

Decolonizing Higher Education: The Hard Work of Genuine Collaboration¹

Benjamin Jewell,² Bethany Mizushima,³ Kathleen Pickering,⁴
Jane Ridgway,⁵ and Walter Little Moon⁵

Abstract

Higher education assumes a pedagogy in which academics transfer specialized and exclusive knowledge down to students and community members serving as “research subjects.” This colonially based model of higher education has been severely critiqued and substantially revised by applied anthropologists committed to a collaborative model of co-equal knowledge acquisition and exchange between academics and culturally distinct communities. This paper addresses some of the challenges in implementing a genuine collaborative model from the perspective of academics, students, and community members, in the context of research conducted on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. By meeting these challenges, genuine collaboration will transform the academic paradigm of appropriation by integrating community participants, modeling ethical practice for students, and improving the quality and accuracy of the ultimate research results, removing the artificial seams among teaching, research, and service. [collaboration, methodology, decolonization, Pine Ridge]

Introduction

The inspiration for this paper grew out of a seven-year longitudinal research project on household economic dynamics on Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, which was conducted by Professor Kathleen Pickering from Colorado State University. In the course of randomly selecting household participants, Jane Ridgway and Walter Littlemoon, together with other household participants and Lakota organizations, were part of the constant transformation of the research toward more compelling needs and goals of the Pine Ridge Reservation. Graduate students, like Beth Mizushima and Ben Jewell, brought their own energy, perspectives and ethical journeys into the field, and created their own networks of resources, solutions and relationships with the household participants. Strangers at first, over the years friendships formed and trust was born, opening the door for honest, heartfelt discussions. In this essay Pickering, Ridgway and Littlemoon, Mizushima, and Jewell reflect on the challenges and opportunities surrounding the hard work of collaboration and the birth of human connection. We hope our experiences of joining to take on genuine collaboration will be a model for colleagues across the social sciences and communities across the globe.

Overview, written by Kathleen Pickering

Applied anthropology has been committed to identifying solutions for problems that have been identified by academics through basic research and theory. For example, the mission statement for the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology is to promote “the social and economic betterment of the ethnically and culturally varied human beings and communities with whom we work, and application of principles that explain and improve human relations, and the dissemination of this body of knowledge” (HPSFAA 2008). Sol Tax (1975) initiated a move toward Action Anthropology, which he described as the simultaneous pursuit of helping people solve a problem while gaining scientific knowledge. More recently there is a move toward “Appreciative Inquiry,” where underutilized, positive core strengths of a community can be illuminated to provide a sustainable source of positive energy, and to involve internal and external stakeholders to address the community’s unique needs (Ludema et al. 2003).

From the viewpoint of applied anthropology, the social sciences have farther to go. Finding appropriate solutions depends upon having sufficient culturally embedded understanding and experience to communicate with “ethnically and culturally varied communities” (HPSFAA

2008). That communication should be more than simply describing the results of completed research, although even that basic form of giving back to the community continues to be a shortcoming within much of current social science research. Communities need the opportunity to interpret results and derive their own solutions from those results. More fundamentally, communication should begin before the research is even designed, so that community perspectives are integrated into the research design. Collaboration is the term most frequently used to describe the active creation of shared goals, methods, and funding between academics and local communities to accomplish applied research (Harrison 2001). Although it may be challenging to engage in collaborative work, it results in sound research that can be utilized by the community for appropriate and positive program planning and development (Schensul et al. 1987:11). Collaboration therefore ensures benefits to all parties involved as the community has access to cost-effective and culturally sensitive services, such as grant writing, planning, advocacy and applied research, and researchers have access to research, employment and publications (Stull et al. 1987:41).

Genuine collaboration demands certain constants, like mutual respect, consensus, power sharing, transparency, and learning in two directions. Many barriers remain to achieving genuine collaboration, stemming from the often implicit legacy of colonial domination that was buried in the foundations of higher education. Linda Tuhiwai Smith's book, *Decolonizing Methodologies* (1999), exposed the assumptions of privilege and power behind which academics have been trained to hide while transforming indigenous peoples into their subjects. More recently, Devon Abbott Mihesuah and Angela Cavender Wilson challenge the assumptions of power and control embedded in the university structure in their call to "indigenize" the academy for the empowerment of native communities (2004: 31-32).

This call to decolonizing higher education reignites our commitment as applied anthropologists not only to be aware of local concerns but also to remove the colonial

attitudes of control, superiority, and power that constitute the unacknowledged gorilla in the living room of our professional lives. We must have the courage to admit clearly who is teaching and who is learning when social scientists set forth to "help" local communities. We must own the unstated messages we convey to our students in higher education about appropriating knowledge, dominating discourse, and elevating specialization above the social integrity to be a compassionate human being.

This paper mirrors the transformation of my own thinking over the last twenty years of working on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota. I now see the limitations of the applications of my own academic training and acknowledge the greater gifts of understanding, humility, and compassion that Lakota people have conveyed to me. I now appreciate in a more profound way the need to develop a collaborative language that appreciates distinctive world views and knowledge systems and is committed to an exchange of ideas and support among equals across a level playing field (see Sherman 2006).

