Études/Inuit/Studies

Creating space for negotiating the nature and outcomes of collaborative research projects with Aboriginal communities
Créer un espace pour négocier la nature et les résultats de projets de recherche en collaboration avec des communautés autochtones

Natasha Lyons

Citer cet article

Résumé de l'article

Cet article examine les questions de propriété intellectuelle et d'éthique impliquées dans la négociation des processus et des résultats de recherches faites en collaboration avec des communautés autochtones. Une série d'idées y sont soulignées pour poser les fondations d'une réflexion sur les manières de créer un espace conceptuel de discussions ouvertes et constructives entre partenaires de recherche. On applique la notion «d'espace communicationnel» d'Habermas à un partenariat entre des anthropologues basés dans le sud et des membres de la communauté inuvialuit de l'Arctique de l'ouest canadien. Ce partenariat se concentre sur la documentation de savoirs au sujet d'une collection exhaustive d'objets ethnographiques ancestraux conservés à la Smithsonian Institution à Washington, D.C., et sur la manière pertinente de diffuser ces savoirs auprès des communautés des Inuvialuit, des anthropologues et des muséologues. Cet article présente une suite de méthodes générées par le groupe de recherche qui contiennent certains paramètres utiles pour concevoir la recherche et entretenir la confiance et l'engagement entre partenaires. On y discute aussi de la dynamique des pratiques de la recherche communautaire et, en particulier, des méthodes par lesquelles les projets de recherche sont conçus, construits et poursuivis.

Creating space for negotiating the nature and outcomes of collaborative research projects with Aboriginal communities

Natasha Lyons[*]

Résumé: Créer un espace pour négocier la nature et les résultats de projets de recherche en collaboration avec des communautés autochtones

Cet article examine les questions de propriété intellectuelle et d'éthique impliquées dans la négociation des processus et des résultats de recherches faites en collaboration avec des communautés autochtones. Une série d'idées y sont soulignées pour poser les fondations d'une réflexion sur les manières de créer un espace conceptuel de discussions ouvertes et constructives entre partenaires de recherche. On applique la notion «d'espace communicationnel» d'Habermas à un partenariat entre des anthropologues basés dans le sud et des membres de la communauté inuvialuit de l'Arctique de l'ouest canadien. Ce partenariat se concentre sur la documentation de savoirs au sujet d'une collection exhaustive d'objets ethnographiques ancestraux conservés à la Smithsonian Institution à Washington, D.C., et sur la manière pertinente de diffuser ces savoirs auprès des communautés des Inuvialuit, des anthropologues et des muséologues. Cet article présente une suite de méthodes générées par le groupe de recherche qui contiennent certains paramètres utiles pour concevoir la recherche et entretenir la confiance et l'engagement entre partenaires. On y discute aussi de la dynamique des pratiques de la recherche communautaire et, en particulier, des méthodes par lesquelles les projets de recherche sont conçus, construits et poursuivis.

Abstract: Creating space for negotiating the nature and outcomes of collaborative research projects with Aboriginal communities

This article investigates intellectual property and ethical issues involved in negotiating research processes and outcomes in collaborative projects with Aboriginal communities. A series of ideas are outlined to lay a foundation for thinking about ways to create a conceptual space for open and constructive discussions between research partners. Habermas's notion of "communicative space" is applied to a partnership between southern-based anthropologists and members of the Inuvialuit community of the Canadian Western Arctic. This partnership is focused on documenting knowledge about a large and comprehensive collection of ancestral ethnographic objects housed at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., and on disseminating this knowledge in meaningful ways to the Inuvialuit, anthropological, and museum communities. This article presents a suite of methods generated by the research group that lay some useful parameters for designing research and fostering trust and investment among

[*] Ursus Heritage Consulting, 514 Terrace Drive, Coldstream, British Columbia, V1B 2X2, Canada.
gaultheria22@gmail.com

partners. It also discusses the dynamics of community-based research practices and, specifically, methods for conceiving, constructing, and sustaining research projects.

Introduction

Intellectual property—construed here in a broad sense to mean both tangible and intangible property of Indigenous peoples (Nicholas and Bannister 2004; UNESCO 2003)—is a compelling framework for discussion about cultural knowledge and community-based scholarship in and with Aboriginal communities. Bell and Napoleon (2008: 18) state that intellectual property discourse fundamentally aims to "restructure relations [...] in a manner that acknowledges and respects unique First Nations identities and is consistent with First Nations values, beliefs, laws, and practices." This perspective brings research partnership with First Nations and other Aboriginal communities clearly into the realm of ethics and appropriate practice.

While questions about intellectual property and ethics are central to all research pursuits, they are especially critical to Aboriginal communities and researchers who have continually suffered under the ethnocentric regimes of outside research and political institutions (Grande 2008; Smith 1999). In advanced capitalist societies, as Habermas (1971) observed, technology and science have eclipsed the role of ethics and self-reflection in research practices. He recognised that contemporary research is closely equated with positivism, and that science is no longer seen as one form of knowledge but as *the* form of knowledge (Held 1980: 296). Consequently, the knowledge of Western-educated "experts," be they doctors, scientists, academics, or government administrators, has subverted other forms of knowing and being, legitimising the powers of these individuals to make decisions on behalf of much wider constituencies (Held 1980: 264). It is these very assumptions, and the protocols of research based on them, that Indigenous people and scholars working with them seek to examine, decolonise, and ultimately transform.

Aboriginal communities have steadily taken back the reins of research, in an effort to produce questions, models, and outcomes that are of primary use to themselves rather than to outside interests (e.g., Battiste 2000; Bishop 2005; Mihesuah and Wilson 2004; Smith 1999). This process has occurred throughout the circumpolar North, in addition to many areas throughout the world, as Indigenous communities challenge and confront colonial relations, including those embedded in the research process (e.g., Atalay 2006; Fienup-Riordan 2010; ITK and NRI (2007); Lyons et al. 2010; Marshall 2002; Pratt 2009). The emerging research models apply Indigenous epistemologies both to the questions that interest communities and to the larger organising principles

that guide the work. Clark cogently describes the process of reclaiming research agendas and returning authority to community hands:

> The argument emerging […] is that the authority for Indigenous studies must be located prominently among Indigenous institutions and rooted in Indigenous ways of knowing and being. From these essential sources of authority, Indigenous scholars and our non-Indigenous allies rightfully are empowered to discipline the disciplines and to subject Indigenous studies to the concrete needs of Indigenous Peoples (Clark 2004: 219).

