Culture

Doing Unto Others: Applied Anthropology, Collaborative Research and Native Self-determination

Wayne Warry

Citer cet article

Résumé de l'article

Cet essai traite de l'anthropologie appliquée mise en rapport avec l'autodétermination des autochtones. On note une mutation radicale de la recherche indépendante à la recherche collective lorsque le principe de l'autodétermination est mis en application. L'auteur décrit l'engagement des autochtones dans l'élaboration d'une recherche et le rôle de leur politique concernant les paramètres de la recherche appliquée.

Les praticiens et bureaucrates non-autochtones aux méthodes inadéquates détiennent toujours le monopole du lien entre cette politique et la recherche. Les anthropologues peuvent renforcer la recherche interdisciplinaire en encourageant la recherche collective et toute autre technique de recherche qualitative jugée « culturellement appropriée » par les autochtones.

Doing Unto Others: Applied Anthropology, Collaborative Research and Native Self-determination

Wayne Warry
McMaster University

This paper examines applied anthropology in relation to Native self-determination. Adherence to the principle of self-determination in research produces a fundamental shift from independent to collaborative research. The paper discusses Native people's involvement in research design and the role of aboriginally defined policy in shaping the parameters of applied research.

The research-policy nexus remains dominated by non-Native practitioners and bureaucrats employing inappropriate methodologies. Anthropologists can strengthen interdisciplinary research by advocating the use of participatory and other qualitative research techniques which Native people view as 'culturally appropriate'.

Cet essai traite de l'anthropologie appliquée mise en rapport avec l'autodétermination des autochtones. On note une mutation radicale de la recherche indépendante à la recherche collective lorsque le principe de l'autodétermination est mis en application. L'auteur décrit l'engagement des autochtones dans l'élaboration d'une recherche et le rôle de leur politique concernant les paramètres de la recherche appliquée.

Les praticiens et bureaucrates non-autochtones aux méthodes inadéquates détiennent toujours le monopole du lien entre cette politique et la recherche. Les anthropologues peuvent renforcer la recherche interdisciplinaire en encourageant la recherche collective et toute autre technique de recherche qualitative jugée «culturellement appropriée» par les autochtones.

In this paper[1] I discuss an idea which, at first glance, appears self-evident: that anthropologists concerned with Native issues should be guided in their work by an adherence to the principle of Native self-determination. Adherence to this principle indicates a fundamental shift from independent to collaborative research.[2] Applied anthropologists can assist Native people in informing 'mainstream' social and natural scientists of the need to enter into collaboration with Native people. From a Native perspective, applied collaborative research enhances the self-determination process. From a disciplinary perspective, however, collaboration remains problematic because academic experts are forced to relinquish control over the research process. But I argue that a shift to collaborative and inter-disciplinary research is urgently required if anthropology is to be relevant within the context of the self-determination movement. In the nexus between participatory methodologies and inter-disciplinary research, a truly forceful Native policy science can emerge.

The reference to the Golden Rule in the title was used in a conversation with Art Solomon, a Native Elder, who asked, somewhat rhetorically, whether I would tolerate my own methods, or passively accept my interpretations, if I were member of a Native com-

munity. The title, then, is meant to elicit considera-
tion of those conceptual and methodological under-
pinnings of our discipline that relegate Native
people to passive roles as 'objects' in our research. It
is time for anthropology to move from writing *about*
Native people or speaking *for* Native people, to
working *with* Native people. Applied anthropology
must move the discipline beyond sterile questions of
representation and reflexivity in ethnographic texts
to a dialogue concerning method, process and
praxis. To borrow a thought from Flannery's Old
Timer, it is time to question what Native people
really want from anthropology (Flannery, 1982: 272).
What they desire, I believe, is nothing short of full
partnership in the research process; a partnership
that leaves behind the antiquated role of informant.

I distinguish between collaborative action or
participatory research[3] where research participants
are directly involved in the study design and analy-
sis, and interdisciplinary research, which involves
teams of professionals (following J. Schensul *et al*,
1987; and S. Schensul, 1987). If the 'subjects' of our
study are not directly involved in formulating re-
search problems, and in interpreting the data, then
collaboration does not take place. The degree and
quality of Native involvement in research distin-
guishes collaboration from consultation. Native
people have rejected this latter approach as a strat-
egy which governments use to rationalize Indian
policy or to make policy more digestible to the public
at large. All too often consultation with colleagues,
policy makers or Native leaders in advance of re-
search passes for 'collaboration' (see for example,
Miles-Tapping, 1990; O'Neil and Waldram, 1989).

My own experience in collaborative research
has involved contractual research as a practicing an-
thropologist. Native front-line workers, elders and
policy makers have been responsible for designating
research problems and have contributed to the re-
search through their involvement in research com-
mittees, focus groups and workshops. In this way,
Native collaborators have been involved in all stages
of the research, including the interpretation of data
(see Warry, 1990, 1986; McCaskill *et al*, 1989). My
experience suggests that a loss of power over the use
or interpretation of data is a natural by-product of
the collaborative process. At times my ability to
pursue certain issues has been restricted, and my
interest in gathering data that might directly contrib-
ute to theoretical discussions in anthropology has
been curtailed by the practical concerns of my Native
collaborators.

Despite these observations, I do not believe that
collaborative applied research endangers the ad-
vancement of a general theory of culture - I assume
that applied collaborative anthropology, in develop-
ing responsible praxis, is in no way 'anti-theory'. A
shift to Native control over the research process,
however, will inevitably involve greater reliance on
contractual agreements between academics and
Indian Bands. This practice will force academics to
explicitly negotiate research designs and will lead to
a constructive dialogue between Natives and non-
Natives concerning the relationship between 'basic'
and 'applied' research.