I. Reservation Participant Voices: written by Walter Littlemoon and Jane Ridgway

Over the last several years, we have come to appreciate the efforts of Dr. Pickering and her graduate students to incorporate practical application of their research projects on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, where we live. At the same time we realize that there are major obstacles innate to the reservation which need to be recognized, understood, and addressed before any long lasting, significant, positive changes can be brought about that will improve the well-being of the residents here. We hope our point of view, as participants from the reservation, will aid those working in the field of applied anthropology to achieve their ultimate goal — "to make our world a better place."

Historical trauma, multigenerational trauma, intergenerational trauma, complex post-traumatic stress, and psychosocial rehabilitation are big important words. Psychologists use them, as do psychiatrists, sociologists, anthropologists, and other scholars, to describe the psychological and physical devastation encompassing generations

of oppressed peoples. They form teams to study them, hold conferences to discuss them, and write tomes filled with charts, graphs and statistics to describe them. Those big words describe the suffering of millions of individuals who have survived acts of genocide and war brought on by the leaders of nations as they rally their troops under words of righteous indignation.

Those scholarly words describe the spider's web that has ensnared our lives on the Pine Ridge reservation. Their impact grows when coupled with an impoverished, sparsely populated, remote location. Most important, those words are incorporated into the personalities of children as they develop their understanding of the world, their relationship in it, and their response to it. Statistical numbers reflecting those words go off the charts in "Indian Country." On Pine Ridge, an area nearly the size of the state of Connecticut, teenage suicide is three times the national average. Higher still are the death rates for alcohol and drug related deaths, infant mortality, diabetes, tuberculosis, and countless other devastating conditions.

Difficulties in attempts to "make the world a better place" arise when the pervasive impact of these traumas are not recognized or understood. These traumas play out in our everyday life during the moments that we are communicating in everyday language. When everyday words join in with those scholarly words — frustration, distrust, fear, anxiety, confusion, and hopelessness — more people are able to comprehend them, and the possibility to work together toward positive solutions grows.

The impact of trauma can play out in different ways because we are humans with different personalities. Outsiders have called our ancestors "noble" and "beautiful." We want very much to be like our ancestors, but generations of negative changes have left those of us raised on the reservation in disarray. "What you learn intellectually lies in the shallow pools among the wrinkles of your brain. What you learn through the skin of experience sinks deep into your roots.⁷ Most of our children have been born into chaos and chaos has shaped them. We strive for peace and

contentment yet we have all but lost the way. We need a multifaceted network of help to achieve a more contented life. As long as help comes to us in fragments, we will remain fragmented.

We want to know what the scholars have learned through their research. More importantly, we want to be able to understand how that research can be applied toward our goals. We acknowledge that each profession has formed its own vocabulary to facilitate communication within their group, and that's okay. We have in our lifetime experienced the evolution of our own language, as well as of the English language. It seems quite often to be brought about through advances in technology and, of course, through the creativity of teenagers. However, when it comes to improving lives through the sharing of ideas and implementing plans of action between two cultures, we find friendly conversation, using simple words, to be the most useful for all involved.

In this paper, we share some of what has shaped us for applied anthropologists to consider. You have written books about us that we have never seen, or if we have, we rarely can comprehend their language. You have read the laws that have impacted on our lives and, again, few of us have seen them — though we have heard of them through word of mouth. You are called "experts" and people outside of the reservation turn to you for your knowledge. But who is an expert? A man we knew years ago was called to speak before a Senate committee because they considered him an expert. When he rose to address the Senators gathered there, he said: "Do you know the definition of the word 'expert'? It is a person who carries a briefcase and is more than 50 miles from home." That appears to many of us on the reservation to be true. Many of us are intimidated and feel diminished when in the presence of an outside expert.

Of all the laws, acts and treaties that the dominant society has placed on us, we feel the imposition of the boarding schools, both Catholic and federal, have been the most destructive. More than one generation of us were taught in them. They were meant to be institutions of learning, but were instead institutions of destruction. A Jewish counselor

once said that the impact of the Indian Boarding Schools on our people was as if “the concentration camp survivors from the Holocaust had to watch their children be taken away and placed in a camp” (personal communication, Jayme Shorin, n.d.). Those of us who were sent to the boarding schools as five- or six- year-old children were beaten and punished over many years to instill a different way of life, and from what we observed we learned behaviors that we should never use in our lives. When we became teenagers and young adults, the boarding school experiences stayed within many of us as anger and frustration. We have had a hard time expressing ourselves as adults. Some committed suicide, some drank themselves to death, and others just gave up and didn’t care whether they lived or died.

Those of us who have tried to carry on have found little on the reservation to give meaning to our lives. We have developed unique behaviors in order to survive. Our conversations tend to be guarded, and we frequently withdraw and fade into the background in a crowd, rarely stepping forward to participate. We cut conversations short just to get away from others; we tend to be suspicious of people, meetings and group activities. For many of us there are no feelings of freedom, or pleasure. Nothing. We are just there — silent observers of our own lives. We feel a need to be close, but just “close by,” not really involved. Few of us learned how to parent or form close relationships, as we spent all but three months away from home as children. Yes, we are individuals with differing personalities. Some of us can “put on a good show,” but in our quiet moments the show is over. Our children have learned through observation and follow the same path.