These models are often conceived as processes that allow the community to "grow with" the research (Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation and Smith 2009: xiii). This approach gives equal emphasis to process as product and has led to discussions on the clash of epistemologies that pits process-oriented against product-oriented research (MacPherson et al. 2000; Turnbull 2000). It also emphasises pragmatism, thereby assuming an open and evolving dialogue that invites broader conversations and new meanings and understandings on a given question (Baert 2005; Kemmis and McTaggart 2005; Preucel and Mrozowski 2010: 33).

This article investigates intellectual property and ethical issues surrounding how researchers[1] negotiate the nature and ownership of research processes and outcomes in collaborative projects with Aboriginal communities. It examines the intersection of interests in research partnerships between Aboriginal communities and outside research allies. While it is laudable to conduct all research "in house," this is not possible for many Aboriginal communities who are stretched with other demands and who often lack the capacity and personnel (Lyons 2007: 63). Below, I consider how research goals, processes, and products are negotiated between collaborators. Such partnerships raise a key challenge of meeting the divergent needs of respective team members. For instance, there is a fundamental disconnect between the types of products and outcomes that are useful to most Aboriginal communities and those required by most outside researchers.[2] Many Aboriginal communities seek to build infrastructure, capacity, resources and inter-generational relationships through their collaborative research partnerships (Denzin and Lincoln 2008; Fienup-Riordan 2010; Lyons et al. 2010). In contrast, most academic practitioners must routinely publish journal articles that their institutions acknowledge and that use a framework and language specific to the discipline in question. The articles are seldom written in commonly accessible language and formats (ITK and NRI 2007; Trimble and Fisher 2006).

I will first outline a series of concepts for negotiating the production and dissemination of research results. The concepts are drawn from different cultural

---

[1] While social science researchers may originate from source communities, this paper focuses on collaborative research conducted by Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal partners.

[2] Researchers who are working with Aboriginal communities are associated with or employed by a variety of institutions, such as private and independent businesses, government, academic and public institutions, and of course Aboriginal communities themselves. In this paper, I will focus on academic interests. My own affiliation is as an independent heritage consultant associated with the Department of Archaeology at Simon Fraser University.

traditions that recognise the theoretical and practical elements of making space for dialogue. I am particularly interested in looking at ways to create space for open and constructive discussions between partners. I elaborate on Habermas's (1996) notion of "communicative space" and apply it to my work with the Inuvialuit community of the Canadian Western Arctic. Our partnership currently has a goal of documenting knowledge about a large and comprehensive collection of ancestral ethnographic objects housed at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., and disseminating this knowledge in meaningful ways in the Inuvialuit, anthropological, and museum communities (Loring et al. 2010; Lyons 2010a; forthcoming). My intent here is to highlight a suite of methods that our project team has generated that lay some useful parameters for our research discussions and which foster trust and investment.

Creating space for the middle ground

There are deep historical roots to Aboriginal distrust of Western newcomers, be they government representatives, educators, religious practitioners, or researchers (Grande 2000, 2004, 2008; Mihesuah and Wilson 2004; Noble 2008; Pyburn 1999; Said 1978; Smith 1999). The newcomers' institutions and practices have marginalised Aboriginal communities from public and political processes, and excluded them from Western society at large. Indigenous scholars cite a history of dehumanising research practices that have shown disrespect or even worse for their persons and cultural traditions (e.g., Smith 1999: 1). Grande maintains that Aboriginal communities continue to live under the spectre of colonialism: "We live within, against, and outside of its constant company, witnessing its various manifestations as it shape-shifts its way into everything from research and public policy to textbooks and classrooms" (Grande 2008: 234).

For this reason, building the foundations for successful and mutually beneficial partnerships between Aboriginal communities and outside researchers takes a good deal of time, commitment, and faith in order to enter a realm where trust can be built (Denzin and Lincoln 2008; Kral and Idlout 2006). Given this history of research, it is critical that Aboriginal and outside researchers establish a safe space for discussion. I call this largely unrecognised element of community-based research "the middle ground," where the nuts and bolts of a project are negotiated (see also Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2010; White 1991; Zimmerman 1997). The list of items up for discussion is contingent on the project, but might at minimum include research questions, process, communication style, roles and responsibilities, leadership, decision-making, funding sources, copyright, ownership, deliverables, and strategies for sharing and disseminating outcomes. These questions loom much larger and are more pressing in a research partnership than in a study undertaken individually by a researcher, as there are more parts to coordinate and more places and ways to fall down. On the other hand, the shared successes and sense of accomplishment of things done well and right are felt much more broadly and deeply in collaborative research.

So how does the middle ground get negotiated? This is a complex topic and engenders additional questions: How are agendas created, research questions formulated, intentions arrived at, and deliverables and outcomes decided upon? The middle ground is a tricky space, especially at the beginning of a partnership when the parameters of both research and collaboration are being formulated and established. Yet, this is exactly how the middle ground should be viewed: as a *space* to be recognised, occupied, developed, and expanded. It needs time and breathing room, energy and flexibility. It needs consideration ahead of the work because the project's ultimate success will rely on how it is cultivated. Making space for such dialogue has both theoretical and practical elements, as seen in selected cultural concepts outlined below.

Several cultural and spiritual traditions recognise the need for creating space to acknowledge the spoken word. Amongst the Stó:lo and other Northwest Coast societies, large-scale ceremonies and feasts are held to observe the naming, passing, and other rites of passage of community members. Within Stó:lo longhouses, a purposeful and tangible relationship is cultivated between speakers and guests. Certain guests are formally "asked to witness" the words and cultural work of the longhouse speaker in a respectful way (Carlson 1997: ii). Witnesses are deemed responsible for remembering the words expressed and the cultural work that attended them as a record of their occurrence; this is a sacred obligation (Bierwert 1999: 113-114; Carlson 1997: 184; McHalsie 2007). Similarly, in certain Buddhist traditions, witnesses assist the speaker by "holding the space" into which the spoken word is delivered (Nhat Hanh 1995). These witnesses help to create an atmosphere of peace, calm, respect, and compassion by chanting, joining hands, or otherwise enabling a harmonious environment into which the words are invited.

