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Abstract

This thesis provides a description and analysis of the process of developing a museum education programme at the UBC Museum of Anthropology (MOA). The programme Debra Sparrow: Weaving Two Worlds Together was developed collaboratively with Musqueam weaver, artist, and educator Debra Sparrow and myself, Jill Baird. At the time, I was temporary Education Coordinator at MOA between December 1993 and June 1995. The case study of this collaboration process is presented from the perspective of myself and Debra Sparrow and examines the working relationships and different individual cultural assumptions which we experienced in our collaboration. It also explores the evolving relationships between collaborators, and the institutions and communities each represents. The thesis contributes to the gap in the literature on museum and education collaborations by documenting the process, integrating theory and praxis, and stimulating the discussion within the discourses of museology and education on collaboration and change. More importantly, it illustrates that First Nations and non-First Nations museum workers can work together in a way which respects each other's world views.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

What I think is really important about relationships and working relationships with people coming from two different cultures is that you have to meet half way, and those two people have to be open, very open to whatever it is the end result will be and be willing to go in that direction. I think that the role of the museum as I see it playing now, in my relationship with you Jill as an individual and as a person who walks from the other side and meets me half way, is that we look at how important it is to find a working relationship that respects... each other's teachings.

(Debra Sparrow, Personal Communication 19/05/97)

This thesis critically reviews the experiences of two women who collaboratively developed an education programme at the UBC Museum of Anthropology (MOA). The two women are Debra Sparrow, and myself, Jill Baird. Debra Sparrow is a First Nations educator and weaver of Musqueam ancestry. At the time of the development of the education programme, I was a student and the temporary Education Coordinator at MOA. The programme Debra and I jointly created is entitled Debra Sparrow: Weaving Two Worlds Together. It evolved over a period of eighteen months between December 1993 and June 1995. The programme was developed to introduce Salish weaving as practised by Debra Sparrow to school groups visiting the Museum and to build upon the fact that the Museum of Anthropology sits on traditional Musqueam territory and houses a collection of material culture of the Musqueam people.

\[1\] The term First Nations refers to the distinctive and different Aboriginal peoples of British Columbia and parts of Canada. This term is to denote respect for their self-determination as Nations.
Embedded in this critical review is a research method which is self-reflexive and dialogic involving both Debra and me as subjects. This research seeks to answer the following questions: Does the process of collaboratively designing a museum education programme participate in transforming relations between First Nations and museums? Can the process of reviewing the development of a collaboration, also be considered part of the collaborative process?

I use the term ‘collaboration’ with care because all too often it is used in museums to describe a wide variety of arrangements which are seldom conceived or structured in terms of shared benefit (Ames 1995; Doxtator 1994a, b; Haig-Brown 1995; hooks 1994). It is ironic that the term collaboration is used today to suggest positive working partnerships. Historically, collaboration has had fluctuating meanings. For example, during periods of war, collaboration had negative connotations often leading to charges of betrayal (Tuyttens 1995).

In dictionaries, collaborate has two meanings: first, to “work in combination with, especially at a literary or artistic production” and second, to “cooperate treacherously with the enemy” (Concise Oxford English Dictionary). The first definition is often the meaning which is utilized in museums, though for many First Nations the notion of working with museums invokes heated and often negative debates about those who do research about First Nations in museums and other mainstream institutions (Cruikshank 1995; Kew 1993) and whether collaboration actually begins from positions of equal status and shared benefits (Doxtator 1994a, b). The idea that at one moment a collaborative work can be positive and shared work and the next it can be treacherous and have undesired implications is one which operates
for both First Nations and non-First Nations who choose to work across cultural borders. These shifting notions of collaboration are all too frequently not employed in museum discourses about partnerships and collaborations. The notion of working partnerships, albeit sometimes a difficult process, is one which is most often utilized by museums (Harper 1996, 1993; Hooper-Greenhill 1995; Nicks 1992). This study aims to explicitly discuss shared benefits, power sharing, and to expand on those moments of shifting relationships.

This thesis combines the practical experiences of Debra and myself in museums with a burgeoning critique of museum practices (Brown 1993; Doxtator 1994a; Marrie 1984; McLoughlin 1993; Reigel 1996). I have become increasingly uneasy about the way in which museums develop programming around First Nations cultural traditions. This work contributes to an ongoing history of museological discourse in Canada and at an international level. It shows how educational and museum objectives and paradigms are being re-evaluated as First Nations individuals and communities address concerns about the cultural representation in museums and academia (Ames 1994; Archibald 1992; Cruikshank, 1995; Hill 1988).

Museums, like the UBC Museum of Anthropology, are involved in heated debates with First Nations peoples about everything from conservation and storage to exhibition development and ownership of sacred cultural material (Hill 1988; Doxtator 1994a, b). They are increasingly being confronted with their colonial legacy and being challenged to include those past and present voices that have been so markedly absent from museum exhibits (Doxtator 1994a; Hill 1988; Horn-Miller 1993; McLoughlin 1993; McMaster 1993b; Todd 1990).
Perhaps the most major contribution I see coming from an indigenous agenda for museums is the granting of humanity to those people talked about in exhibits. Not only is it more engaging for a museum visitor to learn about an identifiable 'real' person, it is also more respectable. Who will believe now that the subjects of research can offer more than just raw data for other people's theories? Their voices can be heard, if one just listens. (Mitchell 1990 in Brown 1993:21)

Despite the recent discussion about museums as contested sites (Ames 1994; Doxtader 1994; Zolberg 1996), museums remain "powerful and subtle authors and authorities whose cultural accounts are not easily dislodged" (Macdonald 1996:2).

In response to demands that museums re-evaluate the way they work, museums are exploring different avenues such as building partnerships and collaborations as ways of addressing these new challenges. Collaborations, however, are undertaken by museums often with unclear understandings of the time commitment involved, and with a mix of implicit or explicit political, philosophical, and economic agendas.

The collaborators

This work presents Debra's voice and my own as we reflect on our work together, the importance of collaboration, and the question of how to introduce different stories, histories, and points of view into museums and the academy through collaborative processes.

While this thesis bears my name, Debra and I are its co-contributors. We have both invested our experiences and time in this research. We are motivated by our shared desire to look for better ways of working within museums as non-First Nations and First Nations women. We are also looking for ways of sharing different
experiences and teachings. Our dialogues in this research study partially represent our efforts to transform the historical relations between First Nations and museums by including both of our voices in the analysis of the process, not just the interpretation of the researcher.

A step in transforming relationships is for us to introduce ourselves. Debra will represent herself, as will I. It is an important strategy to declare ourselves at the outset as this study focuses on two individuals – our beliefs, perceptions, and experiences. Historically the relationship of between the researcher and researched has privileged the former. This is particularly true in research with First Nations and non-First Nations (Doxtader 1994a; Warry 1992). Therefore, it is important to know a little bit about us and it is important that we each choose what is said. Throughout this thesis, I have chosen to italicize and indent Debra and my spoken words. They help to illustrate the combination of our shared and different experiences. That being said, I respectfully introduce Debra Sparrow and myself.

My name is Debra Sparrow and my Indian name is Thelliawhatlwit. It is the woman's version of my father's name Thellaiwhatltun. I reside on the Musqueam reservation. I am the mother of three children, Sasheen, Ali and Josh. I think that the way I want to learn, and how I learn, basically comes from the processes that my ancestors had...I sort of rejected mainstream learning. I do understand how important it is. Yet I feel that in order for us in Musqueam to feel really good about where we are going, we have to really completely understand where we were. And that's an education isn't it - teaching yourself and others about who you are?

(Debra Sparrow personal conversation 12/04/97)
My name is Jill Baird. I am of French, Irish and English ancestry. I am married to Cecil Baird and I am the mother of two teenage children, Carson and Rachel. When I turned thirty I decided to go back to school, first attending community college and then university. Since then I have been a cultural worker in a variety of capacities and for a variety of organizations. I have worked as an artist, a facilitator, a member of a curatorial committee and a board member for Women In Focus, an artist-run centre. I was a public programmes assistant and education coordinator at the Museum of Anthropology and in that time worked collaboratively with the Chinese Cultural Centre Theatre Company on school programmes. Since its inception in 1991, I have also been a festival programmer and member of the Board of Directors for the Vancouver Society of Storytelling.

My identity is grounded in developing working relationships with people and institutions where consensus, community building, and respect for people’s work, knowledges and histories, are of primary importance. This way of working has evolved from lengthy and often difficult learning processes of conflict and negotiation. It is through these varied experiences that my interest and commitment to cross cultural work expanded and developed.

In the academic community there are ongoing discussions about whether different kinds of cultural knowledge and dialogue can achieve rigorous academic or “theoretical” standing. Lee Maracle (1992), Julie Cruikshank (1995), bell hooks (1994), Trinh T. Minh-ha (1989) and others have argued that dialogue and conversation, as well as academic discourse, can give rise to the theoretical. A theoretical discourse, as

---

2 I did not introduce myself during our conversations. So, I have described myself in writing.
Roland Barthes asserts is merely one that turns back upon itself, one that reflects upon itself and its own terms (1968). This reflects the work undertaken by Debra Sparrow and me. Often academic theory uses a language filled with jargon that is abstract and is particular to specific fields of thought. As such it is not readily accessible outside academic spheres. This study is meant to be easily readable and useful to Debra Sparrow, her community and others who are interested in working at the borders where different cultures meet.

It is because we are concerned with these fundamental issues, this research was initiated. It allows a practice based on personal relationships, conversation, mutual respect and accountability to frame the theoretical. By bringing to this research the personalities and respective reflections of Debra and me, this study of collaboration provides an accessible critique about museum practices and a transparent means for other museum workers to view our work.

This research began with more than a formal consent seeking process. I asked Debra whether she was interested in revisiting our collaborative process. She agreed. I would not have continued without her participation. I felt strongly that her full participation was essential and that she have a clear voice in this work. Chapter Six: Debra Sparrow: Philosophy of Education and Museums, was included for this reason.

Although working in a mutually respectful way implies power sharing, it is often not made explicit in research how this power sharing is actually implemented or carried throughout the process (Doxtator 1994a; Richardson 1991; Warry 1992; Wolf 1996). One of the goals of this study is to more clearly articulate the nature of our growth toward power sharing. In the context of this study, Debra and I speak about
power sharing as part of the development of the school programme and part of its critical review.

Even with mutual respect underlying our working process, it does not efface the historical or present power differentials; such as the fact that it is I who will be receiving a degree for a study which involves the considerable effort and intellectual contributions of Debra Sparrow.

Debra has agreed to participate in this research because she sees benefits for herself and her community. One of the benefits she articulates, is that conversations about accepting First Nations education traditions and experiences be broadened to include those in powerful roles of authority such as museum professionals and academics.

However, the dilemma of studying others cannot be fully reconciled even as a participant with good intentions (Cruikshank 1995; Haig-Brown & Archibald 1996; Haig-Brown 1995; Richardson 1991; Wolf 1996; Tom 1994). "Clearly, the problematic of 'speaking for' has as its center a concern with accountability and responsibility (Alcoff 1991:17)." That being said, I am convinced that any research such as ours must have value that extends beyond the researcher's interests and career (Warry 1992) and in this case I am of the strong belief that it has value beyond Debra and me to museums and cultural institutions in general.

After working with Debra on the school programme, I gained a better understanding and appreciation of both the difficulties and synergy of our collaboration. I also came to understand that we had begun to integrate different ways of learning and knowing, both in the school programme and in our relationship.
This new understanding of working and learning together encouraged me not to accept previous academic approaches but to search for a method which would make room for both Debra’s and my experiences.

**Thesis Components**

This paper is organized as follows. Chapter Two sets the academic context for this study by reviewing relevant literature within anthropology, education and museum studies - focusing specifically on the Canadian context. It also reviews debates on the question of research approaches and relationships between museums and First Nations.

Chapter Three presents the research design and describes the processes, issues and concerns involved in undertaking this research. Building on the design, Chapter Four establishes the context of the inquiry. The UBC Museum of Anthropology is introduced as the site for development of the programme *Debra Sparrow: Weaving Two Worlds Together*.

Chapter Five is a compilation of Debra Sparrow's spoken thoughts on the questions of collaboration with museums, museums themselves, and concepts of education. This chapter is the result of six conversations during April and May, 1997 but also encompasses the fruit of years of reflection by Debra Sparrow.

In Chapter Six using a descriptive account, I discuss some of the fundamental concerns which shaped our conversations and our relationship. And lastly, in Chapter Seven, I reflect on the possibilities and the pitfalls of the methodology used and discuss the broader implications of Debra’s and my work.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

The Ethics of Researching on the Border

I am a non-First Nation researcher who has initiated a research project with a First Nation woman about a programme which took place in a non-First Nation museum. Museums and First Nations relations have historically been and continue to be unequal, with museums controlling much of the representation and care of the cultural patrimony of many First Nations communities (Doxtator 1994a; Hill 1988). The same can be said for the history of the academy doing research about First Nations where the community or the individuals involved are only viewed as informants and often do not receive any benefit from participating in academic studies (Warry 1990). As a woman of non-First Nations ancestry who works in a museum of anthropology, I have undergone serious contemplation about undertaking research related to First Nations and First Nations issues (Archibald 1993; Cruikshank 1995; Haig-Brown 1995; Haig-Brown & Archibald 1996; Kew 1993).

After considering the issues surrounding research across cultural boundaries (Archibald 1993; Archibald and Haig-Brown 1996; Fabian 1993; hooks 1994), I chose to proceed with caution. I believe that viewing myself as a full participant in this study as both researcher and researched, subject and object, is the first step to overcoming some of the difficulties of working in what hooks, Haig-Brown and others call the borders.

Dr. Jo-ann Archibald, Director of the First Nations House of Learning at UBC, (1993:189) states that if honourable work is to be done between First Nations and non-

---

3 Throughout this work, I use the term non-First Nations museums to designate institutions which are not run by First Nations communities or governing authorities.
First Nations peoples, mutual respect must be the guiding principle. On the surface this may appear self-evident, however, Archibald is calling for a re-negotiation of the power relations that have historically aided academic careers and not the communities or people participating in the research (see also Te Henneppee 1993; Erasmus in Hill 1992; Wolf 1996). By critically examining the relationship of Debra and me, I strongly believe that the outcome of this research will serve both the Musqueam and the Museum of Anthropology well – not as a template for collaborative work but as a road map of possibilities. It will be an articulation of a process for others interested in developing similar working collaborative relationships.

