



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Cox, L. & Simpson, A. Cultural safety, diversity and the service user and carer movement in mental health research. *Nursing Inquiry*, 22(4), pp. 306-316. doi: 10.1111/nin.12096

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://city-test.eprints-hosting.org/id/eprint/7233/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1111/nin.12096>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Abstract

This paper will be of interest to anyone concerned with a critical appraisal of mental health service users’ and carers’ participation in research collaboration and with the potential of the post-colonial paradigm of cultural safety to contribute to the service user research [SUR] movement. The history and nature of the mental health field and its relationship to colonial processes provokes a consideration of whether cultural safety could focus attention on diversity, power imbalance, cultural dominance and structural inequality, identified as barriers and tensions in SUR.

We consider these issues in the context of state-driven approaches towards SUR in planning and evaluation and the concurrent rise of the SUR movement in the UK and Australia, societies with an intimate involvement in processes of colonisation. We consider the principles and motivations underlying cultural safety and SUR in the context of the policy agenda informing SUR.

We conclude that while both cultural safety and SUR are underpinned by social constructionism constituting similarities in principles and intent, cultural safety has additional dimensions. Hence we call on researchers to use the explicitly political and self-reflective process of cultural safety to think about and address issues of diversity, power and social justice in research collaboration.

Keywords

Cultural safety, diversity, research, power, service users/consumers, carers, mental health,

Introduction

The paper offers a critical appraisal of the participation of mental health service users in research collaboration and the potential of cultural safety to concentrate researchers' attention on power imbalance¹, cultural dominance and structural inequality² informing research practices and mental health service users' experience. According to Kara the literature on mental health service user³ research involvement 'suggests that power imbalances and identity issues are at the root of most difficulties and gaps' (Kara 2013, 122). Kara suggests that these matters relate to the diversity⁴ of players in mental health research, which, along with service user involvement, is central to policy in both the UK and Australia (Australian Health Ministers 2010; HM Government 2011a; HM Government 2011b). Diversity concerns are evident in the work of the UK's Mental Health Research Network (NHS National Institute for Health Research 2013) and of a proposed Australian National Mental Health Consumer Organisation (Craze 2010; also see <http://mhconsumer.org.au/>).

These similarities between the UK and Australia reflect their close socio-political relationship and shared history in colonial projects and so they were chosen as the context for our discussion. Today both societies grapple with control of bodies, minds and discourse in

¹ Power is a contested concept in deep, ongoing philosophical debates. We are indebted to Berger and Luckmann's (1966) social constructionism that overcame the agency [Weber] and structure [Marx] debate in arriving at a concept of power that recognised it as an aspect of social relationships occurring in the dialectic between individuals and structures.

² By structural inequality we mean systematic unequal rewards, access to resources and their control, and opportunities in education, health and so on that are a consequence of social processes and relationships experienced by groups such as mental health service users.

³ We use the term service user to refer to mental health service consumers and carers. Various other terms are used in the UK and Australia, e.g. people with lived experience, consumer, carer and survivor. We use the term SUR to denote the movement advocating their involvement in research.

⁴ Our use of the term diversity refers to social experience related to ethnicity, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, physical and intellectual dis/ability, age and socio-economic status.

increasingly complex societies created through globalisation and colonial diasporas. As Bell and colleagues note: ‘As Europeans expanded their borders, the cultures, peoples and diseases they embraced began diffusing through permeable membranes back towards their imperial cell bodies’ (Bell, Brown and Faire 2006, 589).

The resultant health inequity, poverty, stigma and racism (WHO 2010) are of concern in Australia and the UK. Unsurprisingly these processes impact on mental health and problems are compounded since service users experience discrimination and victimisation, poorer health outcomes, and barriers to work, education, the practice of their civil rights and wealth creation (WHO 2014). These structural inequalities reflect and entrench the unequal power relations experienced and constitute the cycle of disadvantage that the mental health SUR movement sought to overcome.

We reasoned that cultural safety, a philosophy and approach to clinical nursing, nurse education and research that focuses on these concerns should be central to this conversation. Further as a specifically ‘postcolonial paradigm of inquiry’⁵ (Racine 2009, 183) it is directly relevant to the mental health and social problems arising from colonial activity, related to what Joseph aptly calls the ‘... colonial ancestry of psychiatric violence’ (2014, 275). Therefore we suggest that cultural safety with its focus on social justice and its challenge to mainstream cultural dominance in research practice and ways of knowing should be integral to mental health service provision, evaluation and research and conclude that it is a useful model to support SUR.

⁵ Note that Ramsden used the term neo-colonial in preference to post-colonial as she saw these power relations as continuous, so post-colonialism had not been achieved (2002, 1).

To ground the discussion we start with an introduction to cultural safety and its definition of culture that inverts diversity concerns by challenging where the locus of diversity problems should be. We then move on to an overview of SUR in its historical context, since state-driven policy approaches to service user inclusion in the UK and Australia, developed concurrently with it. We consider debates about the value and outcomes of such research processes in terms of power sharing and control of research practices in both contexts.

We then turn to a discussion of calls for cultural change in SUR and the potential of cultural safety to bring it about. We consider the role of cultural safety to confront power imbalances as the SUR movement struggles to achieve its aspirations within predominantly state-funded mental health research. Importantly the context of this struggle is policy focussed on individualism and the reduction of human services to market forces, a form of cultural dominance obscured by government policy and rhetoric of inclusion and participation.