Along with the negative impact of the boarding schools, when we were very little children our mothers taught us to run and hide if a strange car approached. In those days, Mormons and others often came onto the reservation to kidnap children who they judged to be living in unsatisfactory conditions. So we were fearful of outsiders from a very young age.

At times strangers boldly looked in the windows of our homes or boldly walked in unannounced and would begin asking odd

questions. Some of our adults would make up stories just to get rid of them. Unfortunately, some of those tales were written into scholarly books as facts and now return to haunt us, as our younger people believe what they have read — for experts have written them.

These are just a few examples of events in our Lakota lives that have shaped us into who we are today and how we express our selves. Our way of responding to life has been altered from that of our ancestors. The emotional words that surround us like hopelessness, distrust, fear, confusion, frustration; the statistics; our illnesses; our remote location; our degree of poverty; and the substandard levels of formal education all reflect the impact reservation life has had on our people. However, even with all the changes in our lifestyle brought by a more dominant culture and, even though we now primarily speak their English language, we think as Lakota.

When applied anthropologists come to study us, and attempt to implement ideas and programs, we hope they will come realizing they are diplomats in a foreign land. We hope, as diplomats, they will learn a bit of our cultural differences before they come here. In general, we are not hugging people. In general, our jokes are used to lighten uncomfortable moments, to lift spirits, and not used to put down others. We hope they will translate their formal reports back into everyday language so that we too may learn and grow. In fact, we suggest those reports be produced in comic book form as many of us are more visual learners. Also, in translating scholarly reports into comic book form, we feel the anthropologists might find it helpful too. We hope they will recognize that some programs they develop, while potentially good, are confusing and foreign to us, and that we may need them to come again for help in straightening out the wrinkles. Nobody wants to be considered a failure. We hope that the applied anthropologists will come to realize that the impact of our multigenerational trauma at times causes us to feel shy, fearful, or even distrustful in working with others. We will act those feelings out differently, some of us will joke and bluff, some of us will run away, some of us will become argumentative, some of us will

just sit there trying to smile pleasantly. Many won't speak up or ask questions, for in our traditional Lakota way, we tend to listen to another share his plans and ideas, after which we decide as individuals whether we consider his plan to be a good idea. If we agree, we may offer to help, or we may wait to be asked. If we disagree, we will step away. This behavior becomes especially apparent if the idea is presented by an outside expert.

As the household economic project unfolded over the seven years, we recognized some of these behaviors, or at least the temptation to act them out, triggered within ourselves, often wondering how the other anonymous participants were doing with the questions. To begin with, we were offered twenty dollars and a coffee mug and asked: "What is your annual household income?" Whew — what a quandary! We kept our faces smooth and our eyes averted while we thought. On the reservation only government agents controlling "entitlements" ask about income and the answers given are based on the needs of the family to survive.

Sometimes politicians seeking election will come offering gifts and asking a few questions — after all the government is the largest employer, and we have very few jobs. Otherwise, people here will visit each other on occasion and ask: "How are you doing?" "Is everything okay?" If we see a need, we help if we're able to. We care and we share. So, for accepting a mug and twenty dollars to answer those financial questions, we felt we were in a pickle. We joked and then answered painfully and truthfully. As the years went on with the project, we gathered more courage and finally said, "We won't answer that." In retrospect, we wish we had reversed the question and asked: "How many times in an anthropologist's life have strangers come knocking on your door asking: 'What is your annual income?'" Is that a respectful question in your culture?"

As time went on, other questions were asked that were psychologically easier to answer — questions about the health system and hunting and gathering. Each time we hoped the answers our anonymous group gave would result in positive changes to our lives here. Few changes, if any, have been seen. However, we have seen positive

changes for many people here from projects that were offshoots of the on-going research.

The first began with a parent who came to us with concerns over a lack of the school system to provide for her daughter's special needs. She mentioned as well another parent whose child was afraid of his second grade teacher. We wondered if other children were experiencing problems within the school system. Dr. Pickering and her students offered their help in compiling a survey/questionnaire with us. Her students went house to house in our community. Parents answered within the comfort of anonymity and several areas of concern were uncovered. Those responses gave us the ammunition we needed and set us on a path for positive change. The State of South Dakota's Department of Education and senators joined in. The Bureau of Indian Affairs School Superintendent joined in. The Federal Bureau of Investigation joined in. Positive change came hard and fast for those children and their parents. That's collaboration.

We Lakota do think a bit differently than outsiders. Our way of thinking is still Lakota — shaped by the land and nature - not by a city or books. In that way, we are still influenced by our ancestors who were observers of nature and men. Through the years as we have come to know Professor Pickering and her students we have found the common connection — we are human and we all want to help make the world a better place. More important we have a greater appreciation for what she and the students struggle to overcome in order to accomplish our shared goals. Through our relaxed conversations with each other, as friends, we have learned to speak from our hearts and hear more clearly.

