

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN  
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT:  
A CASE STUDY FROM  
PANGNIRTUNG, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

by

GWEN DIANNE REIMER, B.A., M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies  
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements  
for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

(c) Copyright by Gwen Dianne Reimer, April 1994

**COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN PANGNIRTUNG**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1994)  
(Anthropology)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY  
Hamilton, Ontario, CANADA

TITLE: Community Participation in Research and Development:  
A Case Study From Pangnirtung, Northwest Territories

AUTHOR: Gwen Dianne Reimer, B.A. (University of Winnipeg)

M.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Wayne Warry

NUMBER OF PAGES: xii, 369

## ABSTRACT

Theories and models of community participation have received considerable attention from academics in the social sciences, and from practitioners in developing countries. This thesis examines the participatory paradigm as it is manifested in two realms: economic development and applied anthropological research. Primary data are drawn from field-research in the Inuit community of Pangnirtung, Northwest Territories.

This thesis is unique in its presentation of a public evaluation, co-researched together with an Inuk member of the community. This report is used as a case-study that provides fodder for theoretical and pragmatic discussions that surround it. Weaving together academic and applied concerns, this dissertation performs a dual purpose. The first objective is to critically examine the ideas that lie at the root of participatory research and development. This is achieved through discussions of development ideology, and through the identification of knowledge as power.

The second goal is to offer insight into the political, economic, and cultural pragmatics of doing participatory research and development at the community-level.



The evaluation of community-based tourism development in Pangnirtung provides the ethnographic data on which this more applied analysis is based. The participatory methodology employed in the evaluation is the base of discussions about the strengths and weaknesses of this type of research. This thesis offers the "co-researcher" model of investigation as a productive process that is relevant to not only the researcher, but also to the communities which are the subject of research.

The conclusion draws several theoretical and ethnographic parallels in doing participatory research and development in the North. Important policy implications are highlighted both for government development practitioners, and for leaders engaged in the struggle for aboriginal self-government. Finally, several recommendations are made toward developing methodologies of research and development, more appropriate to aboriginal community contexts.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgement is due to those individuals and organizations who have offered their knowledge, expert advice, and financial support. First, I extend special gratitude to Professor Wayne Warry who supervised my Ph.D. program of studies at McMaster University, guiding me with a balanced measure of rigour and creativity. Second, I wish to thank committee members Professor Matthew Cooper and Professor Richard Preston, for their diligence in reading long drafts on short notice, and for their constructive criticism.

To the Inuit of Pangnirtung who generously and patiently taught me something about their world, and who welcomed me into their community, I owe my gratitude. Special mention is due to the committed participation of Andrew Dialla, my co-worker during the field-research phase of the tourism evaluation. Thank you also to Pheobe Etuangat for her interpretive skills during interviews with women, and to Sheila Maniapik for her conscientious work in conducting the house-to-house tourism survey.

I thank the Hamlet Council of Pangnirtung for their continued political support of the project. I also appreciate the time, information and logistical support given me by

officials in the Government of the Northwest Territories, Economic Development and Tourism (Baffin Region). I appreciate the time that many tourists took from their vacation, to answer my questions, and to attend focus group sessions.

Finally, I thank my family, my friends, and my husband for their ongoing moral support and encouragement throughout my graduate career.

Funds that made this project possible were generously provided by the following: McMaster School of Graduate Studies; Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada; Northern Studies Training Program; Canadian Anthropology Society; McGill Arctic Tourism Project, and; Government of the Northwest Territories, Department of Economic Development and Tourism (Iqaluit).

#### PREFACE NOTE

This dissertation includes the reproduction of a public evaluation report co-authored by myself and Andrew Dialla (see Chapter Four). McMaster University thesis regulations require that I clarify the separate contributions made by multiple authors to a previously published work. While it is difficult to separate Mr. Dialla's contributions from my own in any categorical way, it is possible to distinguish our roles in the field-project.