Cultural safety: introduction to the concept

Cultural safety was developed with the Maori community by Maori nurse scholar Irahapeti Ramsden in the 1990s, in the neo colonial context of New Zealand (1991; 2002). It aimed for cultural change by exposing and addressing power imbalances to decrease the impact of cultural dominance and racism in health care, education and research (McClelland 2011).

Ramsden was motivated by nursing curricula devoid of structural issues and designed by and for those who did not share her cultural position or experience of colonisation. She wanted to challenge this form of cultural dominance and the way it shaped policy and developed nurses as mere biomedical technicians rather than agents of social change (Ramsden 2002).

Ramsden saw cultural safety as a way for nurses to consider how their socialisation and cultural position impacted on their work. She emphasised the links between ill-health and dispossession, economic status and political agendas, as against individualist biomedical notions that illnesses merely occur within bodies. Further, she argued that transcultural approaches focussed on the “cultural” activities of patients, based on the idea that culture simply means ethnicity and that culture is, therefore, unchanging. As a consequence, transculturalism promotes stereotypical views of culture and limits nurses’ responses to diverse social experiences and positions (Ramsden 2002, 112).

In contrast cultural safety is underpinned by social constructionism so proponents accept that people create society and in turn society influences human activities too. In cultural safety, culture is conceptualised as changeable, learned, strategic and socio-political and ‘...is used in its broadest sense to apply to any person or group of people who may differ from the nurse/midwife because of socio-economic status, age, gender, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, migrant/refugee status, religious belief or disability’ (Ramsden 2002, 114). In cultural safety these differences are accepted and respected as legitimate not as deficits to dominant norms.

Although these issues and aspects of cultural identity are the dimensions of diversity that policy in the UK and Australia seeks to address in the mental health field (see Australian Health Ministers 2010; HM Government 2011a) cultural safety challenges the dominant conceptualisation of diversity’s significance in two respects. Firstly, under cultural safety’s definition of culture, diversity does not belong to people of colour or those who differ in

some way or other from mainstream culture. Dyck and Kearns (1995) discuss one of its key concepts, bi-culturalism, which, although subject to some criticism (Reimer-Kirkham et al. 2002; Harrowing et al. 2010) signals that *everyone* has culture.

This point is important since discussions about health inequality are often dominated by a 'white' cultural position where culture and ethnicity are seen as only belonging to so-called Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD)⁶ 'others' (Tolich 2002; Cox and Taua 2013), positioning the source of social inequity firmly outside white mainstream domains. Cultural safety however requires that health care professionals and researchers accept that they are bearers of culture; that they are socially powerful, privileged and positioned; that their status is related to historical and political processes; and that it is their own values, beliefs and assumptions that require examination to shift power relations and structural inequalities.

Secondly then, the significance of culture and diversity is not differences in ethnicity, in art, ritual or ceremony, but in how people are treated differently in everyday life as they deal with social institutions such as health/welfare, businesses, media and educational institutions. In this respect cultural safety resembles mental health service users' perspectives that health professionals should ask them 'what happened to you' not 'what is wrong with you' (British Psychological Society 2013).

Being grounded in critical social theory, cultural safety recognises that health service delivery, education and research are not value neutral activities but reflect the values,

⁶ In the UK the acronym BME (Black and Minority Ethnic) or BAME (Black, Asian, Minority Ethnic) is used. Australia employs CALD and other terms such as non-English speaking background (NESB) or English as a Second Language (ESL).

assumptions and priorities of those involved and historical and socio-political contexts (Ramsden 2002; Anderson et al. 2003; Reimer-Kirkham et al. 2002, 2009; Browne et al. 2009; Racine 2009). Unless practitioners undertake processes of self-reflection, as required in cultural safety, unexamined relations of power can be perpetuated. Cultural safety provokes us to ask who holds the power to define what counts as knowledge, as health, as recovery or as evidence; challenging us to bring to mind cultural assumptions that ‘culture’ and ‘race’ determine outcomes and blaming people for their social situation (Browne et al. 2009; Racine 2009; McClelland 2011; McGibbon et al. 2013).

Just as proponents of cultural safety say that it is systems that need to change rather than users of such systems, so Frankham (2009), writing about service user involvement in research, proposes that mainstream society is the appropriate locus for efforts at change. This position, which underpins the emergence of SUR to which we now turn, is in stark contrast to the neoliberal view that it is individuals who must engage in ever expanding processes of self-improvement.

The emergence of mental health service user research

The 1990s saw a profound mental health reform agenda in Australia expressed in the First National Mental Health Policy in 1992. Its evaluation and the development of National Standards for Mental Health Services in 1997 emphasised the requirement for service user involvement at all levels of mental health services (Goodwin and Happell 2006). Concurrently in the UK there was a drive to include service users in the commissioning, design, delivery and evaluation of health and social care services (Department of Health

1999a, 1999b, 2000, 2005). Thus as Barber and colleagues (2011, 609) establish, mental health service user involvement, specifically in research, became expected in both contexts.

Beresford (2002) explains that these initiatives were partly in response to the growing demands of a mental health SUR movement to lead and control research that was about them and the issues that impacted on their lives, a process he calls the democratic approach to SUR. However he reminds us that the New Right and the service users' movement did not see participation and user involvement in the same way and, as Frankham argues, the impetus for the SUR movement was the desire to explore the disabling assumptions arising from individualism and the institutionalised disabling practices of society (Frankham 2009, 2).