II. Student Voices, written by Bethany Mizushima and Benjamin Jewell

The colonial influence within academia is reinforced by the way social science students, especially those studying anthropology, are trained. For graduate students, there are two main barriers to initiating collaborative research that we feel discourage alternative methodological approaches to M.A. theses or Ph. D. dissertations. The first is the institutional structure of academia, where disciplinary boundaries establish an atmosphere of

competition between students and engender a sense of ownership over ideas. Competition between students manifests itself through class performance, finding a unique thesis topic, and conducting individual thesis research. In addition, an emphasis on individuality and individual ownership of ideas and data are expected and rewarded. In general, collaborative work is not emphasized during our educational careers. There is a growing body of literature that critically assesses the pathways in which graduate students ascend to the level of Ph.D. (Brewer 1999; Golde and Gallagher 1999; Fry 2001). Golde and Gallagher (1999) highlight three main barriers in the institutional structure of academia that increase the difficulty of working collaboratively: the structure of bounded academic disciplines, the power of the advisor to shape research, and the requirements of funding agencies. Each emphasizes and perpetuates the individualistic nature of academic research (Golde and Gallagher 1999:282).

In terms of bounded disciplines, students are force-fed the requisite theoretical development of a very narrow field. As students of social science, we are taught to first learn the different theories within our field and then to find the one that best suits our interests. During classroom practice we apply the selected theory to different communities. While this may be good for training, without guidance students may mistakenly believe that it is appropriate to mold a community to the needs of a pre-selected theory, rather than molding the theory to match the unique context of a community. This creates a situation where the theoretical model cannot reflect reality, and the lines between researcher and the researched become painfully distinct.

While learning how to negotiate these structures within academia, students must also address moral and ethical issues of research. These ethical issues are also structured by academia; however, they are less apparent or explicit. For example, if students opt to create their own research project, rather than working collaboratively with their advisor on an established project, relationships with informants must be developed independently. At this point, students need to determine how they

represent themselves to their participants. As social scientists we can approach a community either openly and honestly, or we can purposely obscure or alter our identity and intentions in the belief that "better data" may be obtained with an assumed identity and a hidden agenda. This decision may reflect the beliefs of the student, but we also argue that the colonial structures and barriers in place within academia potentially pressure students into choosing the deceptive route. In addition, the pressure to acquire knowledge which is novel and academically significant can entice researchers to do what it takes to encourage informant cooperation. This deception is often justified by those who participate in it by saying that they would not be provided access to their research endeavor if they were to disclose the truth about themselves. Through class sessions, and the overall prestige of academia, students are taught to speak with mastery and understanding. We learn to synthesize materials, critically analyze them, and then contribute to the academic pool of knowledge, thus making us feel as if we are experts. This builds self-confidence, but without direction or a strong moral sense, this confidence could be transformed into an assumption of power over the research participants, as the researcher controls all the information along with the decision to reveal it. We argue that if you must withhold information and obscure your true identity, then you are working on the wrong research project.

Within the applied anthropological realm, this example of deception of identity is one that rarely occurs, since working with a community towards collective goals depends on building trust and confidence. Trust evolves from a combination of good intentions, open communication, mutual respect, and shared decision making. Strong relationships and a solid sense of obligation towards people you work with inevitably follows. However, as students, we believe this discussion of ethics and obligations towards communities is needed not only in theory and methods classes, but also in all courses where the perspectives of "anthropological objects" could be illuminated. In the same manner in which students are taught to try on theories to see which one fits best,

students should also have discussions to try on ethical dilemmas that arise in applied anthropological research.

Another barrier to collaborative research faced by students relates to embedded tensions between community members and researchers who are outsiders to the community. On Pine Ridge, the anthropological legacy is dark and filled with researchers who have sucked information from the Reservation without giving back or who have disappeared as fast as they appeared; therefore, ethical issues are omnipresent for contemporary social scientists on the reservation. With this context, it is crucial that social scientists be honest about themselves, ensure that the research is driven by the community's needs, and create a collaborative and reciprocal relationship with the research participants. Entering this environment as students has presented particular challenges for us in terms of our ability to be effectively immersed in the social context of Pine Ridge. It is intimidating and discouraging to be repeatedly told by participants that what we are doing has no benefit and is nothing more than a continuation of past exploitations. This type of abrasive introduction into a social environment can be enough to send students packing; however, with consistent guidance by Dr. Pickering, fellow research assistants, and friends from the community like Ridgway and Little Moon, students begin to understand the context of the oppression experienced by the local people, expanding opportunities for meaningful relationships. It is a challenging endeavor to assess and address the needs of a community, especially if the community that you are working with is new to you. It can feel virtually impossible to become embedded within the community, do your research, and then publish in the little time that academia allows. Understanding the community you work in is just like the relationships and friendships you develop outside of academia: the bottom line is that it takes time, commitment, and a true affection for the people you work with. Your research participants then become your teachers, your co-workers, and your friends. As you develop relationships, the research, too, becomes holistic and deeper insights into the needs of the

community are slowly revealed. As a result, the research becomes important to persons other than the researcher, the body of academic knowledge to which it contributes. Real people and real lives can benefit.