Anthropology and Native Self-determination

Beginning with the Report of the Special Parlia-
mentary Committee on Indian Self-Government
(Canada, 1983), a host of government policy state-
ments have affirmed Native people's right to self-
determination, even while tripartite negotiations
aimed at entrenching the right to self-government in
the Canadian constitution have stagnated. The cur-
rent stalemate in constitutional negotiations is re-
lated to the potentially sweeping implications - and
financial costs - associated with a concept which, in
the words of Weaver, remains at the level of a 'value
notion' (1984:65).[4]

The ultimate nature and cost of self-govern-
ment is unquestionably vague. The potential para-
meters of Native self-government, however, are
exceptionally clear, and have been defined by nu-
merous studies (see for example, Jackson, 1988;
Ontario, 1989, 1988). Self-government entails the
right of First Nations to exercise authority and to
legislate in areas such as social and cultural develop-
ment, resource use, family relations, law, revenue
raising and economic development. The goal of
Native self-determination, in concert with its politi-
cal counterpart, self-government, involves the rec-
ognition of inherent and sovereign rights. It encom-
passes political control, rather than simple adminis-
trative authority over community affairs. The con-
trol and ownership of intellectual property, as well
as natural resources, is intrinsic to this process.
Recognition of this fact extends beyond the obvious
- the need for negotiation concerning publication
and the financial dividends derived from research -
to the development of truly collaborative research
methods which fully engage Native communities.
Our discipline must recognize that authority over
the research process is an obvious component of
socio-cultural development. Native control over
research can potentially reinforce community and

cultural identity. The concept of self-determination, therefore, is connected to the intellectual health of individuals and communities as a whole. The ability of Native communities to determine their future is quite naturally related, in part, to their ability to generate meaningful research.

Recognition of the right to self-determination, however, has not found its way into mainstream academia. This fact belies the notion of collective morality and advocacy within our discipline. That individual anthropologists have acted as forceful advocates for Native communities and causes cannot be denied (see for example, Asch, 1984; Paine, 1985; Salisbury, 1986, 1977). It may also be true that anthropologists have, to some small degree, raised the consciousness of the Canadian public with regard to the manifest problems faced by Native communities. But this small 'a' advocacy is an astute and non-threatening academic strategy given the current political climate in Canada (Van Esterick, 1985). Much more difficult is to revise our notions of the research process itself, and to make our research relevant - both theoretically and programmatically - to the aims and aspirations of Native communities.

Ryan has noted that anthropology professes ethical practice at the individual level, but that from a disciplinary perspective, we have failed to formulate an adequate standard of behaviour with regard to accountability and the relevancy of our research (Ryan, 1978: 128, 130). It is time for Canadian anthropologists to take seriously the challenge to 'decolonize' anthropology and to make the discipline accountable and relevant to the local communities who are the subject of much of our study.

Taken as a collective body of work, anthropological research has been scarred by an inability to *consistently* produce research of an applied or theoretical nature, which is truly meaningful in addressing the manifest problems faced by Native communities.[5] The philosophical and structural foundations of the discipline encourage the possession, propagation and ownership of indigenous knowledge through esoteric control over research in order to construct and protect university-based careers. In sum, anthropology continues to engage in neo-colonial research which exploits indigenous knowledge.

This is not an original criticism. The commoditization of knowledge, as noted by Hall (1979), is directly linked to a syndrome of academic processes - including the nature of journals, conferences, aca-

demic seniority and tenure - whereby academics package their research for sale in order to advance their own careers. Hall's argument develops from his experience in adult education in third and fourth world settings and is not directly addressed to anthropology. But given our natural alliance with Native people, anthropology must assume a lead role in the decolonization of social and physical science research.

At the heart of this process lies the relationship between the social scientist and the subject - or 'object' - of research:

> For a person in a university or a research institution knowledge is effectively a commodity. In the narrowest sense, researchers gather or 'mine' ideas or information in order to survive and advance economically. Priorities are given to collecting data at a central point, summarizing it and then packaging it in such a way that it can be marketed. The need to serve as policy-makers is also recognized by some as an additional market. The need to serve the people from whom the information has been gathered...is indirect and by necessity of low priority. (Hall, 1977: 23).

If we advocate Native control over land and natural resources, and increased Native involvement in resource industries as part of a strategy of 'sustainable' development, then we must reflect - and act - on the need for similar changes within the industry of anthropology.

Hall's comments are salient given the fact that Native communities are increasingly aware of the exploitation of their communities by outside researchers.[6] Native people's view of researchers in general, and anthropologists in particular, often extends beyond mere skepticism (see O'Neil and Waldram, 1989: 13) to derision and distrust. Native people view anthropology as largely esoteric, irrelevant and as incapable of contributing to solutions to problems facing their communities. Native people say they have been 'researched to death', a statement that is at first glance perplexing given the obvious and manifest research needs of Native communities. But this 'research lament' is easily understood within the self-determination context (Warry, 1990). Research findings, cloaked in jargon, have been unintelligible to communities or have been largely irrelevant to community needs. Academic reputations, so the argument goes, have been built on the backs of Native subjects and at the political and economic expense of Native communities. Native

leaders now advocate research that is collaborative and meaningful to their communities. The 'meaning' of research is directly measured by its relevance to the self-determination movement.

Awareness concerning the potential value of research varies enormously between Native communities. Many communities have neither the inclination, nor the local expertise, to generate research agendas, or standards for local research. This is particularly true in the far north where, despite licencing by the Science Institute of the Northwest Territories, there is, each summer, a massive influx of natural and social scientists. Inuit community representatives often lack the time or expertise to gauge the potential usefulness of research or are unable to generate their own research agendas (personal communication J.P. Chartrand). In contrast, in southern Canada, a number of Native communities routinely enter into contractual relationships before allowing researchers to enter their communities (Walpole, 1986).