In a similar vein to cultural safety's focus on how people are treated in society, Frankham's point is that it is not diversity [e.g. gender, ethnicity, disability or age] per se which dominates people's experience but how society impacts and respond to them. She discusses the social creation of deficit discourses that circumscribe people's identity and social experience more than the disability itself. Thus the SUR movement sought to create knowledge that could explain the economic, political, cultural and environmental structural drivers of these experiences and deprivations (Frankham 2009).

Such concerns stand in contrast to another facet of these developments; namely a consumerist approach. Far from ceding any power or control over research agendas or practices to mental health service users, it is argued that '... mainstream interest in user involvement in research and evaluation highlights feeding user knowledge and experience

into existing research arrangements and paradigms ... ' (Beresford 2002, 101). Further, the complex dynamics of these power relations are often suppressed by discussions of inclusivity and community, overcoming any concerted effort to acknowledge and actually deal with diversity in people's experience, interests and needs and with the complexity of knowledge production in such circumstances (Frankham 2009, 19).

While there are clearly worthwhile and robust benefits to researchers and service users of inclusive approaches (Simpson et al. 2014) these papers highlight the broader social-political influences at play. According to Beresford, mainstream state institutions include service users in processes presented as inclusive, but which are motivated by the need to subvert and contain threats to the legitimacy of state control over mental health policy, planning and research processes that the SUR movement signified. While the perspectives of service users can legitimate governments and their agencies and provide evidence of inclusivity, they can also be aimed at 'efficiency, economy, and effectiveness' and, in this process, service users become available as scapegoats should such policies fail or become unpopular (Beresford 2002, 97).

Service User research: the state of play

In the decade or more since Beresford's paper (2002), concerted efforts to include mental health service users in research and service evaluation are evident both in the UK (Rose 2003; Hodges 2005; Stickley and Shaw 2006; Wilson et al. 2010; Repper et al. 2011; Hancock et al 2012; Staley 2012; Simpson 2012; Hutchinson and Lovell 2013; Simpson et al. 2014) and Australia (Lammers and Happell 2004; Craze 2010; Callander et al. 2011; Hancock et al. 2012). But the level and nature of that involvement most often remains disappointing.

Staley (2012) overviews SUR in the UK's Mental Health Research Network concluding that 40% of projects involved service users on steering groups with variable success and impact; 20% at the design stage with variable impacts, and about 20% involved SURs through the whole project with strong influence on the projects.

Staley's analysis is a far cry from the original intention of the SUR movement that service users should be involved in the whole process (Phillips 2006; Beresford 2002). Hutchinson and Lovell (2013, 642) observe that, despite the apparently well-established nature of SUR involvement in the UK, there is not much evidence that their involvement in research is '... truly an integral embedded part of statutory mental health services'. In Australia too, Lammers and Happell (2004) argued that mental health consumer participation in research was tokenistic while some eight years later '... genuine inclusion of consumers as members of the research team remains rare' (Hancock and et al. 2012, 218.)

These commentators along with Kara (2013) point to the need for a much stronger focus on SUR participation from inception to dissemination of research, to be in line with the philosophy of the SUR led movement in both the UK and Australia and with mental health policy and expected standards in both contexts. It is for these reasons that there have been calls for a cultural change in SUR involvement.

Service user involvement: tensions and debates

Appeals for cultural change in SUR involvement reflect its politicised nature and speak to the problem of power imbalance. In 2006 Phillips suggested that service users had gained some power and could advance their cause by lobbying, advocacy and positions of authority in

health organisations. However Frankham (2009) proposes that the central claim by proponents that research partnership processes are ‘empowering’ relies on a concept that is rarely defined much less theorised. She calls for debate on the advantages claimed for partnership approaches and proposes that the political nature of SUR creates a kind of closed shop preventing analysis of its actual merit. Frankham (2009) argues that the combination of government policy, funding body requirements and the unarguable moral rightness of including service users, militate against sound analysis of the practice. Nevertheless some analysis does exist which clearly shows that power relations are an enduring problem.

Frankham (2009, 13) echoed earlier commentators in calls for a ‘cultural shift’ to address the fact that control still sits with academics. While it is reasonable to note that academic researchers spent decades gaining the qualifications and skills to lead research, it is still the case that major power differentials exist between the parties. A number of commentators point to power imbalances that work in favour of funding bodies and the academy such as devaluing service users’ knowledge (Phillips 2006); service users being outnumbered by academics and not leading projects (Wilson et al. 2010); funders restricting applications to academics (Fothergill et al.2013) and academics using exclusionary scientific paradigms and language (Phillips 2006; Barber et al. 2011). Kara (2013) provides evidence of service users’ being silenced; of academic researchers being able to keep private their experiences as service users or carers and of the challenges of partnership research being laid solely at the door of service users.

Nevertheless Wykes argues that over the past decade sound progress has been made in the mental health field in terms of the ladder of participation, from consultation to collaboration and then to service user led research paradigms 'where the power in the relationship is reversed' (Wykes 2014, 25), although she acknowledges that evidence to support this remains a 'scarce resource' (Wykes 2014, 24). Studies led by SUR Diana Rose (Rose et al. 2003; Evans et al. 2012) provide support for the emergence of SUR-led research, whilst standing out for their rarity.

Further insights can be drawn from Patterson and colleagues' (2014) widespread study of SUR. It somewhat contradicts Wykes' conclusions in reporting that while most respondents had positive experiences the potential of SUR involvement is constrained by experiences of stigma, discrimination and tokenism. Patterson and colleagues (2014, 7) described a need for '... continued attention to deep-level cultural change and development of robust mechanisms to ensure timely and meaningful engagement' and a '... critical examination of power hierarchies within psychiatry'. It is with respect to challenging such power hierarchies to produce cultural change that cultural safety has much to offer.