The image of an anthropologist in the field independently negotiating the difficulties inherent in ethnographic research is one that is engrained in the lore of anthropological training. This "Lone Ranger" approach to field work has roots in the early period of anthropology and is often encouraged today by academic advisors as a response to who emphasize the financial and logistical difficulties in collaborative student research (Van Arsdale 2008:100). There are, of course, considerable hurdles to incorporating students in research. From the student perspective, however, field schools, particularly those embedded in longitudinal research projects, are critical experiential opportunities on the path through academia.

As academics have been calling for a greater discussion of interdisciplinary research (Naiman 1999; Jakobsen et al. 2004; Conrad 2002; Karlqvist 1999), and as collaborative work produces exciting and positive results, working collaboratively becomes more compelling. Building relationships and understanding the community you are engaged with takes time; therefore, we argue that longitudinal studies are one of the most beneficial methods to utilize. Longitudinal studies provide the opportunity to network and meet new people; the research also benefits from the input and guidance that colleagues and research participants contribute. Longitudinal studies that focus on collaboration with the community can teach students how to conduct research in a transdisciplinary fashion, where drawing upon the ideas and knowledge of community members, other practitioners, and academics can benefit the research exponentially (Fry 2001). Working with an advisor on a longitudinal study provides students access to communities where relationships have been developed. This allows students to see the importance of long-term relationships to the development of genuine collaborative research. Longitudinal research also provides opportunities for students to gain a holistic

perspective of the issues within a particular community by entering an ongoing collaborative project, rather than predefining a research agenda to impose onto a new community. The longitudinal perspective illustrates how an ethically and holistically driven research approach can produce academically sound results that have practical applications for both the local and global community. Students learn to engage in collaborative work with people who bring different resources, skill sets, epistemologies and methodologies to the table, furthering their preparation for careers, academic or not.

As well as instilling competition and individuality, academia instills in students a sense of the need to control and own knowledge. Citations allow authors to point interested readers to the foundational works upon which they have built their ideas, as well as to credit authors with individual ownership of ideas when they publish. This is problematic in the sense that it excludes the knowledge and ideas of those who are not a part of the academic community. With this ownership of ideas comes power: academia therefore excludes community members or practitioners while privileging the researcher. Learning through reality, such as by spending time in the field, is the best way for students to discover that they are not the experts and that they should be humble with respect to the teachings of the community members with whom they work. Through hands-on experience, the learned structures that support academic control, dominance, and other colonial ideals, slowly crumble. This is not to say that working in the field is the end all answer. Fieldwork can be a very tumultuous time for students as they are exposed, often for the first time, to commonly known cultural differences, but also to unexpected differences, like the lived consequences of economic disparity. Through these experiences, students can become connected through personal relationships to the positive and constructive perspectives of culturally distinct communities that inspire intellectual, social, spiritual, and emotional awakenings; these students are the ones that begin to see the larger picture.

III. Faculty Voices: Obstacles to Genuine Collaboration, written by Kathleen Pickering

While genuine collaboration is easy to endorse, it is extremely difficult to find in practice. Significant obstacles to accomplishing genuine collaboration lie in deep, rarely stated contradictions between the way knowledge is constructed in academia and in the knowledge systems of communities of concern to anthropology. Rather than intriguing trivia of cultural difference, these contradictions work silently to perpetuate hierarchy, control, and distance between the social sciences and the communities we as academics imagine we serve. In an effort to stimulate a larger dialogue, I will briefly outline some of those contradictions.

Who is Driving? Theory and Research. Western academic training is premised upon obtaining abstract knowledge that has universal application and therefore may be learned independently of any concrete situation or application. This premise sets the stage for two obstacles to genuine collaboration. First, the social scientist arrives in communities with the assumption that what they have learned will undoubtedly apply to this new, unknown situation. Second, the reason they are in that community to begin with is driven by an abstractly defined need to test a theoretical hypothesis. Theory is driving the research, rather than the community where the research is located driving the theoretical issues.

To be clear, the solution to this obstacle is not that academics should abandon theory. To the contrary, I would argue that more theoretical rigor would improve both the outcomes and status of applied work in anthropology and other social sciences. The solution lies in changing the chronology of the research agenda to begin with: bringing the issues of theoretical concern to communities where those issues are relevant, before the research is initiated. For example, the theoretical framework for complex post-traumatic stress disorder was a breakthrough that allowed Walter Little Moon and Jane Ridgway to expand and progress in their understanding of the impacts of boarding schools on Lakota communities and families.

Fortunately, Little Moon and Ridgway had the personal capacity to identify a university resource and gain access to the information, theoretical frameworks, and the encouragement that universities have to offer. Many other local people have important insights to solutions for their communities, but feel that outside resources and support are outside their reach. If every social scientist had the obligation to identify communities where their theoretical frameworks might apply, and communicate the significance of that theory to those communities, other similar breakthroughs could occur. This also requires that we encourage funding entities to think more systematically about three-stage grants. These grants would initially cover the costs of developing a collaborative research agenda, upon a second submission would cover the costs of the research itself, and after a final submission would fund implementation and follow through based on research findings and collaboratively designed solutions.