I acted as principal investigator, setting the scope and agenda of field-research, and taking responsibility for operationalizing the research objectives. Mr. Dialla acted as the community expert in the project. We worked together in all aspects of data collection, although we did divide some interviewing responsibilities: for example, Mr. Dialla interviewed all local men involved in outfitting, while I interviewed local women (with the help of a female interpreter). While I took a dominant role in the analysis of data, Mr. Dialla contributed substantively to the interpretation and presentation of data pertaining to community perspectives. Finally, although I performed most of the initial writing tasks, Mr. Dialla edited and revised the

contents of the report. He also translated the entire evaluation into Inuktitut syllabics.

Issues that surround our relationship as co-researchers and co-authors are addressed in detail in Chapter Three. Further clarification is also provided in the "Preface to the Case Study" which precedes the public report.

I take sole responsibility for the contents of this dissertation, which surround the public report.

**COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN  
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT:  
A CASE STUDY FROM  
PANGNIRTUNG, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	
<b>INTRODUCTION TO COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN PANGNIRTUNG, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES</b>	1
Purpose of the Evaluation Research Project in Pangnirtung	6
Purpose of the Dissertation	8
The Concepts and Criteria of "Community Participation"	12
'Applied Dissertation Research': The Public Report as a Case Study	18
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	
<b>THE PARTICIPATORY PARADIGM AND RESEARCH IN THE NORTH</b>	22
The Ideological Roots of the Participatory Paradigm: Knowledge as Power and Praxis	23
The Pragmatic Approach to Participatory Research	28
Research Practice and Policy in Northern Communities	36
Measuring Community Participation in Evaluation Research	47
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	
<b>PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH IN PANGNIRTUNG</b>	61
The Co-Researcher Relationship as a Participatory Process	63
The Socio-Political Context of the Tourism Evaluation Research Project	83
Participation in Research: A Culturally Appropriate Process	97
The Historical Context of Research in Pangnirtung: Attitudes and Participation	102

<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	
<b>THE CASE STUDY: Community Based Tourism in Pangnirtung, Northwest Territories: Looking Back and Looking Ahead</b>	
Preface to the Case Study	117
<b>COMMUNITY BASED TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN PANGNIRTUNG, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES: LOOKING BACK AND LOOKING AHEAD, by Gwen Reimer &amp; Andrew Dialla, April 1992</b>	
Summary (English)	128
Summary (Inuktitut)	129
Glossary	130
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>2. LOOKING BACK:</b>	
<b>TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN PANGNIRTUNG, 1980-1991</b>	<b>133</b>
2.1. THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN AND BEYOND, 1980-1987	133
2.2. OPERATING A FLEDGLING TOURIST INDUSTRY, 1988-1991	138
<b>3. WHAT IS 'COMMUNITY BASED' TOURISM ?</b>	<b>140</b>
3.1. POLICY AND PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNITY BASED TOURISM	140
3.2. THE 'COMMUNITY' AND LOCAL CONTROL	141
3.3. THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN COMMUNITY BASED TOURISM	146
3.4. WHEN SHOULD THE PILOT-PROJECT END?	148
DIALOGUE 3: OUTFITTER INSPECTIONS AND LICENSING	152
<b>4. THE ECONOMICS OF TOURISM IN PANGNIRTUNG</b>	<b>153</b>
4.1. TOURISM AND THE 'FORMAL' ECONOMY	153
4.1.1. BARRIERS TO SMALL BUSINESS OWNERSHIP	158
4.2. TOURISM AND THE 'INFORMAL' ECONOMY	162
4.2.1. THE GAP BETWEEN TOURISM AND THE LOCAL ART INDUSTRY	164
4.2.2. OUTFITTERS: ISSUES OF CO-OPERATION VERSUS COMPETITION	166
4.3. GOVERNMENT INVESTMENTS AND INVESTMENTS IN THE TOURISM ECONOMY	172
DIALOGUE 4: THE ACCOMMODATION DEBATE	177
<b>5. TOURISM MANAGEMENT, TRAINING, AND AWARENESS</b>	<b>179</b>
5.1. DIFFICULTIES IN LOCAL MANAGEMENT	180
5.2. TRAINING: OUTFITTERS, WOMEN, AND STUDENT HOSTS	184
5.3. TOURISM AWARENESS IN THE COMMUNITY	190
DIALOGUE 5: TOURISM AWARENESS AMONG LOCAL YOUTH	194
<b>6. CULTURE AS A TOURIST ATTRACTION</b>	<b>196</b>
6.1. CULTURE-TOURISM AND THE WHALING ERA IN CUMBERLAND SOUND	196
6.2. THE PRESENTATION OF CULTURE	199
DIALOGUE 6: HOST AND GUEST -- A CULTURAL EXCHANGE	201