Anderson and colleagues (2003) draw on critical theorists to argue that cultural safety directs our attention to imbalanced power relations that favour biomedical and professional discourses and silence other voices in research. The need for such attention is reinforced by Kara (2012, 131) in her review of SUR which showed: '... that power imbalances are situated between constructed group identities: psychiatrists and patients, researchers and researched, and so on; perhaps even between sub-groups of MHSUs [mental health service users], such as those who have been psychiatric in-patients and those who have not'. We

turn now to a brief account of the commonalities between SUR and cultural safety before teasing out the contribution cultural safety can make to SUR.

On common ground: cultural safety and SUR

It is clear that the SUR movement and cultural safety arose for similar reasons and both drew inspiration from feminist, civil rights, emancipatory movements and critical theory (Ramsden 2002; Beresford 2002; Phillips 2006; Frankham 2009; Barber et al. 2011; Hancock et al. 2012; Hutchinson and Lovell 2013; Kara 2013). They were motivated by the desire to bring about social change by addressing the social and emotional consequences of ‘special’ legislative provisions applied to Indigenous people and the Mental Health Acts applied to those with mental illness and the fact that their voices and experiences were either absent or devalued in research, as in their everyday life. To borrow Goffman’s (1963) term, both movements sought to lessen the impacts of a ‘spoiled social identity’ related to a loss of power, status and rights; in terms of racism on the one hand and stigma on the other.⁷

The thrust of methodological implications of culturally safe research is its strong focus on challenging power imbalances so that alternative knowledges, values and ways of understanding are on an equal footing to Western scientific models and such concerns are evident in some accounts of SUR (Phillips 2006; Stickley 2006; Barber et al. 2011; Hutchinson and Lovell 2013; Kara 2013). Likewise, culturally safe research applied to SUR would support the latter’s ideal to engage service users in the whole research process in an equal research partnership (Wilson et al. 2010; Wykes 2014). However, although other

⁷ There are complex cumulative impacts for those experiencing a mental illness *and* who are Indigenous or who are the target of racism or other isms (see Happell, Cowin, Roper, Lakeman and Cox, 2013) chapter 8 for a full consideration of these factors.

Page 14 of 30

participatory models share many principles of cultural safety, the approaches are not the same since one could use a participatory model that was not culturally safe (Wilson and Neville 2009; Cameron et al. 2010).

What are the implications for cultural safety to transform SUR

All research involves basic assumptions about the reasons for individual behaviours, what is an acceptable research approach, where it is appropriate to publish results, and so on. While these assumptions are often unstated and taken for granted, they strongly influence what is actually studied and the way research is conducted. There is therefore a need for culturally safe research... (Ramsden 2002, 105)

Although cultural safety is recognised as an Indigenous and decolonising research methodology (Smith 1999; McClelland 2011) it is applied more broadly to research practice (Tolich 2002; Reimer-Kirkham et al. 2002; Anderson et al. 2003; Reimer-Kirkham et al. 2009; Racine 2009; Seaton 2010; Harrowing et al. 2010; McClelland 2011) and has methodological implications for the conduct of research. These implications centre around the fact that research encounters reflect the diverse and shifting socio-cultural positions of those involved; they are 'power-laden' (Dyck and Kearns 1995, 142). From the perspective of cultural safety then, what matters most is the social experience and social positioning of those involved since these influence research problems, questions, design, methods, analysis, ethics and outcomes (Tolich 2002).

The crux of cultural safety is that researchers undertake a process of critical reflection to bring their cultural values, priorities, assumptions and social experience to mind to first acknowledge and then address imbalanced relations of power and the dominance of certain

forms of knowledge. Although undertaken by individuals these processes are not individualistic as they require reflection on structural position, power and privilege. Therefore they could help to address structural inequality by challenging government policy and priorities and their influence on topics and methods and the very conceptualisation and focus of research projects. Such processes provoke a crucial change of emphasis from locating the source of issues in the diversity of people to how society responds to diversity; a change in focus from individualistic to systemic concerns.

A critical research practice based on cultural safety would go far beyond the transcultural approach of including 'diverse' groups in recruitment and translating established research instruments and information into various languages. For example cultural safety would provoke reflection on which groups and languages are included/excluded and why, and what such decisions say about researchers and the political and economic context of their research practice. In this vein Kalathil (2008) notes that in research black and minority ethnic (BME) people are often stereotyped as being hard to reach, experience racism and are included minimally to show policy adherence.

Kalathil (2008) makes the observation that three decades of service user involvement has seen little change in mental health services, citing these circumstances as a major barrier to their being involved in service user activities. Kalathil (2008, 10) writes '...service user involvement will become a meaningful reality only if the damage done to individuals within mental health systems is acknowledged, and the roles and power relations between users and mental health professionals ... evaluated'. Kalathil (2008, 16) discusses an intersection of race and class where middle class professionals, who have the resources and willingness to