In response to challenges that museums are becoming irrelevant or obsolete, many museums are scrambling to find new partnerships or collaborative ventures with an array of communities. However, in this rush to build partnerships fundamental questions about the power structures and the purposes of these collaborations have only begun to be addressed (Ames 1992, 1994, 1995; Harper 1996, 1993; Karp & Lavine 1990; Karp, Mullen-Kreamer 1992; Macdonald 1996; McLoughlin 1993; Wilson 1992).

Recent research in museum studies, anthropology and education address some of these issues, contributing to a growing practice of respectful and mutually beneficial research, exhibits and programmes (Ames 1992, 1990; Apple 1993; Clifford 1986; Cruikshank 1992; Freire 1996; Haig-Brown 1995; Haig-Brown & Archibald 1996; hooks 1994; Hooper-Greenhill 1994; Morrow 1995; Sarris 1993; Warry 1990). It is only recently that museums have begun to open the doors to a variety of different communities to create collaborative programming (Ames 1992, 1994, 1995; Clifford 1990; Fuller 1992;
Institutional involvement in collaborations has often been the result of direct or indirect pressures from local and cultural communities for more access to museums and other institutions (McLoughlin 1993). Two particular exhibitions in Canada, *The Spirit Sings* (Glenbow Museum 1988) and *Into the Heart of Africa* (Royal Ontario Museum 1991), have become sites for heated discussion, analysis, and advocacy. Issues of access, representation, authorship and authority continue to be played out though the exhibits closed in 1988 and 1991 respectively (Ames 1988; Doxtator 1994a, b; Fulford 1991; Harrison 1993, 1988; McLoughlin 1993; Notzke 1996; Riegel 1996; Trigger 1988). The tales of these exhibits are both sobering and hopeful. Both exhibitions met resistance from the cultural communities whose histories, traditions and material culture were represented. Not all critics voiced the same concerns, nor was either exhibit universally chastised, however, the issues of representation of the ‘other’, curatorial prerogative, and community representation were brought to the forefront in a very public and disputatious manner. *The Spirit Sings* was boycotted4 by many First Nation organizations - from bands and tribal councils to community organizations.

A positive result that contributed to the discussion about cultural representation of First Nations in museums was the creation of a joint task force struck

---

4 *The Spirit Sings* exhibit coincided with the 1988 Winter Olympics in Calgary, Alberta and was initially boycotted by the Lubicon Lake Cree. The Lubicon took issue with the sponsorship of the exhibit by Shell Canada, while their community was in dispute with Shell and the Canadian government over oil rights and land ownership. The boycott spread to other First Nations communities and beyond. The issues surrounding the boycott, although divergent, continue to have implications in museum practice.
by the Assembly of First Nations and the Canadian Museums Association. Its purpose was to discuss issues arising from the boycott and to explore potential alliances. Tom Hill, co-chair of the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, challenged museums to open their doors to those whose material culture is inside. Hill acknowledges the educational value of museums, but states that they must go beyond to ensure that First Peoples have a say in the how their cultures and history are portrayed and interpreted (Hill 1988; Hill & Nicks 1992). He goes on to argue that this includes direct participation in all levels of the decision making process. The Task Force clearly outlines its criteria for respectful, collaborative work between museums and First Peoples and calls for an “ethical framework and strategies for Aboriginal Nations to represent their history and culture in concert with cultural institutions” (Hill & Nicks 1992:v).

The criteria outlined by the Task Force Report on the principles and recommendations for creating partnership provide a strong grounding for this study. The recommendations call for the museums to address the inequities between First Nations and museums and the right for First Nations to speak with authority for themselves. As well as calling for equal partnerships, the Task Force Report asserts the need for these two group to share and value each other's knowledge (Hill & Nicks 1992).

Though the Task Force Report has been lauded as a significant step to improving relations between First Nations and museums, its effectiveness has not really been tested. Deborah Doxtator (1994 a) asserts that many of the recommendations by their nature favour institutional rather than Aboriginal interests. For instance,
the Task Force calls for a new equal partnership between museums and Native peoples, although its recommendations generally ascribe most of the responsibilities to non-Native museums who must out of moral compunction, 'involve' Aboriginal people by allowing them access to the museum’s collection. Aboriginal peoples are given a somewhat passive role in these recommendations (Doxtator 1994b:21).

She goes on to say that "any attempt to find a true unified partnership between Aboriginal peoples and non-Native Canadian museums is hindered by the fact that there is no one shared goal" and that "the goals of Euro-Canadian society for intellectual stimulation and cultural growth have been met to a far greater degree than have the needs of Aboriginal communities for a sense of self-knowing, self-worth, and self-determination" (1994b:22). Doxtader further warns that collaboration between First Nations and non-First Nations museums is "like being a guest in someone else's home" and continues to confer the authority to the non-First Nations institution (1994b:23).

Recognizing the concerns surrounding the socially constructed nature of knowledge and the implied authority presented in the form of exhibitions and programming is essential when entering into relationships with cultural communities (Geertz 1992; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1990). This includes the values that continue to permeate academic works and the values of First Nations community involved in any research. Both the museum’s constructed knowledge and the communities’ knowledge base have to be taken into consideration if they are to find places to meet and work collaboratively. Neither are developed in a social or political vacuum (Clifford 1988). First Nations groups are attempting to address their concerns and maintain a sense of community in order to assert their social, political and economic claims in the larger world in essence to challenge the right of established institutions to
control the presentation of their cultures (Brown 1993; Doxtator 1994a, b; Jules 1994; Karp & Lavine 1990; Karp & Mullen Kreamer 1992). The benefits of any collaborative efforts must be clear for both sides.

Although recent literature raises the question of current consultative practices in museums, they seldom propose alternative ways of implementation. In some Canadian museums curators, conservators, designers and programmers have been stimulated to address concerns of representation through collaborations or building partnerships (Grandmont 1996; Gauthier 1992; Epp 1994: Harper 1996, 1993; Leonard 1993; Mayer 1995; McMaster 1993a, b). A number of articles focus on issues surrounding First Nations and museums (Ames 1994, 1995; Clifford 1990; Doxtator 1994a, b; Gorforth 1992; McLoughlin 1993; Tanner-Kaplash 1995). Claudia Notzke (1996) discusses the situation in Alberta, since the Task Force Report of 1992. Her analysis builds on the strategies used in Aboriginal co-management of natural resources and applies these to the stewardship of cultural resources. Other anthropologists such as Cruikshank (1995) and Kew (1993) focus on how to create an anthropology of the present where the concerns of the community represented are in the forefront.

Debra Doxtader (1994a) in her report on “Aboriginal People and Museum Policy submitted to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples” reiterates that there needs to be a shift in emphasis from the institution’s needs to the community’s needs. This includes decisions on the ownership and stewardship of First Nations cultural property. She clearly states that ownership as an intellectual issue is central to the success of collaboration (1994a).
Although there is a growing literature on Canadian museum collaboration projects, little has been written about educational or school programming focused on First Nations cultural traditions. There is even less written on non-First Nations institutions engaged in programming which addresses First Nations issues and communities.

There is however, a growing literature in museum education which focuses on optimizing learning opportunities, literacy, policy development, docent training, and interactive and computer programme development (Berry 1989; Hooper-Greenhill 1994; Lopez 1996; Worts 1991). That being said, calls for change do not often include expanding the role of communities in developing museum education programmes, but rather reach out to communities as a form of audience development. Many continue to discuss museums within what could be referred to as the preservation and interpretation paradigm. This means that the primary focus of programming is to provide museum users with information about who used the objects, how they were used, and the role of the museum in preserving the objects for public display. Although this is a laudable and necessary aim for education programming, it is limited by its desire to solely connect knowledge acquisition with the school curricula. Different ways of understanding and different cultural perspectives are not the primary concern.

Bernadette Lynch, Director of Education at the Whyte Museum of the Canadian Rockies, and Kahente Horn-Miller, a Mohawk student, both speak to the possibilities and issues in collaborating across communities (Lynch 1993; Horn-Miller 1993). Their discussions parallel in many ways my experiences as a student assistant at the
Museum of Anthropology and my work with Debra Sparrow, but only in terms of the central issues. They do not explore the collaborative process in any depth as this study does.

Museum education is growing as a profession and is becoming more central to many museum operations. The issues of concern to both educators and communities are being incorporated into the development of education programmes and exhibits. However, this integration is not uniform and is not always derived from community partnering or collaborative ventures.

There are those who work in museum education who work towards community access, co-development and collaboration. It would be mis-representative to suggest that since such practices are not documented in scholarly or professional journals that they are not happening. Too often, museum educators do not have the time to address their experiences in the form of research. Their day to day work is taken up by exhibit and programme development, volunteer training and recruitment, and establishing and maintaining connections to local schools. This study, then, contributes to the discussion of working with communities collaboratively.
Chapter 3: Research Design

There are two core elements to this work: first, the critical review of Debra Sparrow and my collaborative efforts in creating the school programme *Debra Sparrow Weaving Two Worlds Together* and second, the way in which this critical review was undertaken through conversations that were dialogic and self-reflexive.

The method chosen to review the development was critical ethnography. Critical ethnography attempts "to probe the lived-realities of human actors and the conditions informing both the construction and possible transformation of these realities" (Dilorio 1982 in Anderson 1989:252). Unlike other forms of ethnography, critical ethnography is what Lather (1986) called openly ideological research. It is an appropriate method to critically review the co-development of a school programme which seeks to participate in transforming relations between museums and First Nations peoples.

Anthropological research and museum practice have historically privileged the researcher and/or the institution (Warry 1990; Doxtator 1994b). Those relationships are dramatically changing and as a result, ethnography is changing to be more self-reflexive and self critical (Clifford & Marcus 1986; Clifford 1988, 1991; Marcus & Fisher 1986). Also museum practice is becoming more collaborative and sensitive to issues of First Nation control of representation (Ames 1995; Hill & Nicks 1992).

Critical ethnography serves as a framework for this study. There are varying descriptions, definitions and rationales for undertaking critical ethnography (Anderson
1989; Heshusius 1994; Quantz 1992) and participative inquiry (Reason 1994). For the purposes of this study critical ethnography is a means to engage in dialectical interactions of action and reflection – praxis – in relation to both the research and their situations, thereby transforming those situations. Such reflection entails serious consideration of ideologies and practices and the accompanying power relations. Critical ethnography in a First Nations context resists hierarchical power relations between study participants, including principal researcher, and focuses on the ethics sensitive to and respectful of the participants and their contexts (Haig-Brown & Archibald 1996:246).

The one modification I made to Haig-Brown’s and Archibald’s description was to move away from a dialectical interaction which seeks truth through argumentation to a more dialogic structure which is more akin to an exchange between two voices. By choosing a critical ethnographic method, which encourages shared conversations about power relations and vested interests, I saw the means by which Debra and I review our collaborative efforts as fluid and participatory.

This is one way to address or reduce the important ethical and practical dilemmas of researching ‘others’ raised by Linda Alcoff (1991) and Diane Wolf (1996). “Dilemmas in fieldwork are as much ethical, and personal as academic and political” (Hale 1991:121 in Wolf 1996). I concur with Gaytri Spivak (in Alcoff 1991:23) that “speaking for” needs to change to “speaking to”. Here I see myself as neither rejecting my role as researcher nor presuming an ability to speak for Debra Sparrow. By changing the relationship to a speaking to - the possibility of producing what Spivak calls a “counter sentence” (in Alcoff 1991:23) exists. In this context, a ‘counter sentence’ is provided in the form of Chapter Five, authored by Debra, compiled and edited by both of us from our recorded conversations in April and May of 1997. Debra’s participation in this study, her agreement to review the excerpted transcripts and this
written text, and the act of editing her own spoken words provides another "counter sentence."

Greg Sarris asks: "Can both parties speak? Does each have voice and narrative? In what ways? Under what conditions?" (Sarris 1991:128). These are the main questions a critical ethnographic research method makes possible to answer and to describe how.

Within the critical review, the focus was on three themes. The first theme was Debra and my relationship during the collaboration. The second theme was Debra's educational philosophy which forms a large part of the content of the school programme. The third theme was the implications of our working relationship on the practice of museum education in museums like the Museum of Anthropology.

**Theme one: Relationships**

The relationship between collaborators formed the foundation of the study, therefore the review began with the theme of relationships. In constructing this research proposal, the first step was to get Debra's consent. She agreed to participate. (Consent form attached in Appendix A). I asked Debra if she thought I needed to get official permission from the Musqueam Band Council to undertake this research with her. She clearly stated that she was participating in this research project as an individual talking about herself and her ideas and not as an official representative of Musqueam. Michael Ames was asked if the consent of the Museum of Anthropology was needed to undertake this study, and whether or not Musqueam should be officially informed about the study. He said official consent from the Museum was
unnecessary, and he concurred with Debra’s assertion that she was acting as an individual.

The second step was to re-visit the documentation materials in the Debra Sparrow: Weaving Two Worlds Together development file at the Museum. This material included the proposal, contract, my personal journals (field notes), taped and transcribed conversations with Debra, myself and others, and two video tapes of training workshops and piloted programmes. The proposal and contract were examined for the purpose of determining what roles and responsibilities were outlined and whether explicit control over the development was declared and if so, by whom. The examination of this material lead me to the decision to undertake in-depth open-ended conversations with Debra.

The audio tapes and transcripts of conversations about the programme, its content and its evolution were consulted next. These audio tapes were recorded on January 20, February 1, February 20, September 23, September 28, of 1994. The purpose in consulting these tapes and transcripts was three fold: first, to see if and how we discussed our roles and responsibilities; second to characterize how we talked to each other and others present; and third to determine from our interactions if the tapes and transcripts exposed our evolving relationship.

Next, the video tapes created from the training sessions on June 6 and October 12, 1994 and from the piloted programmes on October 14, 1994, and January 11, 1995 were reviewed. The purpose here was to identify which Education Volunteers

---

5The documentary materials are located in the Weaving Two Worlds Together development files in the Education Office at the Museum of Anthropology. These materials include the transcripts, copies of the audio tapes, and the video tapes and all other documentary material.
participated in training sessions and pilot programmes and to determine if there was any discussion of problems or potentials of the programme with respect to working collaboratively.

The next and major component of the study involved in-depth conversations with Debra Sparrow during April and early May, 1997. (See Appendix C for list of questions.) I was committed to recognizing and representing Debra as a significant force in both the development of the school programme *Debra Sparrow: Weaving Two Worlds Together* and in its critical review. By choosing in-depth conversations and a dialogic structure where Debra and I talked about our concerns and issues in a safe and respectful situation, I envisioned this critical review as a honest reflection of our three and a half year working relationship.