Various academic models have also been developed to explore and expand this notion of creating space for facilitating research process. From the perspective of Indigenous scholars, an "intellectual space" or "inquiry room" is needed to examine avenues for decolonising research methodologies and to identify their place in and relationship to research processes (Grande 2008: 234; Mihesuah and Wilson 2004; Smith 1999, 2005). In Grande's (2008: 234) "Red Pedagogy," this work starts by situating the problem "in the historical disconnect between Indigenous education and Western theory." Grande articulates how Indigenous research epistemologies are distinct from Western paradigms, with a view to providing a platform for the creation of alternate, "Red" theories. Such research has been very much equated with regaining the humanity of Indigenous peoples within both the scholarly community and the secular world (Wilson 2004). It has also been argued that the perspectives that emerge should be judged on their own merits, and within their cultures of origin, rather than by neo-colonial standards (Denzin and Lincoln 2008: 2).

Jürgen Habermas and other critical theorists have examined the question of how groups of people communicate in the public sphere. This work provides a close look at methods for "levelling the playing field," referring to the process of identifying and working to reduce the impact of pre-existing social cleavages, power differentials,

language barriers, and other factors that prevent respective parties from creating an environment suitable for discussions (Crossley 2004; Habermas 1984, 1989; Leone and Preucel 1992; Noble 2008; Preucel and Hodder 1996). In his *Theory of Communicative Action*, Habermas (1984, 1989) describes a process "in which people consciously and deliberately aim 1. To reach *intersubjective agreement* as a basis for 2. *Mutual understanding* so as to 3. Reach an *unforced consensus about what to do* in the particular practical situation in which they find themselves" (Kemmis and McTaggart 2005: 575-576). Habermas also closely examined the question of how to keep these communications between groups clear and undistorted, through a sustained reflexivity (Crossley 2004; Held 1980: 256).

As his theory matured, Habermas (1996) recognised that establishing the conditions for communicative action opens a kind of "communicative space" between people. The idea of communicative space can be considered both metaphorical and literal, as defined and operationalised by the group in question. It is a space that lays a foundation of trust and respect between group members. This foundation gives rise to several outcomes. First, communicative space fosters solidarity among members who open their lines of communication in truthful, sincere, mutually comprehensible, and ethically appropriate ways (Habermas 1996). Second, the communication is conducted freely and openly by participating members, and is thus legitimate and meaningful to them. Such legitimacy or authenticity, in a public process or otherwise, is rare "in a world where communications are frequently cynical, and where people feel alienated from public decisions and [...] political processes" (Kemmis and McTaggart 2005: 576-577). In what follows, I adopt Habermas's (1996) concept of communicative space to develop ideas on the negotiation of research.

How to create communicative space in the real world

The Inuvialuit partnership

To shift the foregoing conversation into more concrete terms, I look at a real-world example of group process in action, using my work with the Inuvialuit community of the Canadian Western Arctic. The Inuvialuit are the Inuit of the lower Mackenzie River and adjacent shorelines of the Beaufort Sea. They are descended from Thule peoples who migrated from Alaska ca. 1000 AD, and who specialised in beluga whale hunting (Friesen and Arnold 2008). When Europeans arrived in their territory, the Inuvialuit were living in a number of named local groups that together formed one of the most concentrated populations in the Arctic (Alunik et al. 2003: 14-17; McGhee 1974: xi; Stefansson 1919: 22-23). Post-contact Inuvialuit history is closely associated with the bowhead whaling industry, whose centre was at Herschel Island, and which brought environmental devastation to the region and its peoples (Usher 1971). With the collapse of the industry, many Inuvialuit moved from the coast to the Mackenzie Delta and became successful trappers and traders. In the late 20th century, they would halt oil and

gas development and successfully assert a land claim, signed in 1984 (Berger 1977; Inuvialuit Final Agreement 1984; Usher 1993).

The land claim settlement called for the creation of institutions to foster, document, and promote the "social, cultural and educational welfare of Inuvialuit" (Alunik 1998: 21). In the 1960s and 1970s, Inuvialuit leaders began to document traditional land use and occupancy (Cournoyea 1997), a task that is today being performed by the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre. This institution opened in 1998, and its energies have largely focused on language reclamation, culturally specific curriculum development, and revival of living cultural traditions, such as drum dancing, sewing, and land-based skills (e.g., Arnold and Hanks 1991; GNWT 1991; Inuvialuit elders with Bandringa 2010; Hart 1994, 1997, 1999, 2001; Hart and Cockney 1998; Nagy 1994a, 1994b, 1999, 2002, 2004, 2006; Parks Canada 2004; Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre n.d.a, n.d.b, n.d.c; Radford 2005).

I have been working with the Inuvialuit for a decade on community-defined heritage goals (Lyons 2004, 2007, 2009, 2010b, 2011, forthcoming; Koutouki and Lyons 2009). Our current project is to document Inuvialuit and museum-based knowledge about the MacFarlane Collection, an assemblage of nearly 300 ethnographic items collected in the mid-19th century from Anderson River Inuvialuit, which became a founding collection of the Smithsonian Institution (Lepage 2009; Loring et al. 2010; Lyons 2010a). This collection was purchased and assembled by Hudson's Bay trader Roderick MacFarlane with help from Anderson River people, in whose territory he established a short-lived post from 1861 to 1866 (MacFarlane 1890-1891; Morrison 2006). The MacFarlane Collection has been little studied or exhibited, and few of its items have ever been circulated among or studied by Inuvialuit.

This project seeks to facilitate Inuvialuit access to the MacFarlane Collection, and to create a platform to generate knowledge, interpretation, and meaningful engagement with the objects and, in turn, to share this knowledge in meaningful ways with the Inuvialuit and wider communities. In November 2009, our team of Inuvialuit elders, youth, educators, and anthropologists conducted a weeklong workshop at the Smithsonian Institution to view, interact with, and begin documenting knowledge about the MacFarlane Collection. Throughout 2010 and 2011, we conducted outreach activities in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region to share our experiences through school visits and community information meetings to document elders' knowledge and to engage youth interest in the collection and the project (Lyons et al. 2011). With the Reciprocal Research Network (RRN n.d.), we have launched the MacFarlane Collection on an online museum portal hosted by the University of British Columbia. We also have recently launched a project website that presents traditional and curatorial knowledge, Inuvialuit perspectives about the collection, and curricula for local schools (see Inuvialuit Living History n.d.).