What Time is It? Balancing the Short-term and the Long-term. While academics have acknowledged that time sense is culturally bounded (Pickering 2004), this important insight is completely neglected when it comes to constructing genuinely collaborative academic research. The academy remains completely embedded in short-term thinking. The tenure process, grant deadlines, agency requirements, publication revision schedules, degree deadlines, and the semester structure are all examples where the demands of short-term thinking dominate over the long-term processes of communities in relation to research. While an untenured faculty member may be working with a community toward a fabulous and innovative approach to defining and researching an issue of concern, the grant deadline demands that something be turned in, short-circuiting the community process and putting the power to define the project in the hands of the professor, who feels the pressure to get grants and publish quickly or be denied tenure. While graduate students may feel the importance of establishing a relationship with a community before they define their thesis topic, their paper is due within a sixteen-week semester; they must defend their

research proposal within eighteen months; or they are expected to complete their master's degree within three years. Yet the communities who accommodate these time-constrained academics may have a completely different conception of time. Academics, as well as other entities and agencies working in applied fields, need to respect the organic processes of communities in identifying priorities, making decisions, and implementing plans. Consensus, capacity building, local ownership, and empowerment are all terms that are popular in the social sciences today, but are strangely disregarded when academic practice comes into play. Interestingly enough, by constructing long-term, collaborative research relationships with communities, students and academics can work together to join ongoing projects, as well as being part of the process of creating new research, within a time frame that is both comfortable to the community and capable of complying with the time discipline of the academe.

Where is it Happening? Places of Pedagogy. The university model is still dominated by learning in the classroom. Classrooms, however, are not places where communities can influence the dialogue. To the contrary, classrooms are spaces where faculty can control and dominate the pictures being presented with as much romance or disparagement as they choose, protected from the annoying intrusion of community perspectives. Yet, once again, the theoretical literature on pedagogy all recognizes the superior outcomes gained through hands-on and experiential learning. Learning through reality presents students with the pretty and the dark, the inspired and the traumatic, the unexpected and uncontrolled nature of real life that can lead to workable solutions to community issues, rather than colonial fantasies of other people's lives. Field schools, service learning, and more vigorous recruitment and retention of ethnically diverse students are all attainable methods for reducing the obstacles to genuine community collaboration.

Who Owns This? Takers and Givers. One of the fascinating characteristics of capitalism that is deeply embedded in the academic process is

the colonial drive to appropriate. The lens of appropriation sees only those pieces that can be extracted for the profit and accumulation of the production process. In a completely subliminal way, academics are trained to apply the same lens to knowledge and research. Those pieces of a community's history and culture that we can use to advance our own research agenda we quickly fix on and make our own, leaving out the rest as irrelevant. The products of that appropriation are then used for career advancement, or to build relationships with funders, at times without ever reporting the research results back to the community. The drive toward appropriation is even built into the way graduate students are trained to read other academic literature, picking and choosing out of a rapidly growing body of literature the paragraph or phrase that serves their argument, without ever engaging the whole argument of the author or the body of work that author represents. And yet there are countless examples of research that focuses on a disembodied aspect of a society, for example, political or economic transactions, only to find that religion or kinship was in fact the key explanatory variable for how that society conceived of their own political or economic processes. By taking a holistic and reciprocal approach to research, looking at what we can contribute to positive community-based change, the errors, as well as the ethics, of appropriation may be overcome.

Who Am I? Specializing Out of Humanity.

Finally, the academic training to become a specialist or expert can also conflict with efforts at genuine collaboration. Initially, the sense of superiority that stems from being an expert is easily perceived as condescending arrogance in communities without the privilege of income and education. Furthermore, there is an unstated assumption that being an academic expert absolves one of having fundamental social skills or patience for those outside of the expert realm. Academics admire efficiency, professionalism, and objectivity, all of which can be detrimental to the process of genuine collaboration with communities where compassion, family ties, and social relationships are the critical skills for success. Graduate students deserve to have their

emotional lives developed along with their intellectual lives, or we are training them to become the same detached, cold, rude, and arrogant outsiders that local communities have lamented for decades. By conveying a holistic approach to research that integrates across the heart, head, spirit, and body, faculty will give their students a better chance to build long-term responsive relationships between research and community. By accepting our biases and subjectivity, along with the limitations of our academic training, we will be forced to be whole people, to develop more than just our mental lives. In the long run, social scientists could be not only more effective but happier.

IV. Implementing the Model: Outcomes from Genuine Collaboration

Negotiating the barriers to genuine collaboration requires that students and faculty successfully balance the "demands of producing relevant knowledge...with the desire to do applied research" (Lassiter 2008:76). While daunting, this balancing act is not new to anthropology. In the final section we highlight two examples of revelatory experiences that we hope will shed light on the perspective that we have laid out. The first explores the process of uncovering root causes with an example from Beth's M.A. research on the health care system at Pine Ridge. The second expands on the notion of building from community assets with an example from Bradley Morse's M.A. video project on bicycle safety on Pine Ridge.