<b>7. LOOKING AHEAD:</b>	
<b>OUTCOMES, POSSIBILITIES, AND QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION</b>	203
7.1. POLITICAL OUTCOMES	203
7.2. ECONOMIC BENEFITS	205
7.3. MANAGEMENT CONCERNS	206
7.4. TRAINING NEEDS	207
7.5. COMMUNITY AWARENESS	208
7.6. CULTURAL CONSEQUENCES	209
7.7. PANGNIRTUNG'S TOURISM PILOT-PROJECT AS A MODEL OF COMMUNITY BASED DEVELOPMENT	210

**APPENDICES**

<b>A: KNOWN RELEVANT TOURISM STUDIES AND REPORTS:</b>	
NWT, BAFFIN REGION, AND PANGNIRTUNG	211
<b>B: OUTFITTER TRIP PRICING FORMULA - 1991</b>	213
<b>C: TRAVEL FEATURE ARTICLE</b>	214

**TABLES**

<b>TABLE 1: COMPARATIVE EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY: PANGNIRTUNG, 1981/1991</b>	154
<b>TABLE 2: FORMAL TOURISM ACTIVITY CONTRIBUTIONS, WAGES &amp; SALES:</b> PANGNIRTUNG, 1991	155
<b>TABLE 3: HOUSEHOLD ECONOMIC SURVEY SUMMARY: PANGNIRTUNG, 1991</b>	156
<b>TABLE 4: SOCIAL ASSISTANCE CASES/MONTH, SEASONAL AVERAGES:</b> PANGNIRTUNG, 1983-1991	157
<b>TABLE 5: INUIT OWNED AND OPERATED LICENSED SMALL BUSINESSES:</b> PANGNIRTUNG, 1991	157
<b>TABLE 6: INFORMAL ECONOMIC ACTIVITY CONTRIBUTIONS:</b> PANGNIRTUNG, 1991	163
<b>TABLE 7: 'HOME-CRAFT 'BUSINESS'WOMAN, WALL HANGING SALES:</b> PANGNIRTUNG, 1988-1991	163
<b>TABLE 8: INFORMAL ARTS AND CRAFTS SALES DIRECT TO TOURISTS,</b> SURVEY RESULTS: PANGNIRTUNG 1991	163
<b>TABLE 9: DOCUMENTED OUTFITTER EARNINGS: PANGNIRTUNG, 1989-1991</b>	167
<b>TABLE 10: OUTFITTING, GUIDING, &amp; FISHCAMPS, SURVEY RESULTS:</b> PANGNIRTUNG, 1991	167
<b>TABLE 11: GOVERNMENT INVESTMENTS IN TOURISM, BAFFIN REGION</b> AND PANGNIRTUNG: 1990-1981	173
<b>TABLE 12: ESTIMATED ANNUAL TOURISM INVESTMENTS AND RETURNS:</b> PANGNIRTUNG, 1990/1991	173

**CHAPTER 5**

<b>PARTICIPATORY DEVELOPMENT: THEORY AND PRACTICE</b>	215
The Roots of a Participatory Paradigm of Development	216
Pragmatic Approaches to Participation in Development: Case Studies	227
Participation and Tourism Development	234
Measuring Community Participation in Tourism in Pangnirtung	241