The Inuvialuit project is a partnership between a number of individuals and institutions, including Catherine Cockney (Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre), Mervin Joe (Parks Canada, Inuvik), Albert Elias (elder and interpreter, Ulukhaktok), James Pokiak

(hunter and outfitter, Tuktoyaktuk), Maia Lepage (photographer, Inuvik), Charles Arnold (retired Director of Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre, Yellowknife), Kate Hennessy (School of Interactive Arts and Technology, Simon Fraser University), Stephen Loring (Arctic Studies Center, Smithsonian Institution), and myself, Natasha Lyons (Ursus Heritage Consulting; Simon Fraser University). The present paper is single-authored, largely because I took this opportunity to develop a number of my own ideas about research collaborations in the general sense, and how they relate to the work we have done together in a specific sense.

Communicative space and the Inuvialuit partnership

In the following sections, I consider how the members of our Inuvialuit partnership have created a communicative space to establish goals of mutual interest, and how this space has helped us to develop effective and equitable processes of communication. Our project has moved forward via three processes: establishing a charter for research conduct; developing methods for vetting interview data; and creating time and space for relationships. These discussions lead to a consideration of how to address conflict and challenges in research partnerships.

A charter for research conduct

Early on in our research, our team drew up a charter to define our collective and individual goals and responsibilities. The aim was to establish some ideals of conduct to look to and rely upon in our working relationships. The charter outlines the following areas of collective action: the kind of atmosphere we are interested in cultivating and sustaining (open, honest, positive, supportive, and constructive); how we will conduct our communications; how we will support project goals and remain flexible in light of new ideas or opportunities; and how we plan to provide feedback on project deliverables.

The charter recognises that the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre holds copyright to the data we produce, including interviews with elders and youth, and gives partners latitude to produce articles and conference presentations that others can provide feedback on. At an individual level, our charter outlines the roles and responsibilities of team members, and how they can contribute to activities and products decided upon by the collective. We consider this document, like other project documents and products, to be living and subject to ongoing revision and re-consideration. Although many of us have known and worked with each other for some time, this charter has helped to facilitate a trusting space between us and a protocol to be used as needed.

Vetting of project materials

This is a second area of considerable interest and discussion among partners. We are currently working on a set of methods for reviewing, vetting, and verifying the

documentation collected from interviews and curatorial research. The first step involves reviewing interviews by project collaborators and determining which perspectives, ideas, and opinions to base our interpretations on. Once we have decided on a set of interpretations, we then return to the elders, youth, and other community members who contributed the information to verify it and to ask permission to publish it on the project website.

Vetting is an extremely important step in the interpretive process because it filters the information that will ultimately be presented about the collection, and may privilege certain voices over others. As interviews are transcribed and translated, we must also consider the question of maintaining the integrity and the intent of the speaker's statements (Nagy 2002, 2006). We are very conscious of the different factors that inform community dynamics, and are working to develop procedures that select the most accurate set of stories or interpretations, at the same time as representing different voices and perspectives (see Cournoyea 1997; Habu et al. 2008). An important element is to relay how we made our inferences and arrived at our interpretations. In my prior work with Inuvialuit elders, I found that recurrent ideas or interpretations of ancestral artifacts are often—but not always—the most historically accurate ones (Lyons 2007: 213-218). Previously, I have presented a range of different individual experiences and memories of historical events, family, and personal histories (Lyons 2010b). Inuvialuit contributors have always chosen to have their names attributed to the information they have provided.

Once the draft of a document, presentation, website text, or other product is completed, there is another level of vetting by team members and other appropriate reviewers. This is an important step for the information to be culturally appropriate and accurate from an insider's standpoint, but also for outsiders to have a chance to comment using their knowledge of the research area and cultural context. Our group does not wish to create histories that are proprietary or that uncritically provide only one facet of a group's social history. Together, multiple lenses or viewpoints can help form a kind of situated or contingent objectivity to historical narratives (*cf.* Haraway 1991; Wylie 2000, 2006). In our partnership, we have consciously worked to create a safe space for discussions about vetting and interpreting practices, as these processes form the main axis of our work. Our discussions—whether between two of us or among many—operate in a space where differing opinions can be put forward and discussed.

Building time and space for relationships

In our partnership, we are always working towards the most (culturally) appropriate methods for planning our project, sharing our findings, and making time to work on our relationships. We regularly set aside time and space for conventional teleconference meetings, but many of us also maintain friendly communications outside the workplace. Although our team members hail from all three coastlines of North America, we manage to come together for meetings, public outreach, and

workshops once or twice a year. We consciously allot time and activities to these visits without a formal agenda so that we can enjoy each other's company and catch up on news and family life. This is an important feature of relationship building, as we are all invested in the process of the work as well as the friendships we have cultivated with each other. In fact, the strength of these relationships is the basis for our team's synergy and the high level of engagement among partners and community members.

Falling down and getting up: Addressing conflict and challenges

With the above ideals in mind, I will briefly address the issue of conflict within community partnerships. My perspective is that we should not shy away from establishing procedures for conflict or from discussing its challenges. My own anthropological practice has seen mistakes of procedure and interpretation that were corrected by my colleagues in the Inuvialuit community (and elsewhere). In each case, when I realised my mistake (or when it was pointed out to me), I apologised and asked how it might be corrected. Recently, one such correction meant attaching an addendum to a published paper that was going out to Inuvialuit community members and organisations. Afterwards, two of us talked in detail about revamping and improving our review procedures.

It is never comfortable to be in the wrong, but naming the mistake and facing the conflict—rather than skirting it to avoid confrontation—does provide some redress and help to move things forward. Showing colleagues in academic and descent communities that you have the humility to admit your transgressions is a sign of leadership and accountability; it shows that you are fallible and willing to learn from mistakes (Lyons 2007: 72-73, 243-245). This kind of presence is particularly important in cases where the research cites the voices and words of community historians, or discusses family histories and other themes near and dear to the hearts of community partners (*cf*. Cournoyea 1997). As suggested above, there should be ongoing discussion of protocols for presenting the views and interpretations of project partners and Inuvialuit community members—in whatever format (web, print, video)—because project goals and activities develop and change.

Discussion: Inclusion, rigour, and space

It is not easy to strike a balance between the needs, interests, perspectives, ideas, and personalities of respective team members in research partnerships. The true litmus test of success is the engagement of all team members and, in our case, their commitment to generating and disseminating the knowledge we are producing. Balance also implies caring for each other and for the individuals we invite into our research process. Many of our research participants are the oldest living members of their communities, and face many types of health challenges (Lyons 2007: 155). We have adopted an ethical approach that seeks to care for those involved in our process with

thoughtfulness, attentiveness, and nurturing (Battiste 2008; Denzin and Lincoln 2008: 3).