Page 16 of 30

1
2
3 volunteer their time, feel awkward around black people with whom they are otherwise
4
5 unfamiliar. These dynamics were identified as additional barriers to BME (and, we would
6
7 argue, working class) involvement in SUR. Kalathil's work suggests that a culturally safe
8
9 approach could make a strong contribution to easing such concerns by facilitating a
10
11 reflection on such dynamics amongst researchers. Indeed McClelland (2011) advocates
12
13 starting with community protocols rather than with ready-made academic methods which
14
15 shows how profoundly research processes and the excluding academic paradigms discussed
16
17 by Barber and colleagues (2011) might change if power relations were more balanced.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Anderson and colleagues (2003) extend the applicability of cultural safety beyond
25
26 Indigenous and immigrant groups by arguing that English speaking Europeans also suffer and
27
28 experience barriers to accessing resources and services. As we have seen, cultural safety,
29
30 although arising from a focus on Indigenous groups and non-English language communities,
31
32 nonetheless considers power relations not only on the basis of ethnicity and experiences of
33
34 racism and colonisation but also on dimensions of age, gender, class, ability, sexual
35
36 orientation and so on. It considers such factors in terms of the socio-political context of
37
38 inequality, suggesting that cultural safety '...should have explanatory power for all of our
39
40 research participants' (Anderson and colleagues 2003, 210). This is particularly so since, as
41
42 Anderson and colleagues (2003) point out, various scholars argue against the idea that
43
44 'colonised' and 'coloniser', or 'whites' and 'blacks' are always opposing categories. This is not
45
46 only because colonial experience is nuanced with colonised and colonisers cooperating,
47
48 colluding or resisting in state regimes but also because these experiences dehumanise
49
50 everyone, regardless of where we are positioned.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

In terms of research this insight challenges notions that health professionals and researchers always belong to the dominant colonising ‘white’ culture and the researched from oppressed minorities (Anderson et al. 2003; Reimer-Kirkham 2009) and binary opposites of service user/academic are not sustainable in SUR (Phillips 2006; Kara 2013). However such binaries are powerful, for example when BME people are pressured to separate out parts of their identity (ethnicity) from other parts (service user), and silenced when they raise issues of racism, being told that they are there as a service user not as a member of a particular group (Kalathil 2008). Cultural safety could support SUR teams in negotiating such dynamics by encouraging participants to articulate how their social experience is related to structured responses to ethnicity, culture, class, gender, disabilities and sexuality for example and what implications for their research might arise from such endeavours (Simpson et al. 2014).

Cameron and colleagues (2010) make similar points in exploring the possibility of a ‘culturally safe epidemiology’. For example they argue that in epidemiology the practice of deeming ethnicity as an independent risk factor has been discredited as ‘black box’ epidemiology that merely homogenises diverse people on the basis of cultural stereotypes. Such an approach cannot enhance understanding of the complex interplay of social experience, health determinants, historical factors and power issues which inform high rates of morbidity and mortality. In contrast culturally safe research requires researchers to turn the research lens back to ‘... their own cultural assumptions and analyse critically the impact their theoretical stance has on the knowledge they generate’ (Cameron et al. 2010, 95).

As Browne and colleagues (2009, 171) argue, cultural safety draws attention to 'critically orientated knowledge'; their research shows '...that it is not primarily cultural beliefs or cultural barriers that influence how people manage their health, illness or access to care' but structural constraints and limits to life opportunities. So just as we saw that it is ideas about disability that are disabling so too we can see that health inequality is not so much about worldviews (idealised notions of the cultural beliefs of 'others'). It is how life is experienced that holds the keys to understanding inequality, injustice and ill health (Kelly 2006; Cox and Taauw 2013), a research paradigm that would be a consequence of a culturally safe approach.

Browne and colleagues (2009) offer a sophisticated analysis of the epistemological⁸ foundations of cultural safety seeing cultural safety as compatible with critical enquiry concerned with human freedom and social justice. They, like Anderson and colleagues (2003) and Racine (2009), draw on postcolonial feminist theory to develop what Seaton (2010, 151) calls a 'critical cultural theory'. Such a theory would consider human freedom by emphasising '... intersecting oppressions' (Browne et al. 2009, 168). Together these papers make a convincing argument that cultural safety can help us consider whether research is dominated by certain cultural agendas, views or positions and what this means for the capacity of research to improve the human condition.

The limitations of cultural safety

A limitation of cultural safety is that it draws attention to culture which can lead researchers' focus away from marginalisation and oppression. However applying cultural safety's ways of

⁸ Epistemology is a branch of philosophy that studies the nature of knowledge, ways of knowing things and the limits of knowledge.

thinking about culture is transformative and deepens understanding of the diversity and complexity in peoples’ everyday experience (Browne and et al 2009). This is an important point since research shows that assumptions about race, colour, age and gender impact on medical care and health (Kelly 2006; Kalathil 2008) and Tolich (2002) suggests that similar dynamics apply in research.

For example in Australia an inverted age pyramid related to decreased life expectancy and high birth rate for the Indigenous population vs. the general population, problematises age-based criteria. There new immigrants too are younger than the general population while longer term immigrants are older (Minas et al. 2013). Therefore selection criteria must be nuanced to avoid skewed results and unnecessarily excluding sections of the population (McMurray 2004; Minas et al. 2013). In another example Browne and colleagues (2009) cite the case of people identifying as Canadian being assigned to ‘groups’ (Chinese or Asian) for recruitment. A process of cultural safety could limit these problems by researchers examining assumptions informing recruitment.

Dyck and Kearns (1995) and Browne and colleagues (2009) question the utility of cultural safety in multicultural societies, built on ideas about equality of class, opportunity and so on. Browne and colleagues (2009, 169) say these ideals ‘...masked the historically mediated unequal power relations and the dominant cultural positions’ of powerful groups in society which in fact go against standards of respect and sensitivity to others. This criticism is similar to Beresford’s (2002) about the inclusive rhetoric surrounding consumerist policy and service user involvement described earlier. We argue the slippage between ideals and practice, also evident in Australia, can be addressed by cultural safety since it draws

attention to these contextual issues and how people really experience everyday life (Cox and Taua 2013). Cultural safety brings the context of suffering (the lifeworld) into view provoking '... us to question all of our vulnerabilities and our common humanity' (Anderson et al. 2003, 212).

