th ed. Oxford: OUP.
- Chilisa, B. (2020). *Indigenous research methodologies*. Second edition. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Cirkony, C., Kenny, J. & Zandvliet, D. (2023). A Two-Eyed Seeing teaching and learning framework for science education. *Canadian journal of science, mathematics and technology education* 23, pp. 340–364. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42330-023-00276-z>
- Cooper, D.R. and Schindler, P.S. (2014). *Business research methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- David-Chavez, D. M., & Gavin, M. C. (2018). A global assessment of Indigenous community engagement in climate research. *Environmental Research Letters*, 13(12), 123005-. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaf300>
- Doucette, M. B., & Stack, R. (2024). Mi'kmaw-owned partnership in Clearwater Seafoods. *Journal of Aboriginal Economic Development*, 14(2), pp.31–37. <https://doi.org/10.29173/jaed38>
- Emanuel, R. E., & Bird, K. D. (2022). Stories we tell: Unpacking extractive research and its legacy of harm to Lumbee people. *Southern cultures*, 28(3), pp. 48–69. <https://doi.org/10.1353/scu.2022.0025>
- Government of Canada. Statement of apology to former students of Indian Residential Schools (2008). <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100015644/1571589171655>
- Guedes, C. and Guimarães, S. (2020). Research ethics and Indigenous Peoples: Repercussions of returning Yanomami blood samples. *Developing world bioethics*, 20(4), pp.209-215. [10.1111/dewb.12264](https://doi.org/10.1111/dewb.12264)
- Hilton, C.A. (2021) *Indigenomics*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.
- Iseke, Judy. (2013). Indigenous storytelling as research. *International review of qualitative research*, 6, pp. 559-577. [10.1525/irqr.2013.6.4.559](https://doi.org/10.1525/irqr.2013.6.4.559).
- Kovach, M. (2021) *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations and contexts*. Second edition. University of Toronto Press.
- Lavallée, 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), pp. 21-40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800103>
- McFadden, A., Lynam, M. J., & Hawkins, L. (2023). Two-Eyed Seeing as a strategic dichotomy for decolonial nursing knowledge development and practice. *Nursing inquiry*, 30s. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nin.12574>
- Milloy, J. S. (1999). *A national crime: The Canadian government and the residential school system, 1879 to 1986*. University of Manitoba Press.
- Reid, A. J. et al. (2021) "Two-Eyed Seeing": An Indigenous framework to transform fisheries research and management. *Fish and fisheries (Oxford, England)*, 22 (2), pp. 243–261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12516>
- Samms Hurley, E. & Jackson, M. (2020) Msit No'kmaq: An exploration of positionality and identity in Indigenous research. *Witness: The Canadian journal of critical nursing discourse*, 2 (1), pp. 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.25071/2291-5796.43> <https://shorefast.org/> (Accessed 04 April 2025).
- Slawinski, N., Winsor, B., Mazutis, D., Schouten, J. W., & Smith, W. K. (2019). Managing the paradoxes of place to foster regeneration. *Organization & environment*, 34(4), pp. 595-618. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026619837131> (Original work published 2021)
- Smith, G.H. (2000). Protecting and respecting Indigenous knowledge. *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision*, pp. 209-224.
- Smith, L. T. (2021). *Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Zed Books.
- Trees Holding Hands (n.d.). <http://www.integrativescience.ca/Principles/TreesHoldingHands/>
- Tri-Council Policy Statement – 2 (2022), Chapter 9 - Research Involving the First Nations, Inuit, and Métis Peoples of Canada. Accessed at: https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/tcps2-eptc2_2022_chapter9-chapitre9.html
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, issuing body (2015) *Final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.
- Two-Eyed Seeing (n.d.). <http://www.integrativescience.ca/Principles/TwoEyedSeeing/>
- Wilson, S., (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.