Relationships must also be negotiated on a more political basis. One element is the interplay between Aboriginal individuals and organisations, and the policies and protocols developed by academic, governmental, and other outside institutions. Battiste (2008: 505) states that "reciprocal [research] relationships must embody both recognition of the custodians of knowledge and awareness of the associated responsibilities of the custodians and the receivers of knowledge." This mandate requires that all parties understand the nature of the knowledge, its intended uses, and the places where it will be disseminated. Noble and others have put forward the idea of "recognition spaces" as places where Indigenous people are acknowledged as the "driving force" in creating their own laws and customs of ownership (Noble 2008: 477; Pearson 1997).

In our partnership, we have established the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre as the holder of copyright and the primary repository of the data we gather. There is certainly a great deal more distance to go in recognising Inuvialuit protocols for ethics and cultural recognition. Our primary mandate is to be inclusive, in both the theoretical sense and the practical sense. In Cooper's (2006) assessment, the epistemic notion of inclusion, by its very nature, connotes truthfulness, virtue, and professional integrity. Inclusiveness, however, does not imply a lack of critical rigour in the research process. Habermas maintains that critical concerns go hand in hand with reflexive and ethical practice. He developed his brand of critical theory both to counter the hegemony of positivistic science and to restore ethical and reflexive concerns to the centre of the knowledge-producing enterprise. He observed that critical self-reflection in the research process "leads to insight due to the fact that what has previously been unconscious is made conscious in a manner rich in consequences: analytic insights intervene in life" (Habermas 1974: 22-23 in Held 1980: 317).

Many Aboriginal scholars endorse this critical and reflexive approach, but from new and distinct standpoints. Grande (2008: 236) asserts that the building of critical perspectives fosters solidarity in Indigenous causes and forms a platform for decolonising pedagogies, developing research methodologies, and initiating institutional reform. This approach is similarly being taken up by Inuit scholars, who note that oral histories and northern narratives should be subject to literary criticism and analysis, like any other canon of scholarly work (e.g., Carpenter 1997; Ipellie 1997; Martin 2009; Vuntut Gwichin First Nation and Smith 2009: xii-xv). Martin (2009: 192) has suggested: "while [Inuit] Elders and their knowledge may be 'traditional', they are also contemporary, adaptable, and therefore not only relevant but essential to the study of Inuit intellectual traditions." These provocative discussions challenge the methods by which such histories have conventionally been approached, produced, and compiled by Inuit and non-Inuit researchers. Our partnership will consider these issues as we move forward in collecting, analysing, and verifying the documentation we are producing.

A particularly successful example of critical practice is Bell, Napoleon, and Paterson's work, as represented in the companion volumes, *First Nations Cultural Heritage and Law: Case Studies, Voices, and Perspectives* (Bell and Napoleon, 2008) and *Protection of First Nations Cultural Heritage: Laws, Policy, and Reform* (Bell and Paterson 2009). Bell and Napoleon (2008: 15) suggest that the diversity of perspectives heard in their case study volume stems not only from the diversity of opinion among their collaborators and participants, but also from the considerable time spent negotiating the expectations and outcomes of each independent study (see Fienup-Riordan 2010; Kral and Idlout 2006). This kind of investment is the hallmark of a successful research partnership, signalling that the groundwork was carefully laid for an equitable process of shared planning, decision-making, and ownership of the ideas and products of the work.

The Inuvialuit Living History project has sought to develop a communicative space in which to engage and operate. To this end, we have established a charter for research conduct, developed methods for vetting interview data, and created time and space for the relationships at the core of our work. We are currently working to use digital spaces as sites for research discussions and processes. Such spaces help to collapse the geographic distances that separate us, and to bridge the disconnect between academic and community agendas. Our primary product after several years of compiling community and curatorial knowledge is a website that seeks to share knowledge about the MacFarlane Collection and make it once again a living collection within the Inuvialuit community. In this regard, community members have been very keen to obtain and recreate patterns from different items, while educators and students have been excited to learn about this ancestral collection through an online exhibit and lesson plans tailored to local curricula. The website, by serving multiple purposes, joins academic goals to community ones. The online exhibit provides both community and curatorial knowledge about the items in the collection. Through the Reciprocal Research Network, one can also query a particular item, add knowledge, and discuss existing interpretations.

We anticipate the need to continue re-visiting our vetting procedures and sharing protocols as questions arise within the research framework. For instance, we are currently discussing intellectual property issues concerning how many details about artifact manufacture should be shared with non-Inuvialuit visitors to the website. Similarly, our team must address who will maintain, support, and update the website over time. The communicative space we have developed does not offer solutions to these issues, but it does provide a safe place where they can be discussed.

We will rely on the communicative space that lies between us as our partnership progresses. Our documents and protocols have addressed some of the challenges and interpersonal conflicts that can arise when the subject matter involves the ideas, opinions, and historical knowledge of community members, knowledge that is collectively very close to the hearts of our Inuvialuit partners. It seems inevitable that well-meaning outsiders will make mistakes, fall down, and (hopefully) be supported and instructed by community members in the ways to do things right. Similarly, outside

researchers have technical and theoretical knowledge, in addition to other sets of skills, to contribute to the collective. Our research framework will not alleviate the need for difficult discussions. What we have established, and will continue to cultivate, is a space for safe and open dialogue that allows us to enjoy and share in the process and products of our research.

Acknowledgments

References

ALUNIK, Ishmael
1998 *Call Me Ishmael: Memories of an Inuvialuk Elder*, Inuvik, Kolausok Ublaaq Enterprises.

ALUNIK, Ishmael, Eddie KOLAUSOK and David MORRISON
2003 *Across Time and Tundra: The Inuvialuit of the Western Arctic*, Vancouver, Raincoast Books, Seattle, University of Washington Press, Gatineau, Canadian Museum of Civilization.

ARNOLD, Charles D. and Christopher C. HANKS
1991 Archaeological Field Training in the NOGAP Area, in Jacques Cinq-Mars and Jean-Luc Pilon (eds), *NOGAP Archaeology Project: An Integrated Archaeological Research and Management Approach*, Victoria, Canadian Archaeological Association, Canadian Archaeological Association Papers, 1: 7-13.

ATALAY, Sonya
2006 Guest Editor's Remarks: Decolonizing Archaeology, *American Indian Quarterly*, 30(3-4): 269-279.