Example 1: Generic Medicines, written by Beth Mizushima and Ben Jewell. The first few times that we went to Pine Ridge we felt as if we were opening our eyes underwater; the more you do it, the clearer your vision becomes. As students who were new to the community, every experience we had, whether it was sitting watching dance competitions, asking Lakota households about how they make ends meet each month, or listening to stories about experiencing racism in border town stores, provided a better understanding of Lakota culture and day to day life on the Reservation. In the classroom we learned about Lakota history, political and economic policies, and current other topics like

institutionalized racism. Fully understanding how these processes impact peoples' lives today, however, required on the ground experience.

Making sense of how historical and current processes influence peoples' lives today was difficult, especially as problems in the community were new to us, but it made us feel passionate about solving them. For example, during household interviews we often heard people discuss negative experiences that they had at the Indian Health Service (IHS) hospital. One complaint often heard was that people were unhappy that they received generic versions of medications. At first, these experiences were overshadowed by the tragic experiences people had, such as having family members die as a result of misdiagnosis. Problems with the health care system seemed esoteric, and root causes were difficult to determine.

With the combination of more time on the reservation and more course work back on campus, we were able to have better conversations with community members. These conversations, which allowed us to delve deeper into the root causes of problems and make connections between things that would never have occurred to us before. Fueled by strong cups of coffee in late hours of the night, Walter Little Moon and Jane Ridgway helped mentally guide us through understanding how people with political power can help individuals in need; how an individual's clinical experience with their doctor can be influenced by the personality of the patient and the doctor; and how experiences in childhood shape the way one perceives the world. As a result of working closely with community members, it became clear that expressing unhappiness with the generic medication was one way that community members could illustrate their experience with institutionalized racism. The root problem was not about generic medicine. Instead, only having access to generic medication was an example of how Lakota people's power to make decisions in their life was being limited by the policies of the federal government.

Our ability to connect with community members was greatly influenced by the fact that we entered into a longitudinal project with Dr. Pickering. As she has worked on the reservation

for over twenty years, she introduced us to her friends and to people she knew could help us on our theses. Connecting with these community members allowed us to speed up, to some degree, the process of meeting community members and becoming comfortable in a new community. Other students who had been to Pine Ridge before helped us enter the project, let us know what was expected of us and listened to us when we felt uncomfortable. Most importantly, collaborating with community members provided a mirror that reminded us to be self-reflexive. With their patience, humor and concern, they reminded and encouraged us as students to evaluate our role in the research project and the community and to evaluate our own personal and academic growth. Like other types of growing pains, being self-reflexive was uncomfortable at times. We knew we had a large responsibility to the community, but as students new to the project, the community, and the pressure of graduate school, knowing how to translate our research into a beneficial project was overwhelming and challenging, and implementing it was even more so.

When working in a community with high rates of poverty and continued colonial oppression, it is common for new researchers to want to emphasize these features in their writing. Students in particular, perhaps out of a sense of shock and a desire to raise awareness, tend to focus on the negative aspects of Lakota society, ultimately perpetuating those aspects in the academic literature and consciousness. Working on a longitudinal project with Dr. Pickering, however, has shown us that it is important to identify the assets within the community rather than focusing on the negative.

Example 2: Building Community Assets, written by Jane Ridgway and Kathleen Pickering. Throughout the seven-year longitudinal study, we have repeatedly interviewed the same 300 Lakota households and have had the opportunity to meet other community members who are not participants in the study. The longitudinal study provided a large group of people with whom we can collaborate, expanded the skill sets and resources that can be drawn upon in collaborative efforts, and provided a stepping stone for smaller

projects to spin off. By interviewing households over time, we were able hear about the community issues that participants were most interested in. Questions about these community issues were then incorporated into the interviews, which provided us a foundation of concrete and broad based information from which to build real action plans.

For example, one graduate student, Bradley Morse, wanted to make a video for his Master's project. He met a family whose son had recently been hit by a car while riding his bike to the school's summer lunch program. Because a number of the longitudinal household participants were also relatives of the young man, Brad gained immediate access to the impact of the death on the extended family and the Oglala community generally. He was invited by the family to make a video that would help protect other youths from similar biking accidents. In the course of video taping the family's involvement with the preparations and events surrounding the funeral, Brad captured the community desire to construct a lighted bike path for the youth of Oglala. Brad worked with the family to create a documentary about the need for bike paths in the community to keep children and families safe and healthy. His efforts joined with those of the Oglala community to create enough visibility around the issue of bicycle safety that ultimately a bike path was built with specially allocated federal funds. Everyone involved agreed that this was a genuine collaborative effort.

Conclusion

Academia has a long colonial legacy of appropriating the experiences and knowledge of culturally distinct communities for the expansion of Western scientific knowledge, without regard to the interests of needs of the appropriated community. We wrote this paper because we believe that it is not only possible but critical to transform the relationship of social scientists to communities of concern. Genuine collaboration can be the engine for transforming the academic paradigm of appropriation. A new process is needed by which academics and communities of concern meet on an equal playing field to discuss, design, and accomplish

research of practical and scientific importance. Community participants are fully informed of the purposes, methods, and outcomes of the research. Students are given a model of ethically informed research practice that values the teaching provided to them by the community where they conduct their research. Faculty are supported by students and the community to call out the contradictions between participatory action research and ongoing forms of colonial privilege. Research results are improved as motivated communities and academics produce informed and insightful findings from which to implement positive and constructive change and model greater scientific understandings.