Native leaders do not question the need for research *per se*. Indeed, they clearly recognize that the information needs of their communities are manifest. But they decry the monopolistic control of academics over the research process. Specifically, they argue that the analysis and interpretation of research findings must take account of indigenous science, which is based on experiential and humanistic interpretation, and that the ultimate use of data can only be determined by indigenous, rather than academic needs (cf. Mohawk, 1985; Jackson *et al* 1982).[7]

The Research-Policy Nexus

Policy may be broadly defined as a set of values for planned action which must take place within an environment of limited or restricted financial resources. Native aspirations raise a series of questions about the relationship between research and policy development. Most obvious among these is the issue of 'whose policy' should guide the identification of research problems. The quest for Native self-government is colored by competing government and Native views on the nature and pace of social change. For many federal and provincial policy makers, the concept of self-government remains a radical notion. Bureaucrats insist on legislative fine tuning, even as Indian organizations call for fundamental structural change. The politics of incrementalism, prevalent in government circles, serve as a barrier to the development of innovative policy initiatives which would propel the self-government

process along its inevitable course (Warry 1990).

The structuralist and incrementalist approaches are, in part, attributable to the bureaucratic and Native political and communicative structures. Ideally, authority and decision making in Indian organizations flow from the bottom up: from band members to chiefs, to regional Tribal Councils and, finally, to provincial and national organizations (Castellano, 1982:116). As important, Native leaders often emphasize holistic solutions to community based problems, while stressing the diversity of cultural groups and the autonomy of First Nations. Provincial and Federal bureaucracies in contrast, encourage specialized expertise and create compartmentalized policies that deny holistic solutions and attempt to homogenize cultural and geographic differences between First Nations. As Fleras (1989: 214- 215) notes, bureaucratic commitments to universalism and legal equality serve as powerful disincentives in restraining aboriginal positions derived from notions of 'special status'. Government concern for financial restraint leads to an over-emphasis on program evaluation and administration. A lack of inter-ministerial co-ordination confounds attempts to develop holistic programs at any level, including the local level (cf. Castellano, 1982; Warry, 1990).

Native policy making has been enhanced by the development of Tribal Councils and larger provincial Native political unions, which assume a lead role in tripartite negotiations, policy research and program development. From the government's perspective the funding of political unions or tribal councils enhances the development of uniform policy with regard to Native people, while officially recognizing Indian political cultural diversity. Government agencies are also reluctant to 'release' control over the research and policy making process. However, Native political organizations are hampered by inadequate staffing in research and policy positions, and by a shortage of trained researchers. Staff time is quickly consumed by comprehensive claims and a variety of political negotiations. Nor do aboriginal organizations always perceive the value in applied research, even when it is collaborative in nature. As a result, a wide range of policy research concerning - for example, social or medical services, housing and welfare reform - is unaddressed.

Applied anthropologists are well suited to policy related research in this fertile middle ground between government and Indian organizations. Pro-

grammatic, rather than comprehensive, issues afford anthropologists an immense opportunity to pursue research that can lead to incipient models for self-governing institutions. The phrase, 'incipient models', is used here to distinguish Native controlled programs or institutions that are developed in the absence of a constitutional and legislative recognition of Native people's right to self-determination. Such applied programmatic research can provide Native leaders with a wealth of information that can be used to develop, for example, culturally appropriate family and social services or integrated models for education or health delivery. Anthropologists can provide a wealth of information to Native political organizations by directly involving Native frontline workers as key collaborators in the research process. In this way, applied research can directly enhance the formulation of Native policy and legislation.

The unwillingness of federal and provincial governments to support Native policy research is a critical aspect of political and bureaucratic control over Indian people. Despite the growing numbers of aboriginal consultants, the shortage of skilled Native researchers forces Indian organizations to rely on non-native consultants or academics on a project by project basis.

Despite the shortage of researchers at the community level, Native experts exist in the form of front-line workers whose experience represents a wealth of knowledge concerning community life. Government policy makers rarely recognize these local experts as important sources of information. Policy formation is greatly enhanced by involving front-line workers as key collaborators, or by designing programs that have information gathering as a key component of service delivery (Homenuck, 1984: 52). The need to recognize 'Native science', which is based on experiential rather than experimental or statistical validation of knowledge, as a reliable component of a policy research process is a major objective of many Native leaders who feel thwarted by the continued domination of the research-policy nexus by non-Native practitioners and bureaucrats employing inappropriate methodologies.

Anthropological research draws on this local expertise by way of qualitative techniques, including the use of focus groups, life histories and case studies, thereby affirming indigenous science as an essential component of policy development. This

contribution, coupled with the use of culturally appropriate interview techniques creates a natural alliance between Native policy makers and anthropologists. For example, unstructured interviews have been shown to be vastly superior to standard questionnaires employing closed questions, which are commonly regarded as 'tests' by Native people and rarely solicit accurate assessment of local lifestyles (Farkas *et al*, 1989).

At an analytical level, the comparative method is ideally suited to the description and interpretation of needs and impact assessments, program design and policy development concerning divergent geographic and cultural communities. Likewise, anthropologists' traditional focus on integrated analysis is culturally compatible with Native efforts to design and implement (w)holistic solutions to community based problems. To be effective, researchers must collaborate directly with Native political organizations in order to distinguish priorities for research. Such consultation can map out a wide range of potential research areas for anthropologists interested in directly contributing to the goal of self-determination. This initiative requires the creation of informal and formal links between Indian organizations, universities, and foundations, that, to date, are all too rare in Canada.[8]

Interdisciplinary Research

Bureaucrats often regard anthropology as an esoteric subject that is ill-suited to the specialized demands of policy science. (Chambers, 1987: 319; Weaver, 1985; Mulhauser, 1975). The discipline remains ineffective in producing policy relevant studies. The structure of anthropological training and the pragmatic limitations of policy work make most anthropological research irrelevant to policy analysis. Like Weaver, I believe that significant changes in the teaching of anthropology at the undergraduate and graduate levels, including the critical analysis of the policy making environment, are essential to the development of applied anthropology *(ibid)* However, even with the preparation of students for policy related occupations, practicing anthropologists will run the risk of becoming, as Salisbury states, 'functionaries' when required to accommodate themselves to the rigid requirements of government bureaucracy (1975: 315).