There were three purposes to these conversations. First, I wanted us to talk about our collaborative process. Was the programme developed collaboratively? What did that mean? What was the nature of our relationship? Second, I wanted Debra to articulate her philosophy of education, which was an intrinsic part of the school programme. What was her agenda? Why was she participating in this research project? Third, I wanted to talk about the implications of our working relationship, her educational philosophy and agenda on the practice of museum education. I also wanted the process to be flexible and to include my understanding of the process as well as hers.

Debra Sparrow and I met six times to talk. We tried a number of times, but family and work commitments took priority. The first two conversations took place in
the weaving studio on the Musqueam Reserve and next four were at Debra's house. Our final meeting was requested by Debra. After each conversation, I transcribed the recordings and made copies for both of us. The transcripts were to be used at the outset of the next conversation as a self-reflexive means for both of us to revisit issues or themes which arose in a previous conversation. It was also a way for both participants to clarify, revise, critique, or expand upon comments, or ideas presented earlier. In total there are 102 pages of transcripts. I have copies, the originals and the tapes were returned to Debra. As a researcher, I found this very useful as I often went over the tapes a number of time in order to clearly hear what we were saying and to ensure I was getting a verbatim account. As a result, I would argue that I have indeed become a "competent listener" as Devault (1990) asserts is necessary if we are going to shift the emphasis of research from solely that of the researcher's interpretation. Attention to changes in our voices, laughter, and pauses all became part of my listening and could not be transferred to the transcripts but were essential parts of the experience.

The final source of information on our relationship were my field notes and the taped journals I recorded. Did I talk about work sharing or define collaboration for myself in my notes; what were the frustrations and successes I recorded were the questions asked of these materials.

Theme Two - Debra's Philosophy

The second theme of Debra Sparrow's educational philosophy was reviewed in two major ways. First, the programme development materials such as contracts,
proposal, programme outline and Education Volunteer Notes were reviewed. These were examined for excerpts in which Debra Sparrow articulated her goals for the programme and her philosophy of education.

As with the theme of relationships, the subject of her theory of education and philosophy was part of our in-depth conversations. At the outset of this research I was committed to sharing this text with Debra in whatever way was possible. After our conversations, it became clear that a chapter where she articulated her philosophy would add much to this work.

**Theme Three: Implications**

The third and culminating theme was the implication of our practice on museum education and relations with First Nations. The *Museum of Anthropology Review* (1991) was consulted for organizational information, staff structure and responsibilities and the history of the institution’s relation to external First Nations communities. A secondary source for information on the Museum’s organizational structure and effectiveness was “The Four Faces of MOA” by Anne Marie Fenger, senior administrator, and Michael Ames, Director of the Museum of Anthropology (1996). This article explains the situation of student staff and further articulated the organizational structure of the Museum. In discussing the Museum and my role as student staff, I also relied upon my five years of personal experience as full and part-time non-permanent and contract staff at the Museum.

I interviewed Michael Ames to gain background information on the Museum and the history of the Education area specifically (Consent form attached in Appendix
A). It was necessary to include him because he was my direct supervisor while I was working developing the programme, and gave the authority and funds to pursue the development of the *Debra Sparrow: Weaving Two Worlds Together*. In regards to specifics about the programme, Ames was asked to discuss the rationale for Debra Sparrow retaining authorship and what, if any relations, this may have had on other joint projects between the Museum and First Nations people.

The programme development file as discussed earlier was consulted to determine if anything specifically laid out in the contract, proposal or budget provided any guidelines for working collaboratively between museums and First Nations. The audio tapes and transcripts of various conversations during the development were also consulted. The purpose here was to see what challenges were faced by Debra, me, the Education Volunteers and others throughout the process. Education Volunteers’ written comments and criticisms, as well as responses from visiting schools were examined to ensure that their concerns were not lost in this review.

Over the eighteen month period, December 1993 to June 1995, while developing the programme, a number of video tapes were created. For the most part, these tapes were created for use as training tools for the Education Volunteers. These tapes were viewed again for the purposes of determining whether there was any discussion about the relationship between the Museum and First Nations in any of the pilot programmes or training sessions.

As discussed earlier my own field notes, both written and tape recorded, were examined for personal discussions on the impact of this work on me and my museum work. Such questions as, did I talk about my own changing understandings; how did
I characterize my shifts in understanding; and did I discuss the implications of working with Debra in this collaborative manner were asked of this data.

The final source of information on the theme of the implications of this collaborative work were sought from the tapes and transcripts of our in-depth conversations from April and May, 1997. Questions which explicitly asked Debra and me to consider the impact of our work were asked. Specifically, questions which asked us both to characterize our work to both non-First Nations and First Nation colleagues and communities were also part of our discussions. (See Question List in Appendix C.)

The analysis and discussion focusing on the three themes is in Chapter Six. Comments and assessments of the both processes of developing a school programme and undertaking a method of research which seeks to more fully involve Debra and me are presented in the final chapter.
Chapter 4: Establishing Context

The programme *Debra Sparrow: Weaving Two Worlds Together* was developed at the Museum of Anthropology (MOA) which is both a teaching museum and a public museum. Its teaching role includes university courses in museum principles and practices, conservation, and material culture. It is also a site for student internships. Local high school, college and university students as well as international students work, research and contribute to the institution in paid and volunteer positions. In the work of Ames and Fenger (1996) the organizational structure of the Museum has been characterized as having four faces, a university museum with teaching and training responsibilities, an anthropology museum committed to anthropological research and practice, a professional museum meeting the international museological standards, and a public museum developing special and general audiences.

As an organization, the Museum has a less hierarchical arrangement than most public museums, where academic and professional staff along with students and volunteers are able to “participate in research and teaching programmes... to initiate their own, and play a more equal role in policy and programme decision making...”(Ames & Fenger 1996:3). This is an important feature of the institution and was one of the reasons I was afforded the freedom of and the responsibility for pursuing the creation of a programme with Debra. The organizational culture of the Museum relies on strong individuals willing and able to pursue their own interests and to bring others from the institution in as allies.
The Volunteer Associates at the Museum of Anthropology are an autonomous group which provides a variety of services to the Museum. In the area of Education, the Education Committee of Volunteer Associates, often called docents in other museums, deliver the in-house school programmes. Working with the Museum staff, Education Volunteers take responsibility for training themselves, and new comers to deliver the school programmes, and schedule themselves to ensure that all requests for school programmes are met by trained Education Volunteers. The Education Committee is one of the committees of the Volunteer Associates. The Volunteer Associates is a separate organization within the Museum which reports to their own Executive and to the Museum management.

I was initially hired in June of 1991 as a student assistant in public programmes, working for the Curator of Art and Public Programmes Rosa Ho (now with responsibilities for Education). Subsequently I became a student assistant to Louise Jackson, then Curator of Education and Ethnology. When Jackson took an unexpected extended leave in January of 1993, I became Education Coordinator. I had the responsibility for maintaining the education programmes and working with the Volunteer Associates under the direct supervision of the Museum’s Director. From 1993 to 1995, I was hired on a short term contracts. It was during this time I worked on the programme with Debra Sparrow.

A chronology of the development of the programme is necessary to make distinctions between the collaborative development of the school programme from the critical review of the process which forms subsequent chapters. The chronicle of Debra Sparrow: Weaving Two Worlds Together is presented from my point of view. It is based
upon my field notes, support documents and audio tapes and transcripts of
development meetings and two video tapes of the programme being piloted.

The decision was made to go ahead with the development of a school
programme with Debra Sparrow in December of 1993. A formal proposal was
submitted to the Director and accepted (Attached as Appendix A). The rationale for
the programme, written from Debra’s point of view, states:

The goal of this programme is to give the students of Vancouver a
glimpse of our world through my eyes and re-interpret some of the
wrong, outdated, misinterpreted information which portrays my
community in negative stereotypical ways and which is too often found
in text books and other ‘authoritative’ sources used by students. (Debra
Sparrow MOA School Programme Proposal 1993)

The proposal called for a broad collaboration between Debra Sparrow,
Vancouver School Board teaching and curriculum consultants, a student intern and
Museum staff. However, the wording of the proposal was very clear on who would
contribute the content of the programme. “The actual format will be worked out in
collaboration with Debra Sparrow. The teacher and curriculum consultants will advise
on getting the programme into a form useful for teachers and students” (Appendix A,
MOA School Programme Proposal, 1993:2). A formal contract was drawn up with
Debra Sparrow for the development of the programme and for leading training
workshops for the programme with the Museum Education Volunteers. Debra was
paid for her work on the programme. All rights to the programme remained with
Debra Sparrow with the Museum of Anthropology having the option to use or not to
use it for a period of five years.
Three meetings were organized in January and February, 1994 with the consultants from the Vancouver School Board, Debra Sparrow, student intern Joy Rusch and myself. It soon became clear to me that the programme needed to have more shape before we invited the participation of others. It also became very clear that we could not separate the format and content, nor was it wise to include others before Debra and I had a better understanding of each other and what we wanted to do. After our two initial meetings, Debra decided that she wished to work only with Joy and me. Consultation with other resource people would be deferred to when the programme was ready to be tested in classrooms or at the Museum.

Once that decision was made, Debra, Joy and I met numerous times to map out the programme. Most of our conversations were tape recorded and transcribed so that we would have reliable notes, as well as quotes for subsequent use in the programme. In April of 1994, plans for programme training workshops were set for the Education Volunteers. Two meetings were scheduled for early June, 1994. At the first meeting Debra Sparrow spoke to the Volunteers about her personal history and about how this history along with her teaching and learning style were part of the new programme. The second meeting turned into a discussion about the Education Volunteers' concerns. Debra was not able to attend this meeting. Their concerns revolved around three key issues. First, as non-First Nations women, they were not comfortable sharing Debra’s personal story. Second, they were not convinced that talking to students about other ways of teaching and learning is what teachers and students expected from a museum. And third, they worried that the programme format was not interactive enough, and did not utilize the museum’s collection well.
It was at this point that I decided to pursue the development of the programme as a possible thesis topic. At this stage, I had not formulated any research questions. I discussed my plan with Debra, but took no other action except to begin keeping both a written and tape-recorded personal journal.

I was also uncertain how to proceed with the project. The volunteers were not enthusiastic about the programme in the format in which it was presented. I felt caught in a dilemma; I had two allegiances. First to Debra Sparrow, I was committed to being faithful to her intent in the programme which was how learning weaving had shown her the value of traditional education and how this system of learning was parallel to those taught at schools today. My second allegiance was to the Education Volunteers, without their participation there would be no one to deliver the programme. It did not seem possible for me to address the Education Volunteers' concerns without jeopardizing Debra Sparrow's goals and our budding relationship.

Acknowledging the legitimate concern and resistance of the volunteers, I decided to change the implementation strategy. I began to work closely with two volunteers who had expressed interest – Barbara Harrower and Sheila Johnson. I attempted to address their expressed concerns and at the same time attempted to negotiate between what I understood Debra and the volunteers wanted. We worked through the summer and into the fall of 1994.

Twice the programme was piloted in September of 1994, once with Debra Sparrow delivering the programme to a school group with the volunteers observing and once with Barb Harrower delivering it to a school group. On both occasions, I video taped the sessions for use in subsequent volunteer training sessions. Over the
next six months, the programme was offered to ten school groups in the museum and was once taken to a school to be delivered in the classroom. It continued to change and evolve.

*Description of the School Programme*

Through the use of historic and contemporary photographs, printed quotes from Debra Sparrow, and a narrative delivered by a volunteer, students are introduced to Debra Sparrow's method of teaching and learning through weaving and are introduced to the Musqueam people. By using Debra Sparrow's experiences of learning to weave as an example, the programme communicates the values of learning the traditions of Musqueam. The last programme outline I wrote for the Education Volunteers of *Debra Sparrow: Weaving Two Worlds Together*, in June of 1995, is attached in Appendix B.

The programme is aimed primarily at grade four students who study Canada's First Peoples as part of the B.C. Social Studies curriculum. It runs approximately one hour and fifteen minutes. Sample weavings created by Debra Sparrow and her sister Robyn Sparrow are shown to the students. As an activity, students are encouraged to brainstorm ways of learning how to weave. Their suggestions are then linked to the way that Debra learned to weave and the value she now places on learning through doing, and connecting with her community. Students are introduced to Debra's process of learning the skill of weaving and then to Debra's current understanding that she actually learned science, mathematics and cultural history through learning to weave. For example, students are introduced to earth sciences by learning about the
different plants weavers use to create dyes. Students also begin to understand that
weavers use chemistry in making dyes, and mathematics to warp the loom and to
create both simple and complex designs. This is where the programme substantially
diverges from other school programming at the Museum. It focuses on how Debra
learned by doing, its value, and its similarity to ways of learning taught in the
mainstream education institutions, not on the material culture in the museum, nor on
the touchable weavings in the programme.

The programme as it stands now imparts Debra Sparrow's experiences of
learning Salish weaving and how those experiences revealed to her the rich and
important educational tradition in her community - Musqueam. She clearly states that
the story comes through her, though the skills she has learned and the knowledge
springing from these skills and experiences come from "the hands of her ancestors" as
quoted in Johnson & Bernick (1986:21).
Chapter 5: Debra Sparrow: Philosophy of Education and Museums.

This chapter was compiled from Debra Sparrow's spoken words, during our conversations between April and May, 1997. Debra and I edited and arranged the text so it would flow well and communicate clearly her ideas.

People recognize the status and the success of the weaving, but it is more than just the success of the weavings, it is the message and integrity of the people from which the weavings come. What I want as a Musqueam woman is to stand equally with the people in Vancouver and the people of the world. By sharing with them this system, people will see the importance of traditional education through our eyes. In order to learn how to weave, you have to be able to understand math, you have to understand science, you have to create and play with certain dyes; you have to be a philosopher, you have to understand the intention of your people - that is education.

We, in western society, are a pretty arrogant society that says, 'you have to have what we have', or you're not very good. I think that it brings it back to an education system and how we look at it. It leaves the real human components out of it. So everything I talk about is a component of what I want, in one way or the other to be included in what your society values as education. What I see, and I see it in a sad way, is that we all function but we don't know why we function. Education to me is really vast, and it's very complex and it's not about being educated in a system. Education always steps way out of any boundaries.