BAERT, Paul
2005   *Philosophy of the Social Sciences: Towards Pragmatism*, Cambridge, Polity
            Press.

BATTISTE, Marie
2000   Introduction: Unfolding the Lessons of Colonization*,* in Marie Battiste (ed.),
            Reclaiming Indigenous Voices and Vision, Vancouver, UBC Press: xvi-xxx.

2008   Research Ethics for Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage:
            Institutional and Researcher Responsibilities, in N.K. Denzin, Y.S. Lincoln
            and L.T. Smith (eds), *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies,*
            Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications: 497-510.

BELL, Catherine and Val NAPOLEON (eds)
2008   *First Nations Cultural Heritage and Law: Case Studies, Voices, and
            Perspectives,* Vancouver, UBC Press.

BELL, Catherine and Val NAPOLEON
2008   Introduction, Methodology, and Thematic Overview, in Catherine Bell and
            Val Napoleon (eds), *First Nations Cultural Heritage and Law: Case
            Studies, Voices, and Perspectives,* Vancouver, UBC Press*:* 1-30.

BELL, Catherine and Robert K. PATERSON (eds)
2009   *Protection of First Nations cultural heritage: Laws, policy, and reform*,
            Vancouver, UBC Press.

BERGER, Thomas
1977   *Northern Frontier, Northern Homeland: The Report of the Mackenzie
            Valley Pipeline Inquiry, vol. 1*, Ottawa, Minister of Supply and Services
            Canada.

BIERWERT, Crisca
1999   *Brushed by Cedar, Living by the River: Coast Salish Figures of Powe*r,
            Tucson, University of Arizona Press.

BISHOP, Russell
2005   Freeing Ourselves from Neocolonial Domination in Research: A Kaupapa
            Maori Approach to Creating Knowledge*,* in N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln
            (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd ed., Thousand Oaks,
            Sage Publications: 109-138.

CARLSON, Keith (ed.)
1997   *You Are Asked to Witness*: *The Stó:lō in Canada's Pacific Coast History*,
            Chilliwack, Stó:lō Heritage Trust.

CARPENTER, Mary
1997   Stories: "Skeleton Woman," "Woman of the Sea", in John Moss (ed.), *Echoing silence: Essays on Arctic narrative*, Ottawa, University of Ottawa Press: 225-230.

CLARK, David Tyeeme
2004   Not the end of the stories, not the end of the songs: Visualizing, signifying, counter-colonizing, in D.A. Mihesuah and A.C. Wilson (eds), *Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*, Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press: 218-232.

COLWELL-CHANTHAPHONH, Chip and T.J. FERGUSON
2010   Intersecting magisteria: Bridging archaeological science and traditional knowledge, *Journal of Social Archaeology,* 10(3): 325-346.

COOPER, David
2006   Truthfulness and 'Inclusion' in Archaeology, in Chris Scarre and Geoffrey Scarre (eds), *The Ethics of Archaeology*, New York, Cambridge University Press: 131-145.

CROSSLEY, Nick
2004   On systematically distorted communication: Bourdieu and the socio-analysis of publics, N. Crossley and J.M. Roberts (eds), *After Habermas: New Perspectives on the Public Sphere*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, Sociological Review Monograph: 88-112.

COURNOYEA, Nellie
1997   Documenting the Oral History of the Inuvialuit, in John Moss (ed.), *Echoing Silence: Essays on Arctic Narratives*, Ottawa, University of Ottawa Press: 7-14.

DENZIN, Norman K. and Yvonna S. LINCOLN
2008   Introduction: Critical Methodologies and Indigenous Inquiries, in N.K. Denzin, Y.S. Lincoln and L.T. Smith, *The Sage Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications: 1-20.

FIEUNUP-RIORDAN, Ann
2010   From Consultation to Collaboration, in Laura Broekhoven, Cunera Buijs, and Peitre Hovens (eds), *Sharing Knowledge & Cultural Heritage: First Nations of the Americas. Studies in Collaboration with Indigenous Peoples from Greenland, North and South America*, Leiden, Mededelingen van het Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde, 39: 1-5.

FRIESEN, T. Max and Charles ARNOLD
2008   The Timing of the Thule Migration: New Dates from the Western Canadian Arctic, *American Antiquity,* 73(3): 527-538.

GNWT (GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES)
1991   *Inuvialuit Pitqusiit The Culture of the Inuvialuit*, Yellowknife, Government
            of the Northwest Territories, Department of Education.

GRANDE, Sandy
2000   American Indian Identity and Intellectualism: The Quest for a New Red
            Pedagogy, *Qualitative Studies in Education,* 13(4): 343-360.

2004   *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought*, Lanham,
            Rowman and Littlefield.

2008   Red pedagogy: The un-methodology, in N.K. Denzin, Y.S. Lincoln and L.T.
            Smith (eds), *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies,*
            Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications: 233-254.

HABERMAS, Jürgen
1971   *Knowledge and Human Interests*, translated by Jeremy J. Shapiro, London,
            Heinemann (first published in German in 1968).

1974   *Theory and Practice*, translated by John Viertel, London, Heinemann (first
            published in German in 1963).

1984   *The Theory of Communicative Action, vol. 1: Reason and the
            Rationalization of Society*, translated by Thomas McCarthy, Boston, Beacon
            Press (first published in German in 1981).

1989   *Theory of Communicative Action, vol. 2: Lifeworld and System: A Critique
            of Functionalist Reason*, translated by Thomas McCarthy, Boston, Beacon
            Press (first published in German in 1981).

1996   *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and
            Democracy*, translated by William Rehg, Cambridge, MIT Press (first
            published in German in 1992).

HABU, Junko, Clare P. FAWCETT and John MATSUNAGA (eds)
2008   *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist
            Archaeologies,* New York, Springer Press.

HARAWAY, Donna
1991   *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*, New York,
            Routledge.

HART, Elisa
1994   Heritage Sites Research, Traditional Knowledge and Training, in Jean-Luc
            Pilon (ed), *Bridges Across Time: The NOGAP Archaeology Project*,
            Victoria, Canadian Archaeological Association, Occasional Paper, 2: 15-27.

1997 *Kitigaaryuit Archaeological Inventory and Mapping Project - 1996*, unpublished report, Inuvik, Inuvialuit Social Development Program.