The likelihood that anthropologists can contribute to the acceptance of Native policy, or to the revision of government policy is increased through our alignment with mainstream disciplines, which

have a longer tradition as policy sciences (O'Neil and Waldram, 1989). Government and Native expectations concerning program planning, development and evaluation under a range of policy initiatives invariably require inter-disciplinary approaches at the community level. Interdisciplinary research is required because of the highly compartmentalized nature of government legislation and the rapid advance in knowledge within disciplines, which make it impossible for any anthropologist to keep abreast of the 'state of the art' in other fields.

It has been my experience that bureaucrats now accept that qualitative research techniques can be used to strengthen quantitative approaches in policy analysis (McCaskill et al, 1989, Warry 1986). This recognition opens the door to anthropological contributions to Native policy directives. But applied anthropologists must recognize that mainstream disciplines, such as law, economics and medicine, also bring a powerful voice to the policy environment that is directly related to the degree of professionalism and institutionalization of these disciplines. Bureaucrats consciously seek multi-sectoral consultation to ensure the political viability of new policy initiatives, an approach that naturally produces an acceptance of inter-disciplinary research. This bureaucratic acumen is unmatched in academic circles where the 'auteur' school of research continues to predominate in both faculty research and graduate training (Sansom, 1985). The ideology of the 'independent' control over research findings and analysis is deeply embedded in the discipline. This ideology is no more evident than in our graduate training, where on-going collaboration in analysis is actively discouraged, and where Ph.D. requirements render dissertations unintelligible to local communities.

The dangers in interdisciplinary research are that the anthropologist's role will be reduced to that of 'colour commentator' or that our qualitative methods will be consumed by quantitative approaches. While not devaluing the role of cultural interpreter, it is important that the anthropologist's role is not confined to providing 'context' for studies devoid of any cultural sensibility. It is imperative that we use the opportunity of interdisciplinary work to fully explain the value of qualitative methods, to encourage participatory research and to enhance Native involvement in all phases of the research process.

Collaborative Research: the participatory model

Quite obviously, multi-faceted approaches are required in applied research if we are to assist Native people in solving the systemic problems existing in their communities. Native leaders increasingly view 'pure' research as sterile. Native communities seek applied research, which focuses on needs assessments and program development or which directly informs policy-making within the framework of self-government.

As Sarsfield has noted, community-based pressure to produce "applied research" is increasing, but the responsiveness of researchers and funding agencies to locally defined priorities still lags far behind (1988: 123). Most research is still initiated outside of the Native community, and the sole responsibility for interpreting data remains with academics or consultants.

Native people's involvement in problem definition is critical to collaboration and is essential if solutions to the many problems facing Canadian Natives are to be found (Postle et al, 1987: 220). Ultimately, the successful elaboration of long term research strategies will require Native policy researchers to acquire a number of on-going research skills, including expertise in the field of management information systems, that will allow communities to see program evaluation as a tool for development, rather than as a threat to program survival (Castellano, 1986 125-126). As Castellano notes, research is of little value unless Native people maximize their involvement in all phases of social reform: from research to the drafting of legislation. Native communities must initiate research that is guided by a realistic awareness of government policy and planning procedures (ibid.)

The isolated nature of Native communities makes collaborative research difficult and expensive.[9] Indeed, given the continued erosion of funding to Native programs and to social science under the present Conservative government, the call for increased Native participation in research design and analysis would seem impractical. Government budget cuts have seriously affected staffing of Native political organizations, thereby undermining the ability of these organizations to enter into collaboration with non-Native researchers (Toronto Star, 1990:A9). Recent changes in the Social Science and Humanities Research Council Strategic Grants Program, however, appear to foster and encourage the development of collaborative, community based research. Native research is also singled out as a

special initiative under current SSHRC discussions (SSHRC 1990). Continued advocacy for enlightened funding strategies to enhance collaborative and inter-disciplinary work involving faculty and graduate students is, therefore, essential.

By taking account of Native policy, anthropologists can begin to design research projects that are fully compatible with Native aspirations concerning self-government. The costs of collaborative research can also be reduced through liaising with political organizations, often located in major cities. What remains clear is that collaborative projects must involve Native representatives in the initial design of research objectives and in all aspects of data collection and interpretation. We must train Native researchers to work in their own, or other communities, and, ultimately, the knowledge we package must be prepared for, evaluated and utilized by Native people.

The research model that has gained widespread acceptance in Native communities is commonly referred to as community based, participatory research (Hall, 1979; Castellano, 1982, 1986; Jackson *et al*, 1982; Price, 1987). As summarized by Hall, participatory research is an integrated activity that combines social investigation, educational work and action (1979 : 406-407). Problem definition originates in the community itself and the community is in control of the entire research process. Hall (1979) argues that participatory research challenges outside researchers to become committed participants and learners in the research process and leads to militancy, rather than detachment from local aims and aspirations evolving out of the research process.

It is the 'militancy' of participatory research that many academics see as misguided or as somehow threatening to the discipline. Brown and Tandon have differentiated the participatory and action research models based on historical factors and ideological orientation (1983). They note that these two methodologies share many common values, including the collaborative analysis of data and community-based problem definition. But they distinguish a tendency for action researchers to seek incremental solutions and to conduct research within, or on behalf of organizational (state or industry) authorities and to emphasize joint use of research results by seeking consensus between clients and organizational authorities. Participatory researchers, they argue, are more likely to advocate radical or structural change, and to dissociate or oppose themselves

to 'system' representatives during the analysis of data and the development of recommendations (1983:285-287).

These distinctions are of academic interest but fail to take account of the complex policy-making environment associated with applied research in the Native Canadian context. If action and participatory research are viewed at opposite ends of a methodological and ideological continuum, then the style of research I advocate is fully participatory in method, if not in ideological orientation. Despite increased indications of militancy in Native communities, Native leaders continue to favour a consensual, if structural, approach to change. The suggestion that anthropologists engage in research directed toward the formation of 'incipient models' of self-governing institutions continues a consensualist approach which is intrinsic to the Canadian political environment. In Canada, participatory research is to be distinguished by adherence to Native policy and a commitment to Native control over the research process.