It was always a thought of mine, through the years I was weaving in my own home, to look at how I was educating myself and how very isolated I was. I never wanted to share any of
that information. I can remember being very—stingy is the word I'll use, but I never really wanted to share what I was learning on my own. Because I felt it was too personal between me, my creator and my ancestors—who were there with me I'm sure, guiding me in the direction I had to go. So it was not about me, never about a personal relationship, but a whole history that needs to be retold. I feel sort of chosen to interpret that now, to some degree I am an interpreter.

I think it is more complex than that. I think it is an accumulation of experiences from the day I came into this world and I think I brought with me from the world I came from the challenges I would have to face. When I was ready to pay attention to them, they were unveiled to me.

I am very humble about it. I don't take personal gratification for anything that I do. I is a really strong word. Because I don't think it's mine as an I. When I say I, I hope you always think of it as a whole people. I think that's what happens in this society we live in—we give it to the individual. And that's where some think the power is, and the power is not there. It's in the knowledge. Knowledge is power.

When I do speak of I, I think of myself as an extension of the those intelligences that did exist here two and five thousand years ago. And I use my intuition, my inspiration and my spirit to connect with my past, present and future. I think that is what schools and academics like to do—look at the disciplines of humanity. Only I think they have taken the spirit out of it.

So as I learn—if learn is the right word, and experienced every year of my life with weaving, I started to realize all of the components, and I have said it a hundred times now, or more, that are involved in this experience that parallels the experience that I was having in my first years of school, only I wasn’t relating to those experiences because I didn’t live them.
Now this process of learning that I'm doing, because I can relate to it so well, I suppose in one way, has a passion about it. I think there is no passion in the school system unless it's categorized as art. But I don't know why, maybe if they approached mathematics with a more of a passion, more people will be interested. For instance, I face the mathematical challenges as a weaver when I warp up a large loom and designing complex geometric patterns into my weavings.

I think we need to school your people about who we were. And you see that's a real threat to society and you know I'm slotted into this category of a romantic history or something, because I want to talk about weaving two worlds together. Society has a hard time, and academics and teachers and educators, have a hard time with that. I don't want to be slotted into a little romantic social studies hour. I'm talking about more complex things than that.

I guess, it's that circle again, I went far away, but I came back when I got a better understanding through my own experience rather than how others told me to experience it. I look at my accomplishments even though they are not written, though they are being written now, as worthy as yours.

I think we all know that it, 'the western school system,' was created for western concepts of civilization, how they perceived things - worlds, and how they perceive what's important. So of course they are not going to take into consideration minorities or Aboriginal people who may have something to offer. I felt horrible in school. I felt so alone and afraid there, and so scared of the teachers. I don't want my kids to live in fear. We need to know that there are other structures and we can incorporate them to work for us and for you in a way that's best, and both of us can feel that we are gaining some opportunities of knowledge. So, I
really feel that's where things are coming to. I think the process verifies my concept of weaving
two worlds together.

I know in myself that I am a capable, intelligent and functioning spirit. If you believe
in self, and if you believe in your destiny and your spirit, and if you can find that, if you can
tap into that, then anything is possible.

I'm not saying that I reject altogether society's concept of education, but I certainly see
that they feel superior. And by that, if their way is so superior, and their teaching tools are so
superior, why is the world failing? Why is it that we are going in such a direction throughout
the world, that we are living in fear now because of our own destruction. If we're so intelligent
and if we're so academic why are we coming to a place where we are threatened by ourselves?

We as Aboriginals see in our past, that it very much represents the present and the
future. When we look at the museums, they appear isolated and removed. Personally, I don't
know how the museum sees itself in relationship to First Nation people. I think they are open. I
think they are open for change. But I think that the experience that you and I had is a unique
one. I think it is a positive one. So I don't know what the relationships have been in the past
with the museum and outside Aboriginal people. I know a lot of people are negative about
museums, Aboriginal people. I haven’t got time to be negative. There is too much to do. If
there comes a time when there needs to be a hurdle to jump or go around. Then that's what I'll
do. As much as there was resistance, there has to be a time to go beyond it.

I was sent there, to MOA, to do work and I have to do it. It's not about having a token
Indian walk in - give you a little bit of information and walk out and say OK, gee at least they
got something. You know, I think, if you’re housing people’s histories, whether they’re Chinese,
or Black or Native of this area, then you have to deal, one on one, with those people whose
histories they have come from and involve them. Give them the ability to connect for themselves and to share that connection with others.

It's the objects really, they are about people's lives, people's needs and intelligences, and they are not about putting into a compartment or isolating different ways that certain people view us or view another culture. It is as human, educational and intelligent as whatever it is that's viewing it. It's not an object. It's an object to the viewer because the viewer doesn't understand its existence. But I would never look at something respectfully from another culture and say that's a nice object. The word object is meaningless, it doesn't have any significance to me.

All these things that are in museums are pieces that reflected someone's life, someone's existence. They're not objects. That in itself again is insulting to us, because that's my families' lineage, heritage - that which is perceived as an object.

I usually look at how it got there. So I know that it transferred hands. I know that it had other existences. So when I look at something say a mask in the museum, even though I'm looking at the mask, the first thing that my spirit does is connect to it and say, why would they have created that and when did they create it, how did they create it, how did they get that inspiration and what was going on that would inspire them to do that. So, it's not about the particular end result it's about the whole history of how the object got there.

I don't think we would say that everything that we do is traditional. I have got a good balance between what I feel is important now and what was important to my ancestors. That's balancing so we have this meeting ground, which is weaving two worlds. You bring in everything you feel is important and everything that the museum feels is important and you add to all of these. They all accommodate one another and enhance one another. So in the end
result you have ways of learning and looking and seeing and hearing that are beneficial to
everybody and respectful to everybody.

Everything I have done, if it's I that I have to use, over the last ten or fifteen years has
been because of my connection with my people, my passion for them, my passion for my history
and how it connects me here - it's my foundation. You have to have a solid foundation because
if you don't your house is going to fall down. I fell without my foundations fifteen years ago
and I refuse to let anybody lay any ground for me now that I haven't laid for myself. My
foundation is set, my building blocks are in, and I want to build that foundation for my kids,
and anyone else who's interested as well.

I wasn't always here, and I didn't always understand this, but I've certainly always,
always, ever since I was little, I have always looked all around me and analysed everything.
Something inside of me was ready, the seed was planted. I was already on my destination, but I
didn't know it because no one enhanced that. No one taught me that, so it took me longer, to get
here because the modern school system removed me from history and any sense that my people
were strong, knowledgeable people. My destiny was to learn through this work and to share
what I learned with others.

Everything really does intertwine. I see it is so important that, we, all people, it doesn't
matter whose people they are housing in a museum, that those people's existence should be
respected rather than looked upon as something that doesn't exist anymore or didn't exist.
That's why the school projects are so important and to have relationships with people who are of
that work, of that race of people whether it's Chinese, Native, Black or Norwegian, whatever the
case may be. The respect is there amongst Caucasians, for each other and their intellects,
but it's not there for other peoples. That's where the significant change will come. It comes with people like myself, who come and voice that they are equal.

So, those are the kinds of things that I am working to change. It will take time to change, but I believe we must stay committed.
Chapter 6: Our Discussions

Introduction

This Chapter has three sections. First, I discuss the review of the programme development materials and background information on the Museum integrating this data with the three overall themes. Then, I discuss the fruits of our in-depth conversations from April and May 1997, again in relation to our relationship. I conclude with a discussion of the impact of our work on collaborative practices in museums.

Programme Development Materials

The documentary materials on the whole did not yield very many specifics about Debra and my relationship, how we worked together, nor the impact we believed our work had on museum education practice. It was very useful to review all aspects of the development before interviewing Michael Ames to get some background on the Museum and the education area and before embarking upon new conversations about our work together.

Returning to the proposal and the contract laid the ground work. In both these documents it was clear that Debra Sparrow would be the author of the programme and would have final say. (Contract is attached in Appendix B.) It was also clearly laid out that the programme would introduce Musqueam traditions through Debra’s personal experience of learning to weave. This did not mean that she would solely contribute the content, but would need to agree with all aspects of the programme.
In terms of power sharing and control, it appeared to have begun at the outset. The writing of the proposal was the beginning of the collaboration, as Debra, myself and student intern Joy Rusch all worked on it. If Debra felt her agenda was being submerged by the Museum's then she could pull out or have the authority to say whatever was in contention was not part of her story. On the other hand, the Museum had permission to use the programme for five years, but was under no obligation to use it. In the end, the Museum remained in control. Through me, it had a working collaborator and had agreed to Debra's authorship, but could also choose not to present the programme. This is not to say that the Museum decided to develop the programme without the intention of delivering it, though the contract did provide a way out if it was deemed necessary.

It seems that Doxtator's (1994b) criticism of the concept of equity between Museum's and First Nations is played out here. In the end, the Museum which provided the funds and staff resources to create a programme decided whether or not it will be used. The programme materials, including the blanket samples and photographs, however, could be used by Debra Sparrow upon request for whatever purpose she required. Over the three years, Debra borrowed the materials numerous times for displays at public festivals, demonstrations of Salish weaving in commercial locations, and to use in school classrooms for teaching.

It was very important to Debra that she retained authorship of the programme. At the time, I did not fully realize in terms of power sharing the implication of the clause giving the Museum permission to use, but not requiring its use. In our subsequent conversations, the perceptions that the programme was not working well,
and was being considered non-viable based mostly on criticisms from Education Volunteers, concerned Debra.

_I know Michael Ames was a little doubtful about the direction it was going in, and the money you were spending. And yet, I think he was a little respectful of the process. So, I was a little insulted, when you said the programme may close down._

(Debra Sparrow, Personal Communication 24/04/97)

In retrospect, it was really in the Museum’s best interests, not necessarily in Debra Sparrow’s best interest to have an agreement that did not commit both parties for a period of time. If both parties do not commit, the questions then needs to be asked what is at stake? After working for a year and a half on our project, the potential for both parties leaving with no tangible product was real. This did not assist in developing relationships or building trust between the Museums and Debra nor did it address the recommendations of the Task Force Report which called for developing equal partnerships.

In the audio and video tapes of the programme development, Debra Sparrow articulates her philosophy many times. However, her discussion of her beliefs about education are imbedded in conversations which wander back and forth from what should be in the programme to how the programme should be put together. From reviewing the audio tapes and transcripts it became clear that Debra was teaching me what she thought I needed to know about her, about her ideas, and about her way of working. At times, others joined our conversations, but her mode of speaking was still instructional.
This did not seem odd to me, since the purpose of the programme was to find a way of communicating her way of learning into the mainstream through use of museum objects and resources. The following extended excerpt from our conversation in March of 1994 demonstrates two parallel ideas: one, Debra teaching me what I need to know and two, a strategy for communicating her educational philosophy to the Education Volunteers and visiting students.

How did I become a successful weaver? It was like starting off in grade one by learning the history of the weaving and the people. Then starting in grade two. Taking the first steps towards learning how to bring my ancestors' philosophy into the contemporary world while learning how to spin. From there going into grade three and learning how to dye wool and warp the loom. Learning what kind of value system my ancestors must have gained by knowing these steps. Learning how to design, learning how to make the wool come alive and reflect the life and history of a people. However, it is important for me to remember in this contemporary world to balance those thoughts.

On to grade four, learning how to express the philosophy of my people into my world today by realizing that there was an education in stringing the warp up, by learning that there was a science in dyeing wool, understanding that science and math and social studies were involved in all aspects of weaving.

Then going to grade five and learning how to mathematically challenge yourself, to make more intricate weavings. Going into grade six and doing weavings throughout the year and challenging your thoughts and your mind. Also it is important to realize that these men and woman - my ancestors - were intelligent people and that they weren't unworthy as we have thought they were for too many years.
Now, you can see that I went to school, but a different kind of school, one that taught me to honour my history and my people. That is the basis of my education and that becomes school even though I was thirty when I started. Maybe if society had allowed us to be the kind of people that we were, we may have succeeded in a different way.

(Debra Sparrow, Personal Conversation 20/03/94)

I use this excerpt from the programme development transcripts to illustrate that Debra was consistent in talking about her educational philosophy throughout our work together. Our earlier conversations, January to September 1994, were exploratory in nature and created excerpts that could be culled to support the programme narrative. They were also a more accurate means of ensuring I was capturing what Debra said, than relying on my notes. Because of the nature and restraints upon our conversations during the development period - January 1994 to June 1995 I have chosen to present Debra’s philosophy in “Chapter Five: Musings on Museums and Education.” This chapter was compiled and edited from conversations between in April and May 1997.

While re-watching the video tapes of two pilot programmes, I found myself evaluating the programme. One programme was delivered by Debra Sparrow and the other by Barbara Harrower, an Education Volunteer. I had to stop myself from critiquing aspects of their delivery and noting ways of streamlining the programme and involving students more in the process. Outside of the introduction to the programme where the collaborative development is mentioned, there is nothing that
clearly speaks to collaborative process. For these reasons, I chose not to further analyze the tapes or use their content in the discussion of this study.

The review of programme development materials lead me to the understanding that even though I had documented much of our working process, there was little open discussion about how we should do what, who should do things, and no discussion about the dilemmas and challenges facing First Nations and non-First Nations women working collaboratively. Therefore, a series of in-depth conversations became the vehicle for Debra and me to discuss these larger issues with the earlier conversations and documentation providing the foundation.

Our In-depth conversations

This section selects parts of our conversations in April and May of 1997, to bring coherence and meaning for ourselves and others. In each transcribed conversation I looked for information that related to three main themes of this study: one, our working relationship; two, Debra's educational philosophy; and three, the impact or potential impact of our practice and her philosophy on museum work. In a detailed review of the tapes and transcripts, I categorized each area of discussion under these broad headings, frequently making subheadings where appropriate. The purpose was to see what was discussed, how often we spoke or returned to certain topics, and to critically look at whether we were engaged in discussion about collaboration in museums and education.

I was excited by the material which directly addressed the three main themes. I continued to read and re-read the transcripts. It became apparent that many themes
and issues arose in our talks which diverged and crossed over those broad three areas. The richness of our conversations became overwhelming. How could I pick and choose, and then justify my selections and omissions. As such, the material I chose to focus upon, spoke to me. At different times listening and reading, it was clear through the inflection in our voices, through repetition, and often through humour that Debra and I highlighted certain areas and concerns. I have paid acute attention to these incidents. I now realize our whole conversation was an analysis of our collaboration, a reflection on our working process.