As Dyck and Kearns (1995) observe, cultural safety tackles power at the level of individuals with their differing histories, social status and experience and at the collective level by focussing on the socio-economic and historical conditions producing health inequity. As suggested, it is our view that this argument remains relevant today particularly in the UK and Australia, since cultural safety encourages researchers to look at current inequity within the historical context that led to it (Reimer-Kirkham et al. 2002; Seaton 2010). We would argue that these aspects of cultural safety make it highly applicable in multicultural contexts such as the UK and Australia where poor health, educational issues, poverty, incarceration and mental distress disproportionately affect immigrant families and Indigenous families (HM Government 2011a; 2011b).

McGibbon and colleagues (2013, 6) summarise the important questions provoked by a culturally safe methodology: evidence according to whom; evidence according to which worldview; evidence according to whose voice? These concerns, also raised by Faulkner and Thomas (2002), Phillips (2006) and Cameron and colleagues (2010) get to the heart of power relations in terms of epistemological considerations in research, about what constitutes knowledge and how class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity and other social complexities influence knowledge construction, legitimisation and translation.

Conclusion

Our discussion shows that while there has been considerable activity over decades in service user involvement in mental health research, there are a number of tensions arising from the practice. Overall our work suggests that matters concerning power, culture and social responses to diversity are only sometimes taken into consideration in such collaborations. In considering the relevance of cultural safety to the mental health SUR movement we established that they share social constructionism as the underlying theory and have similarities in principles and intent (Ramsden 2002; Kara 2012). However we found that cultural safety has a stronger focus on ongoing processes of cultural self-reflection on the part of researchers and on challenging assumptions about how knowledge is created and what counts as knowledge/evidence. Further cultural safety is historically positioned and recognises that nothing is value neutral so power imbalance, a central concern of cultural safety, informs all research and remains a profound tension in research collaboration.

It can be assumed that mental health research seeks to transform clinical practice and improve outcomes for service users and providers and in these endeavours cultural safety calls for a stronger research focus on social and structural issues as opposed to considering individuals the measure of all things. This perspective is echoed by Frankham (2009, 16) in her call for questioning whose interests are prioritised in actions on change, where there are complex and competing ideas from service users, service providers, and policy makers on what improved outcomes might look like. We argued that since cultural safety is a specifically ‘postcolonial paradigm of inquiry’ (Racine 2009, 183) it is an apt approach given that many mental health and social problems are outcomes of colonial activity. Globalisation along with colonial processes has resulted in people from many nations and

1
2
3 communities being dispersed all over the planet. The resulting health inequity, social
4
5 marginality, poverty, stigma and racism are of central concern in Australia and the UK as
6
7 elsewhere. These circumstances raise many questions and suggest the research agenda also
8
9 needs to focus on underpinning social determinants of health inequalities as required in
10
11 culturally safe research, rather than sticking plaster responses to its symptoms and feeble
12
13 attempts to heal.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 In discussing cultural safety and the quest for new ways of knowing, Anderson and
21
22 colleagues (2003, 213) are '...arguing for a scholarship that will transcend our tribalism, and
23
24 that will open up the space for dialogue that will move us closer to transformative practice.
25
26 The concept of cultural safety... holds promise, we believe, for opening up such a space'.
27
28 Likewise we see cultural safety as crucial in locating research practice in the socio-political
29
30 settings where it takes place, in bringing about critical reflection on the part of researchers
31
32 and in advancing equity and social justice (Browne et al. 2009). We conclude therefore that
33
34 it is an important and widely applicable model to bring about the kind of cultural change
35
36 that commentators call for in service user research collaboration, in terms of power
37
38 imbalance, cultural dominance and structural inequality.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reference List

Anderson J, J Perry, C Blue, A Browne, A Henderson, K Basu Khan, et al. 2003. "Rewriting" cultural safety within the postcolonial and postnational feminist project: toward new epistemologies of healing. *Advances in Nursing Science* 26(3): 196-214.

Australian Health Ministers. 2010. *National standards for mental health services*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

<http://www.health.gov.au/internet/publications/publishing.nsf/Content/mental-pubs-n-servst10-toc> (accessed 23 May 2014)

Barber R, P Beresford, J Boote, C Cooper and A Faulkner. 2011. Evaluating the impact of service user involvement on research: a prospective case study. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 35(6): 609-15.

Bell M, T Brown and L Faire. 2006. Germs, genes and postcolonial geographies: reading the return of tuberculosis to Leicester, UK, 2001. *Cultural Geographies* 13: 577-99. <http://cgi.sagepub.com/content/13/4/577> (accessed 24 November 2014).

Beresford P. 2002. User involvement in research and evaluation: Liberation or regulation? *Social Policy and Society* 1(2): 95-105.

Berger PL and Luckmann T. 1966. *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. USA: Penguin Books.

British Psychological Society. 2013. BPS news: *Schizophrenia and stigma researched*. <http://www.bps.org.uk/news/schizophrenia-and-stigma> (accessed 18 December 2013).

Browne AJ, C Varcoe, V Smye, S Reimer-Kirkham, M Lynam and S Wong. 2009. Cultural safety and the challenges of translating critically oriented knowledge in practice. *Nursing Philosophy* 10(3): 167-79.