Participatory researchers become trainers and facilitators, rather than isolated owners of what is, from a community perspective, esoteric knowledge. Our discipline has to make research skills accessible to Native people and to dismantle the highly centralized and institutionalized bases of our discipline. The development of northern institutes, summer institutes, distance education models and aboriginal research institutes, such as those now being developed in southern Canada, are examples of important initiatives that should be embraced by Canadian anthropology departments (Walpole, 1986; Union of Ontario Indians, 1988).

Applied Research in Native Communities

I conclude with two brief examples of policy-driven research to suggest how anthropology can contribute to the development of incipient models for Native self-government. These examples illustrate the need for collaborative and inter-disciplinary research that is focused on the attainment of self-sustaining institutions. The first example concerns the need for policy development research in the area of Native justice; the second, policy analysis and evaluation, in support of Native controlled health programs.

The Canadian state defines deviant behaviour and controls conflict resolution within Native communities. This external control over legal process

creates cultural dissonance and dislocation among members of the Native community. Control over dispute processing is integral to individual and community well-being. The control over dispute processing by outside authorities disempowers Native communities by usurping the ability of Native people to define and debate the norms of their communities. The continuing effects of this legalistic neocolonialism is evident in the overrepresentation of Native people in all phases of the criminal justice system, from arrest to incarceration (Asbury, 1986; Hylton, 1983; Jackson, 1988). Many reserves suffer from extremely high crime rates and incidences of domestic and community violence.

Problems associated with Native conflict with the law require the development of Native controlled courts or 'alternative justice systems' to replace or supplement existing criminal justice institutions, which Native people view as foreign and inappropriate. The development of tribal courts is supported in a report by the Canadian Bar Association (Jackson, 1988). A recent judicial inquiry in Nova Scotia also recommends the creation of community based courts and alternative justice programs (Clarke, 1989: 59-62; Nova Scotia, 1989:50-53,58). One lawyer has noted that the development of a separate justice system for Native people is constitutionally feasible and well within the legal parameters set down in the Indian Act (Morse, 1980).

No concrete models for Native courts exist, nor is there any systematic analysis of the pragmatic jurisdictional problems associated with the development of Native justice systems. As noted by Havemann et al (1985: 88), social scientists have not addressed the social and political realities of creating such courts. Native leaders desire applied research projects that could lead to the development of model courts or pilot projects - the logical "next step" needed to propel the self-determination process forward (Havemann et al, 1985; Montagnes, 1986; Saddle Lake, 1985). Federal and provincial governments, however, have consistently resisted the development of tribal courts or integrated justice systems, and have specifically rejected the notion of Native control over criminal justice programs.[10]

Anthropologists have a special role to play in ensuring such research takes place in line with Native policy initiatives in the field of justice. Native people seek the development of justice programs that are based on recognition of customary legal process and substantive law (Indian common law); that is on the integration of culturally appropriate

legal process into all aspects of community life. The development of such incipient models for self-governing institutions, however, can take place only through comprehensive, applied research that is directed at policy and program development. Indeed, years of community based experimentation, in the form of pilot projects and evaluation will be required to advance this key self-determination initiative (Krasnick and Stevenson, 1990).

The notion of developing working models for alternative justice programs is a classic example of the structuralist-incrementalist conundrum. Anthropological research, focused to provide information of use to Native policy analysts concerning alternative justice programs, could directly contribute the creation of incipient models for community based legal institutions. Ethnohistorical research, as well as participant observation research concerning the generation and resolution of conflict at the community level, would be of enormous value to Native policy initiatives. But the long term development and evaluation of working models or pilot projects in the field of Native justice can take place only through interdisciplinary approaches involving lawyers, criminologists and social workers and with the full collaboration of Native elders, constables and justices of the peace.

The second example of collaborative applied research concerns an established Federal government initiative, the Indian Health Transfer Policy, which provides First Nations with funding to conduct health care needs assessments, and to develop community health plans and health care authorities (Union Of Ontario Indians, 1989). The attainment of minimal standards of health care is central to the objective of self-determination (cf. Warry, 1990). The transfer policy raises complex questions relating to self-government, treaty renovation, and financial resourcing and has been the subject of much controversy. Specifically, the transfer policy has been criticized as window dressing for the Federal government's 'hidden agenda' to reduce spending in the area of health care services to First Nations (see Assembly of First Nations, 1988; Canada 1989; Speck, 1989). Nonetheless, First Nations are actively involved in this initiative, and it seems certain that divergent models for health care authorities will be created across the country.

This initiative could potentially lay the foundation for First Nations controlled health care systems that would integrate traditional and western health care and health promotion strategies at the local

level. The needs assessment process itself affords Native people an excellent opportunity to become involved in community based research. The creation of health management information systems affords Native people the opportunity to monitor the health status of their communities and, from an outsider's perspective, provides an unprecedented opportunity to engage in longitudinal research.

Given the Federal government's expectations concerning the transfer process, and the varied health needs of First Nations, research focused on the transfer initiative is ideally suited to multi-disciplinary approaches. I am currently involved as one of a team of experts in environmental health, family medicine, epidemiology and biostatistics[11] in an 18 month long health transfer needs assessment with Mamaweswen, The North Shore Tribal Council and the Whitefish Lake First Nation. The Tribal Council, which represents seven member bands along the north shore of Georgian Bay, initially sought assistance through the Regional Services Program (RSP) of the Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University. The RSP draws on a wide range of faculty and residents to assist communities with health design, measurement and evaluation.

Mamaweswen Tribal Council directs the project through its Health Board, Health Director and Health Transfer Research Director. The role of the RSP team is to provide expertise to the Director and the Health Board, to facilitate the research and program planning process, and to assist in data analysis. While the study team has access to the data gathered during this project, and permission to publish research findings, these privileges are subject to an agreement with the Mamaweswen Council. Publications must be vetted and approved by the Tribal Council, or a designated representative, and the Tribal Council controls any profits from publication.