**Our relationship and collaboration**

Our process of collaboration and our discussion of it was the starting point. Collaboration is central to this thesis, both the act and analysis of it. Collaboration can operate on several levels, but questions about whose expertise will be privileged and when must be negotiated. With Debra and myself, it became clear as we talked about developing the programme that negotiations around privilege, power sharing and responsibility continued to be negotiated. The negotiation was not simply about deciding who would do what, rather it was about weaving different ideological perspectives and agendas into a manageable challenge. Collaborations across cultures are about willingly being in the borderland. “Borders are transformative places....Borders are more often than not places characterized by contestation and friction, by negotiation over identity, and by acknowledgement of different political and cultural agendas (McLoughlin 1993:378).”
Defining collaboration at the outset of our discussions quickly lead to the introduction of different ways of seeing and describing the world.

Jill: I call it collaborative to describe a certain kind of relationship. For me that relationship means that you and I shared power.

Debra: I think we shared knowledge more than power.

(Personal Communications 12/04/97)

I was seeking to get at notions of collaboration and power through discussing the different kind relationship we had over the years. She interprets the real exchange as one of knowledge, not power. I see the two inexorably linked.

As Debra and I talked, the word collaboration seldom entered the discussion. Instead, we spoke about our relationship and how it has evolved. In actual word counts, I said collaboration five times and Debra never said it. However, relationship was said seventy three times, about equally by both of us. (See Word Count Chart in Appendix D.) Without actually defining collaboration, Debra and I instead spoke of working and learning together and of developing a relationship.

After using the word processing programme, Microsoft Word 6.0, to initially count the words collaboration and relationship, I counted the frequency of the following words teach, teaching, learn, learning, resistance, power, respect, destiny, and spirit (See Word Count Chart in Appendix D). It was interesting that relationship and learning were the two most frequently used words in our conversations. Both were spoken by Debra and me almost equally. The next most frequently used word was spirit, and it was used almost exclusively by Debra. It seems somehow prophetic that relationship and learning are words Debra and I choose most to talk about our
collaboration and our ideas of museums and education. It is also telling that spirit is used by Debra, since she clearly articulates that the knowledge and understanding she has gained comes from her spirit and those of her ancestors, and that I seldom use the term, preferring to practically explain what and how I think. This is another illustration of the differences between Debra and I. Although we can talk about similar things, we choose to articulate our understandings in distinct ways.

Our conversations began by talking about how we had come to work together. Debra Sparrow has been involved with the Museum since it opened in 1976. She had been more directly connected since 1986 when she, her sister Wendy Grant-John and Museum of Anthropology Curator of Ethnology, Elizabeth Johnson worked with the Musqueam weaving group to mount an exhibit entitled *The Hands of Our Ancestors: Revival of Salish Weaving at Musqueam*. The exhibit focused on the history of Salish weavings and on the process the women were undergoing in re-learning an ancient craft.

In the ensuing years, Debra Sparrow and her sister Robyn Sparrow continued their connections with the museum through joint and individual weaving commissions. The blankets they created were and continue to be frequently borrowed back for special functions, displays and other educational purposes outside of the museum. It is through her connection to the museum, that I first came to know about Debra Sparrow and that a programme around Musqueam weaving was proposed.

Debra: *I don't think I saw an opportunity personally, but someone saw it and brought us together. I was prepared. If you had asked me five or ten years before that, I would not have been prepared. I wouldn't know what weaving two worlds together was.*
Jill: I think about the one meeting that I recall - you coming to the museum and I came into the room with a whole bunch of books and curriculum guides. I didn’t really know what I was doing in education anyway. I got the job by chance, not by training or through experience.

Debra: BUT

Jill: But it was interesting that you say that it was timely, because it was timely for me to be there, right.

Debra: I don’t know if even if timely is the right word... and I was going to wait until you were finished and ask you this question. Why were you brought to the museum? It could have been any thousands of one of you, but it was you and your destiny brought you to that museum because of your experiences in life. But you were chosen to take this experience because you have the abilities to do what has to be done with it, or otherwise it would be somebody else. We can work together and the spirit knows that. So what two better people to put together than those two.

Jill: I think it probably was destiny in a sense because I had come to university late in life after being a bartender, waitress, having two young kids, real working class — and university opened a whole bunch of doors for me. I started working at the museum where things were totally new to me that weren’t school or text book based, but were people based.

(Personal conversation 12/04/97)

Our descriptions of how and why we came to work together varied significantly. As I spoke about my practical route to museum work, and how I found myself in the challenging position of developing a school programme with her, she
 spoke about her belief in destiny and how her ancestors through her spirit guided her to this work.

Debra continually returned to the spirit and destiny as guiding forces for her work and I sought to articulate the importance of working collaboratively. On the surface, it may appear that we were speaking across each other - me the practical one and her the philosophical one. I do not share that belief. Throughout our conversations, Debra and I raised very similar issues. We just spoke about them differently.

Slowly, I began to understand how our conversation style of parallel, yet distinct ways of communicating was reflected in the process we had undergone during the eighteen month period of developing the programme and since in our continuing relationship and friendship.

Debra: I really go right around the whole topic. I start off and I go way away from it and I come right back. So that the students know, or the people that are listening or are interested, that, art or art history or whatever they are studying about Aboriginal people... is way more complex. And it’s going to take time to change that, but I’m setting out to change that.

Jill: You start at the point, Salish weaving, Musqueam weaving, and then go out beyond it in this big circle into this whole other thing, and come back to it. I wonder, as I’m trying to think about some of the resistance that was met at the museum, whether or not that’s not only an unfamiliar way of doing it, but it actually requires quite a commitment to stay with you. Some faith that this journey is going to take you somewhere and without having very much experience in those ways of thinking...this
requires some investment, and it also requires some faith that the person who is sharing this with you, knows that the path. So I wonder if part of the resistance is truly an unfamiliarity with that way?

Debra: So maybe, you know, you and your volunteers are feeling a kind of resistance, we have been feeling for the last hundred years.

(Personal Conversation 26/04/97)

Partially, what Debra was offering in the programme, *Weaving Two Worlds* Together was this circular way of collecting and sharing information and then bringing it forward through her personal point of view. I and the Education Volunteers at the Museum were only beginning to learn from the personal perspective. Our traditional education didn't privilege the personal. It was not considered official knowledge (Apple 1993). The construct of the objective search for knowledge was privileged and continued to be the way we acquired 'legitimate' knowledge. In the museum education context this was through books by early and contemporary ethnographers (almost exclusively non-First Nations). The experiences of people sanctioned as 'knowledgeable' by outside experts was also part of our knowledge acquisition. Being a museum, information was also sought through the documentation of objects in the museum collection -again the purview of the curators, often outside experts. During the development, I researched and compiled information for myself and the Education Volunteers on Salish weaving, Musqueam or Coast Salish ethnographies. However, very little of this information proved useful with the exception of the book about the revival of Salish weaving at Musqueam (Johnson and Bernick 1986). This was truly
Debra’s story and could not be found nor supported by literature sources traditionally used in academic institutions like the Museum of Anthropology.

Debra: I felt really comfortable walking through it. I have a lot of patience and I understand really importantly where everyone is. I don’t expect you or the museum, or society to all of a sudden stop and say wooooow, let’s all do what Debbie’s doing. But what I do expect is respect and being open to change. The goal is so that we feel comfortable about what’s going on in there too.

(Debra Sparrow, Personal conversation 24/04/97)

When Debra articulated this goal of wanting to be comfortable with what was going on in the museum regarding Musqueam and herself, another aspect of our relationship emerged which specifically dealt with us getting comfortable with each other. At the time, her youngest daughter was listening and colouring at the kitchen table where we were talking.

Jill: Actually, I want to talk about something, that Ali reminds me of. That you and I are trying to do this in a specific context. You’re a mom of three kids, you’re working full time at the weaving studio and you’re working with the Museum as well. A number of times we’ve started interviews and the tapes stop occasionally...I think that’s an important part that your children, and my life, and your life, aren’t separate from this research. They are a part of it. Getting together at a time that’s convenient...just fitting that into the rest of your life. I think it’s really important....

Debra: ...Yeah, I was glad for that because then I didn’t feel pressured. And I don’t want to feel pressured. And I don’t want to feel that way because then I won’t do it. I think that’s important. That’s really important as I said a little earlier about patience
and about taking time. Like time is the essence. You have to have the time to take it
and use it and manoeuvre whatever way it works best for you. It's really, it's a bad way
of doing anything when you say you have two minutes to do it and if you don't do it
then that's it. That's all there is. It's hard because, you know, because I am so easy
going, like that...I don't restrict my time. I overlap so many things...(laugh together)

(Personal Conversation 19/05/97)

Our talking about our personal lives and our children was woven throughout our
conversations and it was important to acknowledge the time and commitment Debra
has given to this research and to acknowledge how I needed to be constantly
responsive to her situation. This is one of the powerful building blocks of a
relationship. Debra's personal needs and working style needed to be respected, if we
were to talk about the process of creating the school programme.

During our conversations we discussed relationships in terms of what I called
power sharing and control. During the early stages of developing the programme, I
subscribed to the popular notion that collaboration meant sharing the work load. My
role, then, included transcribing our conversations, editing out important parts to
include in notes for the education volunteers and for the programme itself. I was also
responsible for the production of the visual materials which illustrated Debra's
narrative. I remember questioning whether this was a collaboration or whether I was
now working for both the museum and Debra Sparrow. As Debra and I continued to
work together a more respectful relationship developed acknowledging my skills and
responsibilities and her contributions as different but equally important to the process.
In our recent discussions, we discussed what our roles were.
Jill: ...I just want your perspective of what you saw me doing as part of this working together.

Debra: What I saw you doing was sweating (we both laugh.)...So I guess part of it is putting the shoe on the other foot here. I think, it is really important to start in a place where the shoe is already on. You know, meaning places where I think they were a little more open...

Jill: Well would you see that as part of my responsibility, because when you say, and I know you say it in somewhat in jest, you saw me sweat. It makes me remember trying to convince the volunteers it was good. I found the negotiation with the volunteers extremely difficult. You and I were working together... I was learning about your philosophy and thinking about how to incorporate it into a programme at the museum. It seems to me that I switched gears and working with the volunteers, it was less of a joint process then. That was my responsibility to work on getting the volunteers over some of these barriers. I felt my job change dramatically when I had to try to convince the volunteers that this was worth it.

Debra: Yeah and I guess every time you left the reserve, I left you on your own. Go get um Jill. (laugh)

Jill: Go get um Jill. (laugh)

Debra: Really I think that’s how I felt. I think I knew what my part was I didn’t really worry about what your part was. I let you worry about it. That in itself is kind of leaving you out in the cold in a way, because you didn’t have support. The only support you were getting was from me and I wasn’t there.

(Personal conversations 26/04/97)
At the time, it did indeed feel as though I had no support inside Museum. There are many reasons for this. I did not feel secure enough to bring my predicament, which felt like failure at the time, to other staff, particularly my supervisor Michael Ames. I had preconceived notions of what I thought I should have been able to accomplish, and was worried that if I brought any problems forward the programme would be cancelled. So instead of seeking support inside, I sought support from Debra and two volunteers who agreed to work with me.

Reflecting back, it was not just my insecurities which made me an outsider. It was a mixture of my student, non-permanent, non-academic status in the institution, the content of the programme and my inexperience of working with the Education Volunteers. Interestingly though, this state of flux actually brought Debra and me closer together. I articulated more strongly to the Education Volunteers that the programme was not about 'how to weave' rather it was about Debra’s journey of understanding the education she was getting through learning weaving. I also became less willing to amend the programme to meet the volunteers’ expressed desires.

Jill: I think there was a time, and I’m pretty clear about when that time was, when you didn’t have to convince me anymore. I understood. Maybe my understanding is deepening all the time, hopefully, but I didn’t have the ability to take that back and work with the volunteers and say look we are going to try something different. I didn’t have the strength...

Debra: Well I think you did though, because I know, I remember you coming to me once or twice or me coming out there and we talked about the problem you had getting them to understand how OK it was for them to interpret for me. So even though you
didn't think you did, you did. I remember, that's when I started saying, well, they have
to understand they have permission from me to interpret my story because I have been
interpreting theirs for all these years. So, let's use it as an example of balancing of two
worlds - yours and mine. That's the weaving and meshing of two worlds that are very
complex and similar, but also very different.

(Personal Communication 24/04/97)

This discussion lead us to talk about resistance. We did not directly talk about
my initial resistance to the kind of teaching and learning Debra was proposing, but we
used the terms 'they', 'we' and 'you' to designate non-First Nations, and specifically
myself and the education volunteers at the Museum when we spoke of barriers and
resistance.

There was resistance to Debra's ideas as they were presented in the
programme. Debra did not speak on behalf of her community in this work and did not
speak as an authority on her people or their history. She spoke about her journey of
coming to know and value herself, her history and her ancestors through weaving and
declared that was a valuable educational vehicle which was often missing from
mainstream schooling.

Debra: They are feeling a little challenged. And by saying, 'you want me to change
OUR ways? I don't think so, its been that way for a hundred years and it will always
be that way honey. I can't think that I would want to change just because you, one
individual says that's the way teaching should be'.

Jill: I think you've hit a nail on the head. Because, I think it's a combination of change,
and fear of change, but also some sort sense of what we do is right. And that you're
only an individual, how can one person, whether she is from Musqueam or elsewhere
come and say look there are other ways of doing things.

Debra: ...I will challenge what I have to do. The resistance of an individual or an
institute. How did it come to be there, to think, to be in such a place where it could be
so arrogant to think it would be the only thing that would know that? And that I would
know nothing because I didn’t go the same route as them.

(Personal conversation 26/04/97)

Other important points about how people should approach collaborations or
relationship building emerged. First, we discussed that relationships need building
through trust and respect. Trust in each others’ motives and agendas as well as trust
that what had been created valued the contributions of all those involved and respects
different ways of understanding and articulating the world.

Jill: ...You and I have worked well together over the years, and learned to really trust
each other. That’s taken a long time to develop and I think a considerable amount of
effort. I know for sure that I have worked hard at sort of learning and understanding.
So I was thinking, traditionally that relationship between researcher and the
community, I don’t know that it’s changed that much...I think that it probably hasn’t
changed that much. So I respect some of the concerns that are represented by a few
people in this community about that. That those power structures haven’t always
changed, some have changed a little bit, some are in the process of change...

Debra: ...I guess I see, the whole relationship on the whole as a positive reinforcement
of the beginning of what we hoped to accomplish. Because I think that you and I
probably have learned from one another, learnt that the first and utmost thing that has
to be accomplished is an openness to respect what the work is. So we have to be very open to, and we have to respect where one or the other doesn't agree and find a way of working that out and then be very diplomatic about how we approach things.