<b>CHAPTER 6</b>	
<b>COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY IN THE CANADIAN ARCTIC</b>	247
Community-Based Economic Development as a Participatory Process	248
The Socio-Political Context of Community-Based Tourism in Pangnirtung	256
Community-Based Development as a Culturally Appropriate Concept	264
Self-Government and the Nunavut Economy	286
<b>CHAPTER 7</b>	
<b>COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND THE RESEARCH-DEVELOPMENT LINK: PARALLELS, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS</b>	290
Participatory Research and Development: Parallel Issues	291
Community Participation and Self-Government: Policy Implications	309
Methodological Implications of Participation in Research and Development	315
<b>APPENDIX I</b>	
<b>METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION</b>	324
Appendix I.a: General Interview Guide	336
Appendix I.b: Community Economic Survey	339
<b>APPENDIX II</b>	
<b>EVALUATION OF PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH METHODOLOGY USED IN PANGNIRTUNG TOURISM DEVELOPMENT STUDY,</b> by Jean-Philippe Chartrand, December 1991	343
<b>REFERENCES</b>	352

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION TO COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN PANGNIRTUNG, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

In the 1970s national and regional native organizations in the Northwest Territories demanded greater local involvement in planning and implementing economic development programs. They were responding to the boom of oil and gas exploration and development that was oriented to southern-based interests and proved to have only short-term benefits for native northerners. In the early 1980s, Europe banned sealskin imports which severely crippled a source of cash income relied upon by Inuit in isolated Arctic settlements. Consequently, federal and territorial governments sought new resources to develop that would create long-term benefits for geographically distant and distinct communities in the North.

In the Eastern Arctic, the Government of the Northwest Territories (GNWT) identified tourism as a resource with development potential. In 1980, the Department of Economic Development and Tourism (ED&T) together with the Baffin Regional Council (BRC) embarked on a "community-based" plan of tourism development. After consultation with local

representatives and the subsequent formation of a Tourism Committee, a tourism pilot-project was initiated in Pangnirtung, gateway to the Auyuittuq National Park Reserve. This marked a significant shift in Territorial development policy and in decision-making at the community level: the people of Pangnirtung were presented with the option of development and with the opportunity to participate in all stages of tourism planning and implementation.

The Baffin Island community of Pangnirtung lies 40 km south of the Arctic Circle, situated along the shores of Pangnirtung fiord and framed by scenic mountains. The community attained Hamlet status in 1972 and, at the time of writing, had a population of approximately 1,200 people, 95% of whom were Inuit. The majority of Pangnirtung's 250 Inuit households continue to be involved to various degrees in the land-based economy, as well as the wage and welfare economies. The Hamlet has a well-developed infrastructure compared to other Baffin communities, excluding Iqaluit which is the regional government centre for the Eastern Arctic. The tourism pilot-project in Pangnirtung has been a major impetus in the construction of new buildings such as the Angmarlik Visitor Centre and Museum, in the renovation of older structures such as Auyuittuq Lodge, and in the extension of the airport runway which now receives daily flights (and which also divides the community into 'uptown' and 'downtown').

During the summer of 1989 I visited Pangnirtung to observe what appeared to be an alternative model of development and to gain a sense of local views on tourism.<sup>1</sup> In the fall of 1990, I returned to discuss with community and government personnel, the possibility of longer-term research. It was during this second visit that I suggested the timeliness of an evaluation of the pilot-project then in its tenth year of implementation.

To my mind, a "participatory research" methodology would enhance the process and results of an evaluation project that needed to incorporate the objectives of participant interest groups, and at the same time fulfil my own academic Ph.D. requirements (Reimer 1992). As will be seen, a participatory research process was not completely appropriate to either the **context** or the **type** of research conducted.<sup>2</sup> The specific cultural and political situation, coupled with the fact that the investigation was **evaluative**, precluded participatory research in the ideal sense of the term (cf.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Resident Attitudes Towards Tourism Development in Pangnirtung, Northwest Territories." Report submitted to Northern Scientific Training Program, by Gwen Reimer, October 1989.

<sup>2</sup> The idea that participatory research is a solution to **all** projects in **all** places is being increasingly criticized by applied development researchers. Edwards (1989), Stone (1989), and Pigozzi (1982) argue that in certain cultural or policy contexts, participatory research is inappropriate. These issues will be discussed further in later chapters.