The involvement of an anthropologist in this type of research, of course, is by no means essential. However, my own interests in Native mental health, traditional medicine, and qualitative research augment the quantitative skills and medical expertise of health scientists who also have strong interests in community based research and planning. I have encouraged the use of qualitative research methods which are regarded as appropriate by the community. These include, but are not limited to, survey techniques utilizing open ended questions, focus groups, and key consultant interviews. Equally evident is the expertise that other professionals bring

to the project including an understanding of clinical epidemiology and bio-statistics, provincial and federal health care policy and jurisdictions, treatment and health promotion practices, and an entire range of issues associated with the complex field of community health, which make for a truly holistic and extensive research and program design.

Although the project has only just begun, the research design corresponds closely to the model of research I am advocating. First and foremost, the project is community based and controlled. The intent is to facilitate indigenous research, to demystify methodology and to leave behind research and planning skills so that communities can generate on-going and self-sustaining research projects at the local level. Native researchers were trained to conduct a community survey. Community forums and workshops are to be used to inform the community of the research process. Local health transfer committees are being established to explain the research findings to community members, and to engage frontline workers and other community representatives in interpreting research findings for the purpose of community based planning.

Conclusion

As Holmberg long ago noted, even the purest of anthropological investigations is a form of intervention (1958, 1955). The anthropologist, through naturalistic inquiry, exchanges information, identifies problems, raises expectations, focuses indigenous knowledge and generates discussion in the community in which s/he works. As all anthropology is, in this sense, applied anthropology, we need to concentrate our debate on how to best include research participants in this dialogue of intervention. The participatory model, I believe, will force us to explicitly recognize the interchange of knowledge between the researcher and the researched. This approach will lead us not to the ineffective musings of post-modernist writers whose attention to discourse leads to apolitical ethnography, but to an active, politicized ethnography involving community members as equal participants in the research process. Participatory research promises a discursive synthesis of western and indigenous science focussed on praxis and the search for solutions to the everyday problems of communities.

The history of our discipline is inextricably linked to the study of Native people. Anthropology's methods are compatible with Native expectations, and its theoretical assumptions are in tune

with Native desire for (w)holistic integrated services and institutions at the local level. Current political realities in Canada necessitate the development of collaborative research designs in which anthropologists play neither a central nor singular role in research. The continued use of traditional anthropological analysis by isolated fieldworkers fails to impact on Native people's quest for self-determination and will relegate our discipline to a peripheral and, eventually, meaningless, position with regard to Native studies.

Native research takes place in an increasingly politicized and chaotic policy making environment. If anthropologists are to contribute to Native goals then we must understand not only government bureaucracy, but also the way Native policy is shaped beyond the level of the local community. It is incumbent upon us to develop research projects that are guided by Native front-line workers. This is best accomplished through closer consultation and collaboration with Native political organizations and tribal councils. Our ability to shape policy is also enhanced through alliances with other disciplines. In fact, given the complex issues confronting Native people and the equally complex bureaucratic links between government and Native communities, it can be argued that interdisciplinary research is intrinsic to Native policy research.

Our responsibility is to make explicit a participatory methodology whereby our own and the Native voice are differentiated and strengthened. Critics of this approach will raise stale arguments evoking the risks of collaboration with Native people: dangers associated with a loss of objectivity, heightened relativism, censorship, or the politicization of the discipline. These critiques mask concern over the inevitable loss of power which is naturally associated with any process of self-determination. Collaboration *does* entail relinquishing power over the research process. It may, in fact, occasionally entail a loss of power to determine the parameters of our research. Many Native people, for example, question the right of outsiders to fully comprehend child abuse or wife assault and suggest that research and discussion of these issues should remain within their community or should be investigated only by Native researchers. These and other ethical dilemmas challenge us to enter an open and honest dialogue with Native people concerning the nature and use of our science.

What collaboration does not entail is the abandonment of explanatory power in any way, shape or form. There is nothing in participatory research which threatens the integrity of a science of culture. The practical examples I have cited offer immense opportunities for graduate students and researchers to pursue individual interests, while contributing to applied research that is guided by Native people's quest for self-government. Theory formulation is informed by the inclusion of indigenous interpretations. Our explanations are strengthened by the discourse that arises between Native and non-Native analysts.

Collaboration simply increases our perspective and forces us to revise our science. Michael Thrasher, a Native traditional leader, encourages us to constantly re-vision our future. Collaboration is, I believe, a central component to this process. I take it as axiomatic that we use others to see ourselves. Interaction with other disciplines assures (w)holistic interpretation and eliminates misguided specialization. Collaboration ensures self-reflection and invites critical re-assessment of our methods. Participatory research is nothing more, and nothing less, than the methodological equivalent of cross-cultural awareness. For that reason, if no other, it should be regarded as a mandatory component of our science.

Notes

1. I presented an abbreviated version of this paper at a session on 'Social Policy in Canada' at the Society for Applied Anthropology Conference in York, England. I thank the participants in that session for their many comments on the paper. My paper has also benefited from discussions with Patti DeFreitas, Patricia Spittal and Penny Young, graduate students at McMaster University, who also identified several sources for me during their research into participatory and applied methods. I would also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for CUL-TURE, whose comments were very helpful in clarifying and revising the paper.

2. Although I focus on collaborative research in Native contexts, this approach is applicable to a wide variety of settings, in particular, to community based, urban research.

3. Action and participatory research are *both* collaborative processes. The term 'collaborative action research', which occasionally (as in Australia) substitutes for 'participatory research' fails to identify important, if subtle, ideological and methodological differences between the two approaches which I discuss in the text (PRC 1989; Brown and Tandon 1983).

4. From a Native perspective, the failure of these negotiations resulted from government intransigence created, indirectly or directly, by an influential "foundation policy" as represented by the Nielsen report - a policy which was, at its best, antithetical to the position of Native political organizations, and at its worst, a hidden agenda for assimilation (see Weaver 1986a, 1986b; Erasmus 1986).

5. Native critics, such as Mohawk (1985), take this critique much further in asserting that collective bias and racism against Native people exists within anthropology.