Callander R, L Ning, A Crowley, B Childs, P Brisbane and T Salter. 2011. Consumers and carers as partners in mental health research: Reflections on the experience of two project teams in Victoria, Australia. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* 20(4): 263-73.

Cameron M, N Andersson, I McDowall and RJ Ledogar. 2010. Culturally safe epidemiology: oxymoron or scientific imperative. *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Indigenous and Community Health* 8(2): 89-116.

Cox L and C Taua. 2013. Socio-cultural considerations and nursing practice. In *Fundamentals of Nursing*, 4th edn., eds J Crisp, C Taylor, C Douglas and G Rebeiro, 320-40. Sydney: Elsevier.

Craze L. 2010. *Scoping study to inform the establishment of a new peak national mental health consumer organisation*. NSW: Craze Lateral Solutions.
<http://www.health.gov.au/internet/publications/publishing.nsf/Content/mental-pubs-s-nmhcorep-toc> (accessed 16 October 2013).

Department of Health. 1999a. *National service framework for mental health: Modern standards and service models*. London: HMSO.

Department of Health. 1999b. *Patient and public involvement in the new NHS*. London: DH.

Department of Health. 2000. *The NHS plan*. London: DH.

Department of Health. 2005. *Creating a patient-led NHS: Delivering the NHS improvement plan*. London: HMSO.

Dyck I and R Kearns. 1995. Transforming the relations of research: towards culturally safe geographies of health and healing. *Health and Place* 1(3): 137-47.

Evans J, D Rose, C Flach, E Csipke, H Glossop, P McCrone, T Craig, T Wykes. 2012. VOICE: Developing a new measure of service users' perceptions of inpatient care, using a participatory methodology. *Journal of Mental Health* 21 (1): 57-71.

Faulkner A and P Thomas. 2002. User-led research and evidence-based medicine. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 180: 1-3. <http://bjp.rcpsych.org/content/180/1/1.full> (accessed 29 January 2015).

Fothergill A, B Mitchell, A Lipp and R Northway. 2013. Setting up a mental health service user research group: a process paper. *Journal of Nursing Research* 18(8): 746-59.

Frankham J. 2009. Partnership research: A review of approaches and challenges in conducting research in partnership with service users. *ESRC National Centre for Research Methods Review Paper*: 1-29. [Partnership research - NCRM EPrints Repository](#) (accessed 26 September 2013).

Goffman E. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Goodwin V and B Happell. 2006. Conflicting agendas between consumers and carers: The perspectives of carers and nurses. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* 15(2): 135-43. doi: 10.1111/j.1447-0349.2006.00413

Hancock N, A Bundy, S Tamsett and M McMahon. 2012. Participation of mental health service users in research: Training addressed and reliability assessed. [Australian Occupational Therapy Journal](#) 59(3): 218-24. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-1630.2012.01011.x (accessed 4 December 2012).

Happell B, L Cowin, L., C Roper, R Lakeman and L Cox. 2013. *Introducing mental health nursing: A service user-oriented approach*. Australia: Allen and Unwin.

1
2
3 Harrowing JN, J Mill, J Spiers, J Kulig and K Walter. 2010. Critical ethnography,
4 cultural safety, and international nursing research. *International Journal of Qualitative*
5
6
7 *Methods* 9(3): 240-51.

8
9
10 HM Government Department of Health. 2011a. *No health without mental health: A*
11
12 *cross-government mental health outcomes strategy for people of all ages*
13
14 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-framework-to-improve-mental-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-framework-to-improve-mental-health-and-wellbeing)
15 [health-and-wellbeing](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-framework-to-improve-mental-health-and-wellbeing) (accessed 7 October 2013).

16
17
18 HM Government Department of Health. 2011b. *No health without mental health: A*
19
20 *cross-government mental health outcomes strategy for people of all ages. Analysis of the*
21
22 *impact on equality (AIE). Supporting document to: No health without mental health: a cross-*
23
24 *government mental health outcomes strategy for people of all ages.*
25
26 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-framework-to-improve-mental-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-framework-to-improve-mental-health-and-wellbeing)
27 [health-and-wellbeing](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-framework-to-improve-mental-health-and-wellbeing) (accessed 7 October 2013).

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Hodges J. 2005. Inclusion of mental health service users on research teams.
Psychiatric Services 56(9). doi: 10.1176/appi.ps.56.9.1158
<http://ps.psychiatryonline.org/article.aspx?articleid=90521> (accessed 4 December 2012)

Hutchinson A and A Lovell. 2013. Participatory action research: moving beyond the
mental health 'service user' identity. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing* 20(7):
641-9 (accessed 16 August 2013).

Joseph AJ. 2014. A prescription for violence: The legacy of colonization in
contemporary forensic mental health and the production of difference. *Critical Criminology*
22: 273-92.

Kalathil J. 2008. *Dancing to our own tunes: Reassessing black and minority ethnic*
mental health service user involvement. National Survivor User Network in collaboration

with Catch-a-Fiya. http://www.nsun.org.uk/modules/downloadable_files/assets/dancing-to-our-own-tunes---report.pdf (accessed 7 October 2013).

Kara H. 2013. Mental health service user involvement in research: Where have we come from, where are we going? *Journal of Public Mental Health* 12(3): 122-35.

Kelly J. 2006. Is it Aboriginal friendly? Searching for ways of working in research and practice that support Aboriginal women. *Contemporary Nurse* 22(2): 317-26.

Lammers J and B Happell. 2004. Research involving mental health consumers and carers: A reference group approach. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* 13(4): 262-6.