(Personal Conversations 19/05/97)

Discussion of the hard work and constant negotiation throughout our working relationship led us to the issue of ownership. We agreed that whatever was created must acknowledge the different roles, contributions and cultural knowledge of those involved. It was not simply a discussion of who got credit, but a fundamental understanding that whatever was created was a result of those participating.

What became clear throughout this process was that Debra and I were learning from each other, but those who in the end would be asked to communicate to large numbers of school groups, the Education Volunteers, were expected to fully understand by just being told. Debra and I had journeyed for over a year to understand each other, but the same consideration was not offered to the Education Volunteers.

Jill: I think that’s really one of the essential things that I’ve learned. Its been a long term process you and I working together, learning, and changing things. Yet, when it came to the volunteers, and we gave them two half day workshops and we hoped that they would get it. So we have to understand that volunteers have to be a part of the process if we are going to ask them to make these changes. In hindsight, I think I have learned a lot through this process... I didn’t really know where I was going, I was unwilling to take the volunteers with me and say this is a new way of doing things.

(Jill Baird, Personal Conversation 24/04/97)
Debra consistently spoke about spirit and destiny. She clearly stated numerous times throughout our conversations that she was destined to be a weaver, to learn through her spirit the values and education traditions of weaving, and that she was 'called' to work at the museum. She brought me into that 'calling' by saying that it was my destiny as well to work through this together. I am still not comfortable with Debra's conception of destiny and spirit. I feel that I had come to the museum through experiences of working in artist-run-centres, student and cultural organizations. That background, combined with my experiences at the Museum led me to undertake developing a school programme collaboratively with a First Nations woman, artist, and weaver.

Debra: I think the timing is really important. That's sort of a romantic notion that it has to be the right timing.

Jill: It's also often used as an excuse.

Debra: Timing must also represent destiny. If we tried this twenty years ago, it wouldn't have worked. If we tried it ten years from now, it may not work. I see everything is through my spirit, and you all see it is through your mind and academics. That's what makes us very different. Maybe parallel we can walk together, but we see things very differently.

(Personal Conversation 26/04/97)

As she eloquently states, Debra and I see the world differently, and choose different ways of describing our world. In terms of developing fruitful and long term relationships, understanding the differences in our cultural backgrounds was crucial. I continue however, to resist her definition of western education and those who come
from it as being one dimensional. Although, caring, sharing and learning from others, including my ancestors, may not be explicit components of the mainstream schooling system, they are a part of my life and my children’s lives.

That is not to say that her assertion that the mainstream education system continues to perpetuate the belief that getting an formal education is the best way to become full participants in society. I concur with her that other ways need to be explored, accepted and valued by society at large. Why not start this process in a museum? This leads into a discussion of the impact on our collaborative development of a education programme on museum education at the Museum of Anthropology in particular and museum education in general.

The impact of our practice on museums

Debra: I think it is important that people in your position and in your indirect position which is above or below you, need really to understand in a more complex way where Aboriginal people are coming from, have come from and where they’re going. I think this basically will give you a little bit of an insight into that world. I wouldn't want to give you the whole sight, but I’ll give you little insight (laugh). So I think that it’s important and that’s why I agreed to work with you. Believe it or not, since the day the museum opened [1976] I wandered in there and started working with the very first crew that opened up those boxes way back then.

(Debra Sparrow, Personal Conversation 12/04/97)

The impact of our work together appears deceptively simple - that is to produce a more complex understanding of First Nations within educational institutions like
museums. This more complex understanding by necessity entails often personal
information. Spending time exchanging views and working towards the shared goal of
creating a school programme has allowed Debra and me to spend more time talking
about what she wanted to share and how it could happen at the Museum and less time
on general Musqueam topics. In that way a more complex understanding of Debra
and, I would argue the Museum, evolved. I would add to Debra’s call for a deeper
understanding of First Nations, a deeper understanding of the possibilities within
museums through collaborative work as one reason First Nations and non-First
Nations should work together.

Through humour, Debra made it clear she was willing to only share so much.
This did not necessarily mean that sensitive information was withheld. She was laying
out the rules, and exerting a form of control. As a researcher and working partner, I
must listen and respect the boundaries she draws. Within methodology literature (Van
Maanen 1988; Wolf 1996; Lamphere 1994; Devault 1990) the call for active or competent
listening is a consistent theme. In this research context active listening included taking
time to understand the subtleties in our conversations.

Debra: weaving two worlds together...you bring in everything you feel is important
and everything the museum feels is important. They enhance one another. In the end
result you have ways of learning and looking and seeing and hearing that are beneficial
to everybody and respectful of everybody.

(Debra Sparrow, Personal Conversation 19/05/97)

Here Debra provides an outline for what is necessary to work collaboratively
and what the benefits can be. Partners in a collaboration need to see and feel respect
for their knowledge and ways of doing things if the work is to be deemed successful.

There will be a time when museums and First Nations partners can indeed discuss on a level playing field. But at this point in the history of First Nations and museums relationship, the onus is on the museums to facilitate a more equal working relationship. The scales continue to be unbalanced with museums in the position of ultimate authority. The choice of whether to engage in relationships with First Nations individuals or communities still resides with museums.

Debra: Well, I think that there is a step between museums and communities to try to have a relationship when there was none...

Jill: That's a big step

Debra: It's a big step and I think that to ask, to assume, on our behalf, that the museum would do everything right – would be wrong because they are learning in this experience as well. This is new for them. Some of them may have worked with Aboriginal people before as individuals, but never on larger scale group that “Written In The Earth” was, or “Weaving Two Worlds Together” [Trafalgar Pilot Programme] was. I think the most important role that both people have to play is to be open to how they come to a meeting ground because it’s very complex. It’s a complex process because of the artifacts you’re handling, the history you’re handling. You look at it as an artifact. I look at as a family object. All of these things get played back and forth...

(Personal Conversation 26/04/97)

---

6 Here Debra is referring to a collaborative project with the Museum, Trafalgar Elementary School, the Musqueam Weaving School and herself. From January to March of 1997, the programme integrated her philosophy and practice of education with visits to the Museum, the classroom and the Musqueam Weaving school.
Debra acknowledged that it is a big step for museums to establish relationships with First Nations where there was none. Museums, like the Museum of Anthropology, who have worked with First Nations in the past, are now being asked by communities and individuals for more control over their representation and are asserting rights to ownership, if not legal rights then moral rights. This will necessarily entail a broader understanding of the different ways of learning and working and accepting those different ways into institutions like the Museum of Anthropology.

Debra recommends acknowledging that the material housed in museums are often family history and to approach people with this understanding. It may be easier to approach people from her community and accept what they offer if museums shift their understanding of the objects in their collection. The shift is from understanding material culture as “that segment of man’s physical environment which is purposely shaped by him according to a culturally dictated plan” (Deetz 177:7) to one that acknowledges the family, spiritual and mnemonic connections that this material brings out in people. As in the case of our work together, the connections to the old blankets in the museums and her work as a weaver did not produce more documentation about how blankets were made and the significance of their use, rather it focused on how she came to understand that her community had a rich education system prior to contact that in many ways parallels the system entrenched in our public schools. But this system was not acknowledged as valuable. So instead of getting ‘catalogue information’ per se, I was exposed to her philosophy and her agenda of getting this philosophy into the Museum as a way of legitimizing her community’s academic traditions.
Debra: I don't know about other Aboriginal people who have approached the museum, or worked with them. They may have done their little bits and gone on, and it looks that way. I don't think it ever ends, I don't think we can just give a little package to you and walk away. I think we have to be attached.

(Debra Sparrow, Personal Communication 30/04/97)

She also clearly asserts that the time has passed when inviting a First Nations as a temporary guest is sufficient. Ongoing relationships which are mutually beneficial must be established. For example, in our conversations the issue of an exhibit entitled Written in the Earth she worked on at the museum was raised. Many First Nations in a number of communities contributed to the exhibit as it developed. Once the exhibit was over, to her knowledge, there was nothing planned which would bring the research or any of the duplicated material to her community. She asked since many people from her community and other First Nations communities do not visit museums, how can information gathered for such exhibits be shared long-term? She went on to suggest that duplicate materials be created for longer term display in community. As a result more fruitful partnerships between First Nations communities and museums may result if successful endeavours are displayed in a community. In the end, if the fruits of a partnership are only evident at the Museum then the community's long term needs are not necessarily being met.

Debra: I think you start where people are a little more open, understanding the process - not really about programme development, it's about a way of learning.

Jill: I think that's a good way for me to think of this study. It's supposed to be about the development of the school programme, but as we speak about it and as I read the
transcripts, we are really talking less and less, about the actual specifics of developing a
school programme. We are talking about much bigger things.

Debra: ...that's always the end result of any system or school or education system you
work in is the approach to the larger picture. So that really is hitting the nail on the
head of what I've wanted this to evolve to. Now that you are starting to see what I'm
talking about and what I've been talking about for the last few years. So to me that is
success, that is the end result, if it is the end, or it might be the beginning again, but
that's the process.

Jill: It's always been about the process. Yet, I still feel the pull to get out of the process,
to get to the practical and the specific. In talking last time, and typing the transcripts, I
realized that, it's that pull and tension which create resistance for me.

Debra: I think that's a key goal for the conversation. Now it's your turn to look at how
we learn, how do we learn as Aboriginal people, what is the process we take in teaching.

(Personal Conversation 30/04/97)

After talking over several weeks for several hours, Debra and I were just
beginning to explore our relationship and its implications. We were however, meeting
one of the major goals of this study – we were jointly reflecting on our process of
working together and we were continuing to learn from each other. In the final
analysis, Debra and I did not engage in this research with the same commitment. Once
our conversations were over, getting Debra to read the transcripts and rough drafts of
the thesis proved difficult. We did meet however three times to edit her ideas which
make up Chapter Five. We reviewed the whole document once before it was
submitted, making minor editorial changes.
I dwell on this aspect in this section on the implication of our practice because it represents one of the difficulties I needed to overcome throughout our working relationship. Three and a half years ago, we both started with what appeared to be similar agendas of getting Musqueam weaving into the Museum as a school programme. However, in hindsight, our broad agendas may not have been shared. Common sense dictates that before any kind of relationship is established participants must clearly articulate their goals and concerns and any conflicting aspects be negotiated. This is indeed something to strive for, but paradoxically this open discussion and conflict negotiation needs an atmosphere of trust and respect which takes time to develop. At the beginning, Debra and I did not know enough about each other, nor did we have clear ideas of exactly what we wanted to do together to be able to freely discuss agendas and concerns. The first step was for us to create a respectful and trusting environment. By the time this was established we had been working together for six months.

To conclude this study, I consider the implications for me as a researcher, a museum professional and woman committed to collaborative work. The final chapter considers the implications of collaboration on the research process and on education programme development.
Chapter 7: Implications

This final chapter reflects upon the entire process of developing a school programme and its critical review. To begin, the research process is reviewed and suggestions offered for others who may engage in self-reflexive research. The implications on the collaborative development of a school programme are discussed first with specific reference to the Museum of Anthropology and then considering museums in general. In the end, it offers ways to transform relations between First Nations and museums by recommending a core of guiding principles for those who choose to work on the borders.

"People who work with First Nations education, Native and non-Native, work in a border world...this struggle for control takes place on the borders between nations" (Haig-Brown 1992:96). Moira McLoughlin asks, "what does the border metaphor suggest to larger non-Native museums" (1992:380)? McLoughlin, along with others (Boddy 1993; Fabian 1993) suggests that borders, or the places where cultures intersect are necessary sites to work, and are of particular interest to those who work in museums. Learning to work within the border area where different cultures and experiences meet has produced a mutual respect and trust between Debra and me. It has also provided us with an opportunity to share our different views about museums and education and to articulate our shared understanding of the ways change can be effected through collaborative work.
Research Process

One of the goals of this study was to shift traditional ethnographic research from speaking ‘for’ to speaking ‘to’ and to develop a way of critically reviewing a collaborative process using a dialogic and self-flexive method. This research approach proved to be a productive way of working in the borders.

Our efforts to talk across our many differences (Ellsworth, 1989), were most rewarding, although sometimes difficult and even risky. We recognized we were in positions “to be similar enough to make dialogue possible, but...also...different enough to make it worthwhile” (Haig-Brown & Archibald 1996:245 citing Burbules & Rice, 1991:409).

As I try to find meaning from what Debra and I have created through conversation, I have a sense of untapped potential. This research project was intended to take a slightly different path. I had laid out a strategy that would facilitate my own reflections on the process and those of my colleague and friend. I envisioned a research process, as described earlier in the work by Haig-Brown and Archibald (1996), which was invigorated by two engaged participants who not only shared their concepts and understandings of how and why the process of developing a museum education programme was useful to review, but went further in exploring each others’ world views in a manner which continued our own teaching and learning processes. I had hoped for a methodology that was inclusive, self-reflexive, and shifted or conflated the traditional researcher/researched roles.

In retrospect, I realize that this agenda was mine, and mine alone. The interest in a self-reflexive methodology comes from my interest in emerging feminist methodologies which seek to challenge the authority credited to researchers and not to those participating in research (Alcoff 1991; Harding 1991; hooks 1994; Wolf 1996).
My methodological interests in critically reviewing the development of the programme through dialogic, self-reflexive conversations was only partially achieved. As illustrated by excerpts of our conversations, we did indeed reflect on our work together and discuss the implications of our work. However, we did not fully review the transcripts together, nor did we review our process as we went.

Self-reflexive research, like the method used by Haig-Brown and Archibald, requires at least two ingredients missing from this study. First, both Debra and I needed to be part of an academic system or educational system where both time and tangible rewards are offered to those who choose to talk and reflect upon transformative research practices. Second, the time frame was too short to really implement a strategy of reviewing the transcripts at the outset of each conversation and for both of us to review all the documentary materials. It was also not clear to Debra what the benefit would be for her to spend so much time going over what had already been said. Her interests lay in applying what we had learned by creating new programmes, expanding existing programmes and getting more appropriate materials reflecting her point of view and Musqueam history and culture in museums and schools.

I continue to subscribe to the idea that the method I proposed was a useful one. It requires some refinement, with particular attention paid to the full commitment of the participants and a clear articulation of the shared benefits in advance. The time commitment is also a key issue which participants would need to negotiate. I feel that in subsequent projects, a methodology which calls for self-reflexivity of all the participants of the process (Freire 1996) has merits and is worth pursuing.
At the outset, I stated that this research would clearly articulate the benefits for both participants. The benefit of this study for Debra and me, as we have discussed over this process, lies in its ability to communicate our ideas, and our working relationship to a wider audience. It also seeks, through the academic system, to validate collaborative endeavours where First Nations knowledge and experience are foregrounded in institutions which have historically privileged non-First Nations expertise.