There is a wealth of powerful outcomes waiting at the end of genuine collaboration, where community and research meld into one. Furthermore, higher education is improved as we remove the seams among teaching, research, and service. We can all play a role in constructing a language of collaboration that makes this future possible. ○

Notes

1. Funding for the longitudinal research reported in this paper came from National Science Foundation Career Award Grant No. 0092527, USDA-Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service NRICGP Rural Development Grant No. 0190121, an award from the Oglala Oyate Woitanacan Empowerment Zone, and the Monfort Family Foundation's Colorado State University Monfort Professorship.
2. Corresponding author Benjamin Jewell received a M.A. in anthropology from Colorado State University (2008) and is currently pursuing a PhD. at Arizona State University. He may be reached by mail at the School of Human Evolution and Social Change, Arizona State University, P.O. Box 872402, Tempe, AZ 85287-2402, and by e-mail at benjamin.jewell@asu.edu
3. Bethany Mizushima has a M.A. in anthropology from Colorado State University (2008), and is currently working towards a Master's of Public Health from the University of Washington.
4. Kathleen Pickering is professor of anthropology at Colorado State University. She received a PhD. in anthropology from the University of

Wisconsin-Madison (1996) and a J.D. from the NYU School of Law (1984).

5. Jane Ridgway and Walter Little Moon are resident activists and cultural facilitators from the Wounded Knee community of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, South Dakota. They are authors, counselors, and senior consultants on issues of post traumatic stress disorder and the impacts of boarding schools on native populations.

References Cited

- Brewer, Gary D.
1999 "The Challenge of Interdisciplinarity." *Policy Sciences* 32: 327-337.
- Conrad, Jobst
2002 "Limitations to Interdisciplinarity in Problem Oriented Social Science Research." *The Journal of Transdisciplinary Environmental Studies* 1(1): 49-63.
- Fry, Gary L.A.
2001 "Multifunctional Landscapes-Towards Transdisciplinary Research." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 57(159): 168.
- Golde, Chris M., and Hanna Alix Gallagher
1999 "The Challenges of Conducting Interdisciplinary Research in Traditional Doctoral Programs." *Ecosystems* 2: 281-285.
- Harrison, Barbara
2001 *Collaborative Programs in Indigenous Communities: From Fieldwork to Practice*. LOCATION: Altamira Press.
- High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology
2008 "About Us." Electronic document accessed November 17, 2008 at <http://www.hpsfaa.org/>.
- Jakobsen, Christine Haugaard, Tove Hels, and William J. McLaughlin
2004 "Barriers and Facilitators to integration amongst Scientists in Transdisciplinary Landscape Analyses: a Cross-Country Comparison." *Forest Policy and Economics* 6: 15-31.
- Karlqvist, Anders
1999 "Going beyond Disciplines: The Meaning of Interdisciplinarity." *Policy Sciences* 32: 379-383.
- Lassiter, Luke Eric
2008 "Moving Past Public Anthropology and Doing Collaborative Research." *National Association for the Practice of Anthropology Bulletin* 29: 70-86.
- Ludema, James D., Diana Whitney, Bernard J. Mohr, and Thomas J. Griffin.
2003 *The Appreciative Inquiry Summit: A Practitioner's Guide for Leading the Large-Group Change*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Mihesuah, Devon A., and Angela Cavender Wilson, editors
2004 "Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities," *Contemporary Indigenous Issues*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Naiman, Robert J.
1999 "A Perspective on Interdisciplinary Science." *Ecosystems* 2: 292-295.
- Pickering, Kathleen
2004 "Decolonizing Time Regimes: Lakota Conceptions of Work, Economy, and Society." *American Anthropologist* 106(1): 85-97.
- Schensul, Jean J., Donna Denelli-Hess, Maria G. Borrero, and Ma Prem Bhavati
1987 "Urban Comadronas: Maternal and Child Health Research and Policy Formulation in a Puerto Rican Community." In *Collaborative Research and Social Change*. Edited by Donald D. Stull and Jean J. Schensul. Pages 9-31. Boulder and London: Westview Press.
- Sherman, Richard T.
2006 "Indigenous Stewardship Model: A Traditional Strategy To Restore Ecosystem Balance and Cultural Well Being Utilizing Values, Philosophies, and Knowledge Systems Of Indigenous Peoples." Manderson, SD. Photocopy.
- Stull, Donald D., Jerry A. Schultz, and Ken Cadue Sr.
1987 "In the People's Service: The Kansas Kickapoo Technical Assistance Project." In *Collaborative Research and Social Change*. Edited by Donald D. Stull and Jean J. Schensul. Pages 33-54. Boulder and London: Westview Press.
- Tax, Sol
1975 "Action Anthropology." *Current Anthropology* 16(4): 514-517.
- Tuhiwai Smith, Linda
1999 *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York: Zed Books.
- Van Arsdale, Peter W.
2008 "Learning Applied Anthropology in Field Schools: Lessons from Bosnia and Romania." *National Association for the Practice of Anthropology* 29: 99-109.