McClelland A. 2011. Culturally safe nursing research: Exploring the use of an Indigenous research methodology from an Indigenous researcher's perspective. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing* 22(4): 362-7, <http://tcn.sagepub.com/content/22/4/362> (accessed 27 August 2013)

McGibbon E, FM Mulaudzi, P Didham, S Barton and A Sochane. 2013. Toward decolonizing nursing: The colonization of nursing and strategies for increasing the counter-narrative. *Nursing Inquiry* 21(3): 179-91. DOI: 10.1111/nin.12042

McMurray A. 2004. Culturally sensitive evidence based practice. *Collegian* 11(4): 14-18.

Minas H, R Kakuma, L San Too, H Vayani, S Orapeleng, R Prasad-Ildes et al. 2013. *Mental health research and evaluation in multicultural Australia: Developing a culture of inclusion*. Mental Health in Multicultural Australia. www.mhima.org.au (accessed 22 October 2013).

NHS National Institute for Health Research. 2013. *Mental Health Research Network: good practice guidance for involving people with experience of mental health problems in*

Page 28 of 30

research. <http://www.rds->

[sw.nihr.ac.uk/documents/NIHR_MHRN_Involving_Mental_Health_Problems_Research2013.pdf](http://www.rds-sw.nihr.ac.uk/documents/NIHR_MHRN_Involving_Mental_Health_Problems_Research2013.pdf) (accessed 21 August 2014).

Patterson S, J Trite and T Weaver. 2014. Activity and views of service users involved in mental health research: UK survey. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 205(1): 68-75. doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.113.128637

Phillips R. 2006. Consumer participation in mental health research. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 27: 171-82.

Racine L. 2009. Applying Antonio Gramsci's philosophy to postcolonial feminist social and political activism in nursing. *Nursing Philosophy* 10(3): 180-90.

Ramsden I. 1991. *Kawa whakaruruhau: Cultural safety in nursing education in Aotearoa*. Wellington: Nursing Council of New Zealand.

Ramsden I. 2002. Cultural safety and nursing education in Aotearoa and Te Waipounamu. PhD diss., Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

Reimer-Kirkham S, V Smye, S Tang, J Anderson, C Blue, A Browne et al. 2002. Focus on research methods rethinking cultural safety while waiting to do fieldwork: Methodological implications for nursing research. *Research in Nursing & Health* 25(3): 222-32.

Reimer-Kirkham S, C Varcoe, AJ Browne, MJ Lynam, KB Kahn, H McDonald. 2009. Critical inquiry and knowledge translation: Exploring compatibilities and tensions. *Nursing Philosophy* 10(3): 152-66.

Repper J, A Simpson and G Grimshaw. 2011. *Good practice guidance for involving carers, family members and close friends of service users in research*. London: National Institute for Health Research.

Rose D. 2003. Collaborative research between users and professionals: Peaks and pitfalls. *The Psychiatric Bulletin* (United Kingdom) 27(11): 404-6.

Rose D, P Fleischmann, T Wykes, M Lees, J Bindman. 2003. Patients' perspectives on electroconvulsive therapy: systematic review. *BMJ* 326: 1363-6.

Seaton LP. 2010. Cultural care in nursing: A critical analysis. PhD diss., University of Technology, Sydney. <https://opus.lib.uts.edu.au/research/handle/10453/20316> (accessed 27 October 2014).

Simpson A. 2012. Review: Setting up a mental health service user research group: A process paper. *Journal of Research in Nursing* 18(8): 760-1.

Simpson A, J Jones, S Barlow, L Cox and the Service User and Carer Group Advising on Research (SUGAR). 2014. Adding SUGAR: Service user and carer collaboration in mental health nursing research. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing and Mental Health Services* 52(1): 22-30. DOI: 10.3928/02793695-20131126-04 (accessed 26 February 2014).

Smith LT. 1999. *Decolonizing methodologies: research and Indigenous people*. London: Zed Books.

Staley K. 2012. *An evaluation of service user involvement in studies adopted by the mental health research network*. London: Mental Health Research Network. <http://www.invo.org.uk/resource-centre/library-resource/?id=545§ion=invonet> (accessed 28 October 2013).

Stickley T. 2006. Should service user involvement be consigned to history? A critical realist perspective. *Journal of Psychiatric & Mental Health Nursing* 13(5): 570-7.

Stickley T and R Shaw. 2006. Evaluating social inclusion. *Mental Health Practice* 9(10): 14-20.

1
2
3 Tolich M. 2002. Pākehā "paralysis": Cultural safety for those researching the general
4
5 population of Aotearoa. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 19: 164-78.
6

7 WHO. 2010. *Health of migrants– the way forward: Report of a global consultation*.
8
9 Madrid -Spain, 2-5 March 2010. <http://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/44336> (accessed 25
10
11 November 2014)
12

13 WHO. 2014. *Mental health, poverty and development*.
14
15 http://www.who.int/mental_health/en/ (accessed 24 November 2014).
16
17

18 Wilson C, A Fothergill and H Rees. 2010. A potential model for the first all Wales
19
20 mental health service user and carer-led research group. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental*
21
22 *Health Nursing* 17(1): 31-8.
23
24

25 Wilson D and S Neville. 2009. Culturally safe research with vulnerable populations.
26
27 *Contemporary Nurse* 33(1): 69-79.
28
29

30 Wykes T. 2014. Great expectations for participatory research: What have we
31
32 achieved in the last ten years? *World Psychiatry* 13(1): 24-7
33
34
35 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3918010/> (accessed 2 June 2014).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60