6. M. Strathern (1987) discusses the question of whether or not exploitation occurs when knowledge is appropriated. I do not feel this problem can be rationalized through appeals to the notion of 'consent' or social exchange (ibid.: 21). Whether exploitation occurs from a Native perspective is partially a function of level of awareness about the potential use, and misuse, of indigenous knowledge. Outside researchers, however, are aware of how they use indigenous knowledge, and it is incumbent upon them to raise awareness concerning the potential use of information while conducting research. As a result, there is a strong element of community development in participatory research.

7. Native people's views of the research process are by no means uniform. Some individuals suggest that the involvement of outsiders is inevitable because in asking 'direct' questions, research is an intrinsically 'foreign' communication process and incompatible with Native forms of interaction. Others argue that Native involvement in research be maximized in order to end community reliance on non-Native experts.

8. For one example of a collaborative approach to designing a Foundation's research agenda, see Clutterbuck et al (1990).

9. Applied research projects in the Federal and Provincial government commonly include costs for travel and accommodation during the data analysis/report writing phase for research committees comprised of representatives from widely divergent communities - a practice that would be considered extravagant by academic standards.

10. Recent Ontario Guidelines for self-government negotiations, for example, suggest that Native control over civil dispute processing is negotiable, but exclude the development of Native criminal courts.

11. Marlene Nose, Health Director, and Bill Greer, Research Director, employees of the North Shore Tribal Council, are responsible for the Health Transfer Project. The consulting team consists of Drs. Doug Sider and Rosana Pellizzari, of McMaster University Medical Centre (MUMC) and myself. The MUMC Regional Services Project is designed so as to be able to draw on the expertise of a wider range of experts at different times.

References

Asch, M.
1984   Home and Native Land, Toronto, Methuen.
Assembly of First Nations
1988   Special Report: The National Indian Health Transfer Conference, Ottawa, March 1988.
Asbury, K.
1986   Fact Sheet on the Disproportionate Imprisonment of Native People in Ontario, 1984-1985, Toronto, Ontario Native Council on Justice.
Brown David, L. and Rajesh Tandon
1983   Ideology and Political Economy in Inquiry: Action Research and Participatory Research, The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 19 (3) 277-294.
Canada, Government of
1989   Health Transfer Program Handbook, Ottawa, Medical Services Branch, Health and Welfare, Canada
1983   Indian Self-Government in Canada, Report of the Special Parliamentary Committee on Indian Self-Government, Ottawa, Queen's Printer.
Castellano, M.
1986   Collective Wisdom: Participatory Research and Canada's Native People, IRDC Reports, Number 3: 50-53.
1982   Indian Participation in Health Policy Development: Implications for Adult Education, Canadian Journal of Native Studies, 2 (1): 113-128.
Chambers, Erve
1987   Applied Anthropology After Vietnam, Annual Review Of Anthropology, 16, 309-37.
Clarke, Scott
1989   The Mi'kmaq and Criminal Justice in Nova Scotia, Research Study, prepared for the Royal Commission on the Donald Marshall, Jr., Prosecution, Province of Nova Scotia.
Clutterbuck, P., Elise Davis, Marvyn Novick, and Richard Volpe
1990   Best Practice Survey, Toronto, Laidlaw Foundation, Children at Risk Study.
Erasmus, George
1986   NSR Comment: Indian Policy in the New Conservative Government, Part II: The Nielsen Task Force in the Context of Recent Policy Initiatives, by Sally Weaver, Native Studies Review, 2 (2): 53-64.
Farkas, C., Howe, C. Kalnins I., Jewell, R., and Sorrell, S.
1989   Explanatory Models of Health During Pregnancy: Native Women and Non-Native Health Care Providers in Toronto, Native Studies Review, 5 (1) 79-96.
Flannery, Kent V.
1982   The Golden Marshalltown: A Parable for the Archeology of the 1980s, American Anthropologist, 265-278.
Fleras, Augie
1989   "Inverting the Bureaucratic Pyramid": Reconciling Aboriginality and Bureaucracy in New Zealand, Human Organization, 48 (3) 214-225.

Hall, Budd, L.
1977   Participatory Research: Expanding the Base of Analysis, Focus/International Development Review, 4, 23-28.
1979   Knowledge as a commodity and participatory research, Prospects, IX (4) 393-408.
Havemann, P, Couse, K., Foster, L., and Matonovich, R.
1985   Law and Order for Indigenous People, Regina, Prairie Justice Research, School of Human Justice, University of Regina.
Holmberg, A.R.
1955   Participant Intervention in the Field, Human Organization, 14: 23-26.
1958   The Research and Development Approach to the Study of Change, Human Organization, 17:12-16.
Homenuck, Peter
1984   The Social and Psychological Effects of Separation From Family and Community on Native Children: A research Proposal, Toronto, Native/Canadian Relations Theme Area, York University, Faculty of Environmental Science.
Hylton, J.
1983   Locking Up Indians in Saskatchewan: Some Recent Findings, in T. Fleming and L.A. Visano (eds.), Deviant Designations, Crime, Law and Deviance in Canada, 61-70.
Jackson, Ted, Don McCaskill and Budd L. Hall
1982   Introduction to Learning for Self-determination: Community-Based Options for Native Training and Research, Special Issue, Canadian Journal of Native Studies, 2 (1): 1-10.
Jackson, Michael
1988   Locking Up Natives in Canada, A Report of the Special Committee of the Canadian Bar Association on Imprisonment and Release.
Krasnick, Mark and Mark Stevenson
1990   Address and comments to the Standing Committee on the Administration of Justice (Ontario) concerning Alternative Dispute Resolution, Toronto, February 19, 1990.
McCaskill, D.; Warry. W and Harvey, T.
1989   An Evaluation of the Ontario Native Courtworker Program (Criminal), Report of the Steering Committee, The Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General, The Ontario Federation of Friendship Centres, Department of Justice, Toronto: Research Services, Ministry of the Attorney General.
Miles-Tapping, Carol
1990   The Aged, Disabled, and Chronically Ill in the Northwest Territories: Results of A Needs Assessment Survey, Native Studies Review, 5 (1) 145-162.
Mohawk, John
1985   In Search of Humanistic Anthropology, Dialectical Anthropology, 9:165-169.
Montagnes, Carol
1986   Alternative Justice Systems Proposal, Toronto, Ontario Native Council on Justice.
Morse, B.W.
1980   Indian Tribal Courts in the U.S. - A Model for