1999 *Kitigaaryuit Archaeological Inventory and Mapping Project - 1997*, unpublished report, Inuvik, Inuvialuit Social Development Program.

2001 *Reindeer Days Remembered*, Inuvik, Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre.

HART, Elisa and Catherine COCKNEY
1998 Case of Kitigaaryuit: Thoughts on the Impacts of Uses of this important heritage site, in J. Oakes, R. Riewe, K. Kinew and E. Maloney (eds), *Sacred Lands: Aboriginal Worldviews, Claims, and Conflicts*, Edmonton, University of Alberta, Canadian Circumpolar Institute: 163-171.

HELD, David
1980 *Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas*, London, Hutchinson.

IPELLIE, Alootook
1997 Thirsty for life: A nomad learns to write and draw, in John Moss (ed), *Echoing silence: Essays on Arctic narrative*, Ottawa, University of Ottawa Press: 93-101.

INUVIALUIT ELDERS with Robert W. BANDRINGA
2010 *Inuvialuit Nautchiangit - relationships between people and plants*, Inuvik, Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre.

INUVIALUIT FINAL AGREEMENT
1984 *Western Arctic Claim: The Inuvialuit Final Agreement*, Ottawa, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

INUVIALUIT LIVING HISTORY
n.d. Inuvialuit Living History web site (www.inuvialuitlivinghistory.ca).

ITK (INUIT TAPIRIIT KANATAMI) and NRI (NUNAVUT RESEARCH INSTITUTE)
2007 *Negotiating Research Relationships with Inuit Communities: A Guide for Researchers*, Scot Nickels, Jamal Shirley and Gita Laidler (eds), Ottawa, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and Iqaluit, Nunavut Research Institute (online at: http://www.itk.ca/sites/default/files/Negotitiating-Research-Relationships-Researchers-Guide.pdf).

KEMMIS, Stephen and Robin McTAGGART
2005 Participatory Action Research: Communicative Action and the Public Sphere, in N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, *The Sage Handbook of*

Qualitative Research, 3rd ed., Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications: 559-604.

KOUTOUKI, Konstantia and Natasha LYONS
2009   Canadian Inuit speak to climate change: Inuit perceptions on the adaptability of land claims agreements to accommodate environmental change, *Wisconsin International Law Journal,* 27(3): 516-542.

KRAL, Michael and Lori IDLOUT
2006   Participatory anthropology in Nunavut, in Pamela Stern and Lisa Stevenson (eds), *Critical Inuit Studies: An Anthology of Contemporary Arctic Ethnography*, Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press: 54-70.

LEONE, Mark and Robert PREUCEL
1992   Archaeology in a Democratic Society: A Critical Theory Perspective, in L. Wandsnider (ed), *Quandaries and Quests: Visions of Archaeology's Future*, Carbondale, Southern Illinois University, Center for Archaeological Investigations, Occasional Paper, 20: 115-135.

LEPAGE, Maia
2009   Museums and Mukluks: Arctic Representatives Explore MacFarlane Collection in Washington's Smithsonian Institution, *Tusaayaksat*, Winter 2010: 29-37.

LORING, Stephen, Natasha LYONS and Maia LEPAGE
2010   Inuvialuit Encounter: Confronting the past for the future. An IPinCH Case Study, *Arctic Studies Center Newsletter,* 17: 30-32.

LYONS, Natasha
2004   *Early 20th Century Lifeways in Qainiurvik (Clarence Lagoon): Report of the 2003 Archaeological Investigations at Site 76Y*, unpublished report, Winnipeg, Parks Canada Western Canada Service Centre.

2007   *Quliaq Tohongniaq Tuunga (Making Histories): Towards a Critical Inuvialuit Archaeology in the Canadian Western Arctic*, PhD dissertation, University of Calgary, Calgary.

2009   Inuvialuit Rising: The Evolution of Inuvialuit Identities in the Mackenzie Delta, *Alaska Journal of Anthropology*, 7(2): 63-79.

2010a   An Inuvialuit Journey to the Smithsonian, *Up Here In-Flight Magazine*, March 2010: 2.

2010b   The Wisdom of Elders: Inuvialuit social memories of continuity and change in the 20th century, *Arctic Anthropology,* 47(1): 22-38.

2011   Memory & Inuvialuit Elders, *Tusaayaksat*, Fall 2011: 8-10.

forthcoming *Where the wind blows us*: *Critical community archaeology in a North American context*, Tucson, University of Arizona Press, The Archaeology of Colonialism in Native North America Series.

LYONS, Natasha, Peter DAWSON, Matthew WALLS, Donald ULUADLUAK, Louis ANGALIK, Mark KALLUAK, Philip KIGUSIUTUAK, Luke KINIKSI, Joe KARETAK and Luke SULUK
2010   Person, Place, Memory, Thing: How Inuit Elders are Informing Archaeological Practice in the Canadian North, *Canadian Journal of Archaeology,* 34(1):1-31.

LYONS, Natasha, Kate HENNESSY, Charles ARNOLD and Mervin JOE
2011   *The Inuvialuit Smithsonian Project: Winter 2009-Spring 2011*, unpublished report, Burnaby, Simon Fraser University, Department of Archaeology, Intellectual Property in Cultural Heritage Issues Project, and Inuvik, Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre.

MACFARLANE, Roderick
1890-1891 On an Expedition down the Begh-ula or Anderson River, *Canadian Record of Science,* 4: 28-53.

McGHEE, Robert
1974   *Beluga Hunters: An archaeological reconstruction of the history and culture of the Mackenzie Delta Kittegaryumuit*, St. John's, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Newfoundland Social and Economic Studies, 13.

McHALSIE, Sonny
2007   "We Have to Take Care of Everything That Belongs to Us," in Bruce Granville Miller (ed.), *Be of Good Mind: Essays on the Coast Salish,* Vancouver, UBC Press: 82-130.

MACPHERSON, Ian, Ross BROOKER and Paul AINSWORTH
2000   Case study in the contemporary world of research: using notions of purpose, place, process and product to develop some principles for practice, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 3(1): 49-62.

MARSHALL, Yvonne
2002   What is community archaeology? *World Archaeology,* 34(2): 211-219.

MARTIN, Keavy
2009   'Are We Also Here For That?': Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit – Traditional Knowledge, or Critical Theory?, *Canadian Journal of Native Studies,* 29(1-2): 183-202.

MIHESUAH, Devon and Angela Cavender WILSON (eds)
2004   *Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*, Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press.