The Implications on Museum Education at the Museum of Anthropology

Working collaboratively with Debra Sparrow required accepting different yet parallel ways of educating. By necessity this required a willingness to adjust the way education programmes were created at the Museum in a few key ways. First, Debra's personal narrative and experience needed to be accepted as authoritative. Traditionally, museum education programmes are created based upon curatorial research, and other forms of written documentation. In this case, the supporting documentation on Salish weaving and the Musqueam needed to take a back seat to Debra's perspective. This focus on Debra Sparrow's personal experiences and knowledges is further complicated by ongoing debates about collaborations with communities versus individuals and the question of when an individual represents her community, and when she represents herself.

Second, this meant shifting the education practice in the Museum which had traditionally focused on the how, why, what and where of objects to what an individual, Debra Sparrow, wanted to communicate through the objects. Her goals
were to communicate the system of education that existed in her community before contact, and to build understanding that this system still had relevance today for herself, her community and other communities. This required a significant shift away from interpreting the objects in the museum collection. It meant providing a space for Debra to share her philosophies and experience.

The time necessary to learn with others new ways of working was an essential ingredient necessary for this collaboration. Working collaboratively must include all the stakeholders. In this case it meant that the Education Volunteers needed to be part of the process from the outset, and that permanent staff needed to participate in order for some continuity over the long term. Large working groups which are constantly negotiating differences do not always function well, even if there is a commitment to collaborative work. Therefore in the situation at the Museum of Anthropology, a collaborative working style needs to be adopted for all projects, those involving insiders and outsiders. If an institution has a working style that already acknowledges the values and differences of the staff and in this case the Volunteers and works to bridge these differences, it will be easier to include staff and volunteers in outside collaborative efforts where these kinds of negotiations are part of the process. In this case, it may be that Debra Sparrow and I required time together to learn about and from each other, and that involving the Education Volunteers or permanent staff may not have aided the project at the outset. However, if the Education Volunteers and other staff had experience inside the institution working collaboratively, negotiating power differences, educational differences, and cultural differences bringing work like *Weaving Two Worlds Together* into the Museum would be less difficult. The ground
work would have been laid. Our collaborative process would have also benefited from involving teachers, not necessarily at the outset, but once a core programme had been established. The same is true with respect to involving teachers. When developing programmes which challenge the status quo or present different ways of knowing, it is important to work with people who have some experience or a willingness to engage in the often difficult but rewarding process of collaboration.

For successful collaborative education programming, the role of the museum educator needs to be strengthened within the Museum of Anthropology. At present this institution's focus is on exhibitions and collections management. Education programmes, unlike exhibitions, often have lives of years rather than months, and can be easily adapted without the cost and personnel commitments involved in exhibitions. Therefore, in concert with First Nation individuals and communities, education programming can be responsive to local issues and pro-active in communicating cultural issues and traditions to the public. This however, requires a commitment to maintaining long-term relationships. Programming can then be updated, expanded or retired when necessary.

**General Guiding Principles**

Overall, there are a few principles of collaboration that surfaced from this review which can contribute to transforming relations between First Nations and museums and which can guide collaborative projects. First, and foremost, developing a relationship based on trust and flexibility. Trust is crucial but takes times to evolve. Flexibility can refer to a range of things from the location of meetings, for example
Debra and I met many times at her home, with her children around. It also refers to
time-lines and schedule. These need to be determined together at the outset and re­
negotiated throughout. Otherwise the real pressures of meeting time-sensitive
objectives are not shared. If the project is to be collaborative, all parties must share in
the stakes and the benefits.

A clear statement of the benefits for both sides are essential at the outset. Do
not presume that the benefits as stated by museum staff have any currency for the
individual or community. Benefits do not necessarily need to be the same. They do
however, need to be articulated and achievable.

It is important to ensure that your collaborators has something to show for
themselves or for their community as a result of their work. Museum exhibitions and
programmes are most often located within the institution. In collaborative projects, it
is necessary to create mechanisms where the community members can see the fruits of
their labours without having to visit the institution. Many First Nations people do not
visit museums or perceive that these institutions are resources which can work for
them. By engaging in collaborative work which breaks out of the walls of the museum
and connects directly with communities, through individuals or groups, a better
relationship can be established between museums and First Nations. It may then be
possible to change First Nations’ attitudes towards museums and those of museum
professionals towards the roles of communities.

Collaborative relationships need to be seen as long-term commitments where
First Nations’ perspectives are acknowledged as equal to those held by museum
professionals. Only when long-term relationships are established, will the possibility
of transforming museums and First Nations relations exist. The ultimate goal is to honour the traditions of both parties and create new possibilities. If museums are to become truly relevant to First Nations communities and to other communities whose cultural patrimony they house, they must begin to think beyond the objects and beyond their own walls.

First Nations and non-First Nations who work together need to ask more questions and refrain from seeking simple answers. Debra and I have a working and personal relationship that may not be shared by others working collaboratively; therefore, more experiences need to be shared by those actively engaged in working on the borders. “It is crucial that critical thinkers who want to change our teaching practices talk to one another, collaborate in discussion that crosses boundaries and creates space for intervention” (hooks 1994:129). This work has created a space for Debra Sparrow and me to do just that. In the final analysis, change begins with individuals who choose to transform relations through mutual respect, trust and hard work.

Jill: Well is there is anything else you feel that you need to say?

Debra: Oh probably just that I don’t see this as the end, but as the beginning.

Jill: That’s a perfect way to wrap it up. (laughing) Can I quote you on that Ms. Sparrow?

Debra: (laughing) definitely. It’s just the beginning, it’s a beginning that will benefit everyone.

(Personal Communication 19/05/97)
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Appendix A

University of British Columbia Ethical Review Form

Debra Sparrow Consent Form

Michael Ames Consent Form
The project will be conducted over a four month time period. Upon approval of this proposal, I plan to conduct unstructured in-depth interviews with Debra Sparrow at Musqueam (Debra's home community) and at the UBC Museum of Anthropology (the site where the programme was first developed). I have attached the permission form signed by Debra Sparrow indicating her full cooperation and informed consent. I also plan to analyze data which was gathered as part of the development process of September 1994 to June of 1995. This data takes the form of tape recorded transcripts of conversations Debra Sparrow and I had while we were creating the programme.

The results of this research will be made available to Debra Sparrow, the Musqueam Band Council and the UBC Museum of Anthropology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. How many subjects will be used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Who is being recruited, and what are the criteria for their selection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Sparrow is the co-developer of the educational programme <em>Weaving Two Worlds Together</em> under review. She is the only person being recruited to participate in unstructured in-depth interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. What subjects will be excluded from participation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. How are the subjects being recruited? If the initial contact is by letter or if a recruitment notice is to be posted, attach a copy. NOTE that UBC policy discourages initial contact by telephone. However, surveys which use random digit dialing may be allowed...if your study involves such contact, you must also complete page 8, the 'Telephone Contact' form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Sparrow is being recruited through personal contact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. If a control group is involved, and if their selection and/or recruitment differs from the above, provide details:

Not applicable

PROJECT DETAILS

21. Where will the project be conducted? (room or area)

The project will be undertaken at Debra Sparrow's home on the Musqueam Indian Reserve and in an office at the UBC Museum of Anthropology.

22. Who will actually conduct the study and what are their qualifications?

Jill Baird, MA candidate in the Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Studies.

23. Will the group of subjects have any problems giving informed consent on their own behalf? Consider physical or mental condition, age, language, and other barriers.

No

24. If the subjects are not competent to give fully informed consent, who will consent on their behalf?

Not applicable

25. What is known about the risks and benefits of the proposed research? Do you have additional opinions on this issue?

No known or anticipated risks.

26. What discomfort or incapacity are the subjects likely to endure as a result of the experimental procedures?

Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. If monetary compensation is to be offered to the subjects, provide details of amounts and payment schedules:</td>
<td>No financial compensation will be offered. Debra Sparrow agrees to participate without financial remuneration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. How much time will a subject have to dedicate to the project?</td>
<td>Up to 10 to 15 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. How much time will a member of the control group, if any, have to dedicate to the project?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Who will have access to the data?</td>
<td>The interviewee will retain all rights to data from interviews as stipulated in the informed consent. Otherwise results will be published in a publicly accessible work. Copies of the results will be given to the participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. How will the confidentiality of the data be maintained?</td>
<td>Debra Sparrow has agreed to participate in the study on the record as stipulated in the consent form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. What are the plans for the future use of the raw data beyond that described in this protocol? How and when will the data be destroyed?</td>
<td>Data will be summarized. The interviewee will decide if the data is to stored with her or destroyed at her own discretion. If the interviewee wishes the tapes to be destroyed, her wish will be honoured. If she wishes to entrust the data to the Museum of Anthropology of the Musqueam Band Council a letter of agreement will be written outlining any and all restrictions of use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Will any data which identifies individuals be available to persons or agencies outside the University?</td>
<td>Not applicable as the interviewee will identified throughout the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Are there any plans for feedback to the subject?</td>
<td>The interviewee will receive the original data, copies of all summaries, and a copy of the full thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Will your project use:</td>
<td>- Questionnaires (Submit a copy);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interviews (Submit a sample of questions);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Observations (Submit a brief description);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tests (Submit a brief description).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 36. FUNDING INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Agency / Source of Funds:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status:</th>
<th>Awarded</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Review:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Date:</th>
<th>Finish Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INFORMED CONSENT

37. Who will consent?

- Subject.

- Parent/Guardian. (Written parental consent is always required for research in the schools and an opportunity must be presented either verbally or in writing to the students to refuse to participate or withdraw. A copy of what is written or said to the students should be provided for review by the Committee.)

- Agency Official(s).

38. In the case of projects carried out at other institutions, the Committee requires written proof that agency consent has been received. Please specify below:

- Research carried out in a hospital - approval of hospital research or ethics committee.

- Research carried out in a school - approval of School Board and/or Principal. Exact requirements depend on individual School Boards; check with Faculty of Education Committee members for details.

- Research carried out in a Provincial Health Agency - approval of Deputy Minister.

- Other, specify:

### QUESTIONNAIRES (completed by subjects)

39. Questionnaires should contain an introductory paragraph which includes the following information. Please check each item in the following list before submission of this form to insure that the instruction contains all necessary items:

- UBC letterhead.

- Title of the project.

- Identification of the investigators, including a telephone number.

- A brief summary that indicates the purpose of the project.

- The benefits to be derived.

- A full description of the procedures to be carried out in which the subjects are involved.

- A statement of the subject's right to refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without jeopardizing further treatment, medical care or class standing as applicable. Note: This statement must also appear on explanatory letters involving questionnaires.

- The amount of time required of the subject must be stated.

- The statement that if the questionnaire is completed it will be assumed that consent has been given.

- Assurance that identity of the subject will be kept confidential and description of how this will be accomplished.

- For surveys circulated by mail submit a copy of the explanatory letter as well as a copy of the questionnaire.
CONSENT FORMS

40. UBC Policy requires written consent in all cases other than questionnaires which are completed by the subject. (See item #39 for consent requirements.) Please check each item in the following list before submission of this form to ensure that the written consent form attached contains all necessary items. If your research involves initial contact by telephone, you do not need to fill out this section.

☐ The consent form must be on UBC Letterhead.

☐ Title of project.

☐ Identification of investigators, including a telephone number. Research for a graduate thesis should be identified as such and the name and telephone number of the Faculty Advisor included.

☐ Brief but complete description in lay language of the purpose of the project and of all procedures to be carried out in which the subjects are involved. Indicate if the project involves a new or non-traditional procedure whose efficacy has not been proven in controlled studies.

☐ Assurance that the identity of the subject will be kept confidential and description of how this will be accomplished.

☐ Statement of the total amount of time that will be required of a subject.

☐ Details of monetary compensation, if any, to be offered to subjects.

☐ An offer to answer any inquiries concerning the procedures to ensure that they are fully understood by the subject and to provide debriefing, if appropriate.

☐ A statement of the subject's right to refuse to participate or withdraw at any time and a statement that withdrawal or refusal to participate will not jeopardize further treatment, medical care or influence class standing as applicable. Note: This statement must also appear on letters of initial contract. For research done in the schools, indicate what happens to children whose parents do not consent. Note: The procedure may be part of classroom work but the collection of data may be purely for research.

☐ A statement acknowledging that the subject has received a copy of the consent form including all attachments for the subject's own records.

☐ A place for signature of subject consenting to participate in the research project, investigation, or study and a place for the date of the signature.

☐ Parental consent forms must contain a statement of choice providing an option for refusal to participate. (e.g. "I consent / I do not consent to my child's participation in this study." Also, verbal assent must be obtained from the child, if the parent has consented.

☐ If there is more than one page, number the pages of the consent, e.g. page 1 of 3, 2 of 3, 3 of 3.

ATTACHMENTS

41. Check items attached to this submission, if applicable. Incomplete submissions will not be reviewed.

☐ Letter of initial contact. (item 19)

☐ Advertisement for volunteer subjects. (item 19)

☐ Subject consent form. (item 40)

☐ Control group consent form. (if different from above)

☐ Parent/guardian consent form. (if different from above)

☐ Agency consent. (item 38)

☐ Questionnaires, tests, interviews, etc. (item 35)

☐ Explanatory letter with questionnaire. (item 39)

☐ Deception Form. (including a copy or transcript of written or verbal debriefing)

☐ Telephone Contact Form.

☐ Other, specify:
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Debra Sparrow: Weaving Two Worlds Together Education Volunteer Outline  page 100
Between the UBC Museum of Anthropology and Debra Sparrow,

KNOW ALL PERSONS BY THESE PRESENT:
That the UBC Museum of Anthropology, hereinafter referred to as the Museum, and Debra Sparrow, hereinafter referred to as the Author, have entered into an agreement this 5th day of January, upon the following terms and conditions.

1. This contract is subject to adequate funding and any further work beyond the terms of this contract is dependent upon the availability of funding.

2. That the Author agrees to develop a school programme entitled (working title) "Weaving Two Worlds Together" in collaboration with Museum staff and to give workshops on the programme to the Volunteer Associates Education Committee.

3. That all rights and title to the school programme shall remain with the Author.

4. That the Author grants the UBC Museum of Anthropology the right to use the programme at the UBC Museum of Anthropology for five years (to August 31, 1999). After five years the Author and the Museum can re-negotiate the use, and the cost to use, the programme at the Museum. However, the Museum is not obliged to deliver the programme continuously.