Canada? Saskatoon, Native Law Centre, University of Saskatchewan.
Mulhauser, F.
1975   Ethnography and Policymaking: The Case of Education, Human Organization, 34 (3) 311-315.
Nova Scotia, Province of
1989   Report of the Nova Scotia Royal Commission on the Donald Marshall, Jr., Prosecution, Volume 1, Commissioners Report, Findings and Recommendations, Chief Justice T. ALexander Hickman Chairman, Province of Nova Scotia.
O'Neil, John D., and Waldram, James B.
1989   Native Health Research in Canada: Anthropological and Related Approaches, Native Studies Review, 5 (1, 1-16).
Ontario, Government of
1989   Guidelines for the Negotiation of Aboriginal Self-government Agreements, Toronto, Ontario Native Affairs Directorate.
1988   Transitions, Report of the Social Assistance Review Committee, Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services Toronto, Queen's Printer.
Paine, R. (ed.)
1985   Advocacy and Anthropology: First Encounters, Institute of Social and Economic Research, St John's, Newfoundland, Memorial University.
Participatory Research Conference
1989   Proceedings of the Participatory Research Conference, A Celebration of People's Knowledge, Co-Sponsored by the Division of International Development and Faculty of Continuing Education, University of Calgary, June 12-15.
Postle, B, Moffat, M., and Sarsfield, P.
1987   Epidemiology and interventions for Native Canadians, Editorial, Canadian Journal of Public Health, 78 (July/August): 219.
Price, John A.
1987   Applied Anthropology: Canadian Perspectives, Toronto, York University, Society of Applied Anthropologists in Canada.
Ryan, J.
1978   Is Applied Anthropology Alive and Well Out There?, in Weaver, S. (ed.) Applied Anthropology in Canada, Proceedings No. 4, Canadian Ethnology Society, 127-136.
Saddle Lake Tribal Justice Centre
1985   A proposed Tribal Justice Model for the Saddle Lake Tribe, Saddle Lake, Alberta, Saddle Lake Tribal Justice Centre.
Salisbury, R.
1986   Homeland for the Cree, Kingston, McGill-Queens University Press.
1977   Training Applied Anthropologists - the McGill Program in the Anthropology if Development 1964-1976. in Weaver, S. (ed.) Applied Anthropology in Canada, Proceedings No. 4, Canadian Ethnology Society, 58-78.

1975 Commentary on Ethnography and Policy Making: The Case of Education, Human Organization; 34 (3) 315.

Sansom, B.
1985 Canons of Anthropology, in Paine (ed.) Advocacy and Anthropology: First Encounters, Institute of Social and Economic Research, St John's Newfoundland, Memorial University, Newfoundland, 3-12.

Sarsfield, P.
1988 Health Issues in Northern Canada, Health Care Issues in the Canadian North David Young (ed), Edmonton, Boreal Institute for Northern Studies, University of Alberta, 119-124.

Schensul, Jean, Denelli-Hess D., Borrero, M. and Bhavati M.P.
1987 Urban Comadronas: Maternal and Child Health Research and Policy Formulation in a Puerto Rican Community in Collaborative Research and Social Change, Donald Stull and Jean Schensul (eds.), London, Westview Press, pp 9-32.

Schensul, Stephen
1987 Perspectives on Collaborative Research, in Collaborative Research and Social Change, Donald Stull and Jean Schensul (eds.), London, Westview Press, pp 170 -210.

Speck, Dara Cuhlane
1989 The Indian Health Transfer Policy: A Step in the Right Direction or Revenge of the Hidden Agenda?, Native Studies Review, 5, No. 1 187-213.

Strathern, Marilyn
1987 The limits of auto-anthropology, in Anthropology at Home, Anthony Jackson, (ed.), London, Tavistock, 16-37.

SSHRC, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada
and Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Nov 26, 1990 announcement, Aboriginal Affairs and Aboriginal Governance and Economic Development initiatives, Ottawa.

Toronto Star
1990 Cuts silence natives, band says, March 3, 1990, A9. Union of Ontario Indians and the Assembly of First Nations

1989 First Nations Health Transfer Forum Examining Indian Health Transfer Implementation, proceedings of meetings, Toronto, Nov 28-30, 1989.

1988 Native Community Care Program, Program Outline, Toronto, Union of Ontario Indians.

Van Esterick, P.
1985 Confronting Advocacy, Confronting Anthropology, In Paine (ed), Advocacy and Anthropology: First Encounters, Institute of Social and Economic Research, St John's, Newfoundland, Memorial University, 59-77.

Walpole Island Research Centre (Nin Da Waab Jig)
1986 A Co-operative Study of Socio-Economic and Environmental Factors in Resource Management on the Walpole Island Indian Reserve, Occasional Paper No. 24. Wallaceburg.

Warry, W.
1990 Ontario's First People: Native Children, in Laura C. Thompson and Dick Barnhorst (eds.), Children, Families and Public Policy in the 90s, Toronto, Thompson Educational Publishers, 207-230.

1986 Native Inmate Liquor Offender Project: Research Report, Toronto, The Ontario Native Council on Justice.

Weaver, Sally
1984 Indian Government: A Concept in Need of a Definition, in Little Bear, L., Boldt, Menno, and Long. J.A. (eds.) Pathways to Self-Determination, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 65-68.

1986a Indian Policy in the New Conservative Government, Part I: The Nielsen Task Force of 1985, Native Studies Review 2 (1): 1-44.

1986b Indian Policy in the New Conservative Government, Part II: The Nielsen Task Force in the Context of Recent Policy Initiatives, Native Studies Review 2 (2): 1-46.

Weaver, Thomas
1985 Anthropology as Policy Science: Part II, Development and Training, Human Organization, 44 (3) 197-205.