MORRISON, David
2006   Painted Wooden Plaques from the MacFarlane Collection: The Earliest Inuvialuit Graphic Art, *Arctic,* 59(4): 351-360.

NAGY, Murielle
1994a   *Yukon North Slope Inuvialuit Oral History*, Whitehorse, Government of the Yukon, Department of Tourism, Heritage Branch, Hudç Hudän Series, Occasional Papers in Yukon History, 1.

1994b   Interpretation in Arctic Archaeology: Lessons from Inuvialuit Oral History*,* in Jean-Luc Pilon (ed.), *Bridges Across Time: The NOGAP Archaeology Project*, Canadian Archaeological Association, Occasional Paper, 2: 29-37.

1999   *Aulavik Oral History Project on Banks Island, NWT: Final Report*, unpublished report, Inuvik, Inuvialuit Social Development Program.

2002   Comment les Inuvialuit parlent de leur passé, *Anthropologie et Sociétés*, 26(2-3): 193-213.

2004   'We did not want the muskox to increase': Inuvialuit knowledge about muskox and caribou populations on Banks Island, Canada, in David Anderson and Mark Nuttall (eds), *Cultivating Arctic Landscapes. Knowing and Managing Animals in the Circumpolar North*, New York and Oxford, Berghahn Books: 93-109.

2006   Time, Space, and Memory, in Pamela Stern and Lisa Stevenson (eds), *Critical Inuit Studies: An Anthology of Contemporary Arctic Ethnography*, Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press: 71-88.

NHAT HANH, Thich
1995   *Living Buddha, Living Christ*, New York, Riverhead Books.

NICHOLAS, George and Kelly BANNISTER
2004   Copyrighting the Past? Emerging Intellectual Property Rights Issues in Archaeology, *Current Anthropology,* 45(3): 327-350.

NOBLE, Brian
2008   Owning as Belonging/Owning as Property: The Crisis of Power and Respect in First Nations Heritage Transactions with Canada, in Catherine Bell and Val Napoleon (eds), *First Nations Cultural Heritage and Law: Case Studies, Voices, Perspectives,* Vancouver, UBC Press: 465-488.

PARKS CANADA
2004   *Paulatuuq Oral History Project: Inuvialuit Elders Share Their Stories*,
          Inuvik, Parks Canada Western Arctic Field Unit.

PEARSON, Noel
1997   The concept of native title at common law, in G. Yunupingu (ed), *Our Land
          is Our Life*, St Lucia, University of Queensland Press: 150-162.

PRATT, Kenneth L. (ed.)
2009   *Chasing the Dark: Perspectives on Place, History, and Alaska Native Land
          Claims*, Anchorage, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Alaska Region, Shadowlands,
          1.

PREUCEL, Robert and Ian HODDER (eds)
1996   *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory: A Reader*, Oxford, Blackwell.

PREUCEL, Robert and Stephen MROZOWSKI (eds)
2010   *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory: The New Pragmatism*, 2nd Edition,
          Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell.

PRINCE OF WALES NORTHERN HERITAGE CENTRE
n.d.a   *Journey to Kitigaryuuk*, Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre website
          (online at: http://pwnhc.learnnet.nt.ca/exhibits/kiti/index.html).

n.d.b   *Lessons from the Land*, Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre website
          (online at: http://www.lessonsfromtheland.ca/).

n.d.c   *The Inuvialuit Place Name Virtual Exhibit*, Prince of Wales Northern
          Heritage Centre website (online at: http://pwnhc.learnnet.nt.ca/inuvialuit/
          index.html).

PYBURN, Anne
1999   Native American Religion versus Archaeological Science: A Pernicious
          Dichotomy Revisited, *Science and Engineering Ethics,* 5(3): 355-366.

RADFORD, Tom
2005   *I, Nuligak: An Inuvialuit History of First Contact*, film, 71 mn, White Pine
          Pictures, National Film Board of Canada, Clearwater Media Inc.

RRN (RECIPROCAL RESEARCH NETWORK)
n.d.   *Reciprocal Research Network*, Museum of Anthropology at the University
          of British Columbia (online at: www.rrnpilot.org).

SAID, Edward
1978   *Orientalism*, New York, Random House.

SMITH, Linda Tuhiwai
1999   *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, London, Zed Books Ltd.

2005   On Tricky Ground: Researching the Native in the Age of Uncertainty*, in* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd ed., Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications: 85-108.

STEFANSSON, Vilhjalmur
1919   *Stefansson-Anderson Arctic expedition of the American Museum: Preliminary ethnological report*, New York, Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History: 14(1).

TRIMBLE, Joseph and Celia FISHER
2006   Introduction, in Joseph Trimble and Celia Fisher (eds), *Sage Handbook of Ethical Research with Ethnocultural Populations and Communities*, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications: 3-25.

TURNBULL, Annemarie
2000   Collaboration and censorship in the oral history interview, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology,* 3(1): 15-34.

UNESCO (UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION)
2003   *Convention for the Safeguarding* of *Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Paris, UNESCO (online at http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en& pg=00006).

USHER, Peter
1971   The Canadian Western Arctic: A Century of Change, *Anthropologica,* 13(1-2): 169-183.

1993   Northern development, impact assessment, and social change, in N. Dyck and J. Waldram (eds), *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*, Montreal and Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press: 98-130.

VUNTUT GWITCHIN FIRST NATION and Shirleen SMITH
2009   *People of the Lakes: Stories of Our Van Tut Gwich'in Elders/Googwandak Nakhwach'anjoo Van Tut Gwich'in*, Edmonton, University of Alberta Press.

WHITE, Richard
1991   *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

WILSON, Angela Cavender
2004   Reclaiming our Humanity: Decolonization and the Recovery of Indigenous
            Knowledge, in Devon Mihesuah and Angela C. Wilson, *Indigenizing the
            Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*,
            Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press: 69-87.

WYLIE, Alison
2000   Feminism in Philosophy of Science: Making Sense of Contingency and
            Constraint, in Miranda Fricker and Jennifer Hornsby (eds), *Companion to
            Feminism in Philosophy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 166-182.
2006   When Difference Makes a Difference, *Episteme: A Journal of Social
            Epistemology,* 3(1): 1-7.

ZIMMERMAN, Larry
1997   Remythologizing the Relationship Between Indians and Archaeologists, in
            Nina Swidler, Kurt Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan Downer (eds),
            Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground,
            Walnut Creek, AltaMira Press: 44-56.