5. That the UBC Museum of Anthropology will consult with the Author regarding any changes to the programme. Any changes will have the Author's written consent.

6. That the UBC Museum of Anthropology will invite the Author to train education volunteers at the Museum one day each year for the five year period. The Museum will pay the Author an agreed upon honorarium rate.

7. That the Museum will pay the Author as follows:
   7.1 per day for up to 7 days for consultation fees, of which has been paid already. Payment of the balance will be made upon completion of project and presentation of an invoice to the Museum.
   7.2 per day for two days for Volunteer training in April or May 1994.

8. That these payments do not include the purchase of weavings and spindle whorls to be used in the school programme.
Weaving two Worlds together
with Musqueam Weaver Debra Sparrow

Proposal for the development and implementation of MOA school programme.

Rationale

"The goal of this programme is to give the students of Vancouver a glimpse of our world through my eyes and re-interpret some of the wrong, outdated, mis-interpreted information which portrays my community in negative stereotypical ways and which is too often found in text books and other 'authorative' sources used by students." Debra Sparrow, Musqueam artist

Weaving two worlds together will be a one hour presentation of Debra Sparrow's views on her community's social, political, academic and artistic traditions. It will provide students and teachers with an introduction to Musqueam culture through the contemporary and historical role of weaving in the community. By using weaving as a metaphor as well as a material, the programme seeks to introduce students to the complex traditions and changes experienced by generations Musqueam people in what we now call Vancouver.

Weaving two worlds together will be an in-house programme delivered by MOA's Education Volunteer Associates. The programme will be supported by touchables, this includes weavings, spindle whorls, and visuals such as photographs and maps. As part of the development and delivery of the programme, comprehensive teacher notes will be developed to encourage teachers and students to explore the topics presented further than the one hour programme permits.

Development

The development of the programme consists of ongoing collaborations with Debra Sparrow (Musqueam), Joy Rusch (Haida/Tlingit museum intern), Jill Baird (MOA Education Coordinator), and Glenys Galloway (ESL and Social Studies Teacher VS). Lorna Williams First Nation Education Advisor VSB will be approached for consultation.

The programme will be developed and reviewed by the appropriate Museum staff and Musqueam Band Council by March 1994.

With the assistance of our partnership school and teacher liaisons, three different classes will be invited to participate and evaluate trial presentations in April. Following any necessary modifications, a two day training workshop for Education Volunteers will be scheduled in May. The final version of the programme will be incorporated into the 1994/95 school programmes offerings.
Programme Outline

The programme will integrate visual images, touchables and a narrative about Musqueam. The actual format of the programme will be worked out in collaboration with Debra Sparrow. The teacher and curriculum consultants will advise on getting the programme into a form useful for teachers and students. Jill and Joy will be responsible for contributing as well as collating all the information into a final form for both the workshop, trial presentation and final programme.

A Visual History of Musqueam:
- historical and contemporary photographs of Musqueam people and places,
- (the visual material will consist of approximately 5 - 10 poster size images and 5-10 smaller images)

Touchable Objects
- 2 simple designed weavings
- 2 complex designed weavings
- 4 spindle whorls

Draft Format for Teachers' Notes

Weaving two worlds together: Through the Hand of a Musqueam weaver

1. Introduction
   - letter to teachers
   - learning goals and objectives
   - details of the programme

2. Activities and Exercises
   - pre-visit
   - onsite
   - post-visit

3. Resources
   - Bibliography
   - Copies of some of the visuals developed for the programme

4. Evaluation
   - school programme
   - information

5. Acknowledgements
Debra Sparrow: Weaving Two Worlds Together

Education Volunteer Notes: Programme length 1hr 15 min.

Programme Overview:

"The goal of this programme is to give the students of Vancouver a glimpse of our world through my eyes and re-interpret some of the wrong, outdated information which portrays my community in negative stereotypical ways which is too often found in text books." Debra Sparrow (20/01/94)

Through the use of visuals, quotes and hands-on material (spindle whorls and woven blankets) and exercises students will be introduced to Debra Sparrow, Musqueam and Salish weaving. By using these materials students will begin to understand the processes of learning Debra experienced and the value of these ways of learning. Using these techniques of learning students will be introduced to Musqueam and its tradition of weaving.

Programme Objectives:
1. To develop students' awareness of the Musqueam
2. To introduce students to the value of combining ways of learning
3. To draw attention to the continuing tradition of Salish weaving
4. To develop students' observational skills

In these notes, I have used quotes from Debra which illustrate the point of the section. Please feel free to use or paraphrase these quotes along with the quotes on the display boards. It is one way to continue to ensure Debra's voice is included in the programme.

I. Meet and Greet
Introduce students to the Museum, its rules and give a brief outline of what will be covered in the programme. For example, today we will learn about the Debra Sparrow, a Musqueam weaver, by looking at some of the weavings she has done and by looking at how she learned to weave. By doing this we will learn about her community, weaving and the ongoing value of combining different ways of learning. Inform students that you will be taking them on a quick tour of the Coast Salish and Musqueam material. Tell students that Debra is Musqueam which is part of the Coast Salish group.
1st stop- Upper Ramp: introduce the Coast Salish region. Particularly the house board with the bear and figure and the grave marker with the 2D design of the fish. (brief info about these two pieces is attached. For background info on these pieces please refer to the transcript notes of Don Bain, Mike Kew, and Marjorie Halpin tour) Inform students that they will be learning about the people whose ancestors made this material and that they should make note of the design on the grave marker: (which they will see again on the blankets and the whorls) and the house boards: (the photograph of 1927 Musqueam delegation was when this piece was donated to UBC by the graduating class. This image is used in the programme)

REMEMBER THESE ARE BRIEF STOPS JUST TO INTRODUCE STUDENTS TO SOME VISUAL MATERIAL!

2nd Stop - Coast Salish Case Visible Storage: show the students the goats wool rattles (it is the same material used to make important nobility blankets). In the drawers in the Salish cases are several objects. (Attached to the outlined information material in the drawers which relates to weaving. Remember not to spend too much time here, but drawing attention to the whorls and the beater would be beneficial) On the way to your location outside gallery 10 show students the large 2 bar loom in VS (across from Haida case).

II. Introduction: (once seated)
• Quickly recap what students have seen, Musqueam material, Salish material, materials used in making weavings. (remind students of the kind of 2d design they have seen)

REMINDER: WHEN SHOWING THE MAPS AND PHOTOGRAPHS ENSURE ALL STUDENTS CAN SEE. ASK THE GROUP!

Overview: First Peoples or First Nations, Indian-origin of name (use BC First nations cultural map); many nations - languages and different cultural traditions, though they share similarities. Introduce the concept of anthropology and the museum, e.g. the study of people and a container of objects people make and use. Make the point that we are doing just that by looking at materials, hearing about someone's life, and learning where they live and why all these things are important to them and to us.

"What I want as a Musqueam woman is to stand equally with the people in Vancouver and the people of the world. By sharing with them this system,
people will see the importance of traditional education through our eyes.*
D.Sparrow

III. Geography (use the Georgia Straits region map, photographs of Fraser River and Point Grey, 1850 & 1980 maps of Vancouver)

Where is Musqueam? Locate on Georgia Straits map. Continue to locate Musqueam using the photograph of Musqueam - photos of Fraser river and Point Grey cliffs where the Museum and the University sit. Show the maps of Vancouver 1850 and 1980. Introduce the idea of change, different situation from her ancestors, but still connected to the history and living in the same place.

Introduce Debra Sparrow -
Who is she? artist, educator, First Nations, Musqueam. Show her picture. What does Debra Sparrow want us to tell you
• This is her personal story, told with permission and developed in conjunction with MOA staff. This is important because she wants students to learn about Musqueam and her traditions from her not just the Museum.
• She would like to tell you about how she learned to weave and how important the weaving was and is in her community. She wants students to understand the knowledge necessary to learn to weave, and that this knowledge has always been in her community, but not always valued.

"In order to learn how to weave you have to be able to understand math; you have to be able to understand science; you have to create and play with certain dyes; you have to understand the history of your people - that is an education." D. Sparrow

Show the picture of Debra at the loom with the small two bar loom (remind students of the large one they saw in V.S.) A blanket is in process in the picture (get kids to look because one group will get this finished blanket).

IV. Time line - History
Ask students how long do they think the Musqueam people have lived on the river. (give students a chance to offer answers). They have lived on this land for over 9,000 years.
• Discuss how hard it is to understand that much time.

Explain the time line exercise. Use four or five students to hold time line. Ask their names (particularly the first and last student)
• dates to emphasize on time line 9000 years ago:
  (archaeological evidence of people inhabiting the mouth of the Fraser River),
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1792 1st contact
1850 the 1st map of Vancouver,
1984/6 the approx. year of students birth
1995 today.

Emphasize the length of the string relating to how long Musqueam people and their ancestors have live in this place we now call Vancouver. Ask students how old they think Vancouver is? You could show its age on the time line. (When finished just leave the time line on the floor, ask two accompanying adult to rewind)

Gather the class back into a semi circle in front of you and the display boards.

V. Cultural history

Introduce the importance of blankets: Use the 1906 & 1927 Photographs - research - Deb had to learn this too:
- why the blankets where important - signs of wealth and status (importance);
- how they were made; two bar loom, goat wool, dog hair & other materials such as feathers and plant fibres (nettle) finger woven;
- who made them; women's work; status achieved through weaving; many women specialized in spinning, dyeing or weaving
(For background refer to Oliver Wells’ & Paula Gusstatson’s workphotocopies of sections in binder)

The Salish were known for their weavings. Many blankets are in museum collections around the world. They also traded with others FN groups for goods up the coast and into the interior.

- Why was weaving not done in Musqueam for 85 years
Ask the students to brain storm some ideas why something that was so important to a community was no longer done.

"We had become a people without roots, without that strong pride in our past. It was being forgotten, but the new european ways did not replace our heritage."
Debra Sparrow.

Some Reasons: introduce a few, it is not necessary to cover all
- residential school (learning western ways of doing things instead of Musqueam ways)
- manufactured blankets- cheaper, more available
- changes to the economy - less trade, more cash transactions, paid work
- new industry - commercial fishing, logging, ship building etc.
• disease - small pox and influenza pandemics
• taking of lands and resources - (refer students back to the maps which will illustrate the physical changes in Vancouver)

VI. Research
• Preface this by asking the students where would they go to learn how to weave and who would they ask. Make reference to the preceding section e.g. if things in your community had changed, and you did not know much of your history.

Questions to ask:
• What kind of things were woven?
  ceremonial blankets; tump-lines; belts & sashes; dance aprons
• What colours were used?
  black, yellow, orange and brown
  now- yellows, greens, browns, peach, reds,
• How were they made?
  two bar loom, natural materials and fibres beaten, cleaned, spun and woven

• Weaving group at Musqueam began asking these questions and learning how to weave and its importance. Deb part of this group.
  went to Sto:lo
  museums, New York & MOA (show old blanket picture)
  books
• What did Debra learn? She learned that you had to know a lot about science, math, history and cultural traditions before you could become a good weaver, and she learned that her ancestors had this tradition of education before such things as school came about.

"I am going to carry the message of an alternative education forward and share our traditional educational values with you because we have been shaming your for a hundred years. There is a tremendous amount of value in traditional learning, where people learn from their elders and their history." D. Sparrow

VII. Science and the Environment
Introduce students to some of the ways the study of science and the environment are related to Salish weaving

Knowledge of environment:
• mountain goat wool - gathered in local mountains or traded with inland or up-river people
• dog wool (domesticated dog in village)
• combined other natural materials
  know which material could be beaten to make small enough fibres to weave,
  which would add strength to weaving (feathers, nettles, cedar bark, etc)
• Cleaning: used a diatomaceous earth to clean and remove oils from
  mountain goat wool & dog hair (reminder, the beater in Visible Storage used to
  clean wool before spinning)

Knowledge of science:
• Spinning: photo of Selisya - great paternal aunt - whorl, women, relatives.
• design in your head, remember, calculate the amount of strands (warp) use
  loom

Dye EXAMPLES: PLANT AND COLOUR

VIII. Hands on Exercise
Break into four groups
Introduce care and handling:
students are encouraged to look, feel and discuss with their groups how
the blankets were made, how a whorl works, what designs are on the
whorl and the blankets

  each group gets a blanket and a whorl
  Let the students look and discuss for 5-7 minutes

Collect the material and ask a few students for their thoughts
  e.g. do you think this material is new or old
  how long do you think it took to make a whorl -
  a weaving

read reports
ensure that some information is gleaned from each. Either the VA or the
student can read, but ensure you do not spend too much time with this.
5-7 minutes

IX. Drawing Activity
Introduce drawing activity
• lay out all four blankets and whorls
• pass out drawing sheets, - one with a whorl shape and one for drawing a
  blanket design
• four colours of pencils
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X. Summary
How Debra came to learn to weaving and the importance she places on the way
she learned to weave - academic in new terms
Debra Sparrow and her discovery of Musqueam weaving.

Review the essential points. - Debra's view of education, its ongoing value in the
contemporary world, the value of learning from your elders, learning about who
you are and where you come from.

Wrap up summary. Invite students to come and look closely at the photos, the
blankets and the whorls before they leave.

REMEMBER REITERATE THE RULES OF BEHAVIOUR IN MOA, EVEN IF THE
GROUP IS LEAVING.
Suggested questions for open-ended discussion with Debra Sparrow.

1. When did you first work with the UBC Museum of Anthropology (MOA)?
2. Why did you become involved with MOA?
3. How did you get involved with the development of an educational programme at the MOA?
4. In retrospect what do you think of the way the programme evolved?
5. Did you or do you not think that the project was collaborative? Would you explain what you mean by the term collaboration?
6. How would you describe the process of creating the programme Weaving Two Worlds Together?
7. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the way the programme was developed?
8. Would you consider the process to be successful?
9. What criteria would you use to gage its successfulness?
10. What would you change in the development process in hindsight?

Attachment to Jill Baird’s UBC Ethical Review
Appendix D

Word Count Chart  

page 110
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Interview 1 12/04</th>
<th>Interview 2 14/04</th>
<th>Interview 3 24/04</th>
<th>Interview 4 26/04</th>
<th>Interview 5 30/04</th>
<th>Interview 6 19/05</th>
<th>Debra #</th>
<th>Jill #</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>collaboration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resistance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destiny</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learn</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The word count was done using a computer word processing programme Microsoft Word 6.0