Hall 1975).

Nevertheless, the emancipatory and pedagogic ideals of the participatory paradigm are congruous with the increasing demand by Inuit organizations for a more cooperative approach to research (cf. Lange 1987). Similar to their view of the history of economic development, Inuit groups consider research as part of a colonial enterprise organized around the needs of the South, with little relevance to the pressing needs of the North. A participatory approach could help solve the problems of irrelevance and of under-utilization of research results. I premised my hopes on Reason and Rowan's critique of orthodox research which, "because the whole process is alienated, there are few connections and very little commitment" (1981:xv). I became committed to co-producing a public report that would manifest the advantages of an evaluation process that relied upon communication with the change agents (GNWT) and the subjects of change (the community), and upon a better qualitative understanding of issues and contexts as illuminated by a local Inuk co-researcher.

With these ideas in mind, I presented the idea of formal local participation via a full-time Inuk co-researcher as both complementary and vital to the evaluation of a community-based development program. Over a two-year period from 1989-1991, I initiated face-to-face discussions and

negotiations with GNWT officials and Hamlet Councillors, supplemented with ongoing written communication. This resulted in a cooperative research effort that included the assent and varying levels of participation by major stakeholders in the tourism development pilot-project. The Pangnirtung Hamlet Council represented community interests. The Government of the Northwest Territories Department of Economic Development and Tourism represented territorial and regional interests and also agreed to sponsor a full-time local co-researcher. I represented academic interests, and acted as the principal investigator in the evaluation.

The formal data collection that began in July 1991 set out to accomplish two goals. First, our **applied** research objective was to provide the territorial and local governments with a comprehensive evaluation of tourism development in Pangnirtung. The basic research questions consist of: Is tourism bringing economic benefits to community members? What social and cultural effects has tourism wrought? Finally, has community participation in the development process helped to achieve the goals of community-based tourism?

Second, my **academic** objective was to study broader issues of Northern research and development that would form the basis of my Ph.D. dissertation in anthropology. Here the research questions include: Is community-based development a step in the right direction toward positive results in the

north? Furthermore, is a participatory research methodology a positive move toward relevant and responsible research in the north? The thesis that follows is a description and analysis of the theoretical, methodological, and practical issues that shaped the process and results of what I consider to be 'applied dissertation research.'

#### Purpose of the Evaluation Research Project in Pangnirtung

From a purely applied point of view, GNWT, the community, and I shared three main objectives for the research in Pangnirtung: 1) to evaluate the tourism pilot-project that began in 1980, the first of its kind in the Eastern Arctic to have been modelled upon a community-based theory of development; 2) to use a community-based methodology of evaluative research as complementary to the first objective (this was accomplished primarily by hiring a local Inuk co-researcher), and; 3) to produce a report for public use in both Inuktitut and English.

I believe that one reason the project went ahead was because I happened to 'be in the right place at the right time.' The community and ED&T recognized the need for an evaluation of the tourism pilot-project, but a scarcity of public funds precluded a large scale research project by a professional consultant. As well, the short history of GNWT's community-based development policy logically led to a view that local participation in its evaluation was pragmatic, if

not expedient.<sup>3</sup> Thus the Baffin Regional ED&T Superintendent favoured the idea of creating employment for an Inuk co-researcher as both politic and practical. Finally, my own research interests and skills provided an appropriate and inexpensive ('free') agent through which the community and the government could acquire the information they desired. Because I was a student and demanded as payment only full access and use of the data for dissertation purposes, local and territorial representatives were easily able to reconcile themselves to the receipt of consultant services for no salary in return.

Andrew Dialla was hired as co-researcher within the first three days of my arrival in Pangnirtung, selected from two applicants who had submitted resumés in response to an advertisement posted a week or so before. Andrew's involvement in the tourism industry in Pangnirtung, his excellent command of the English language, and his previous interview experience working with CBC North made him an excellent candidate. In the months that followed, Andrew and I learned to work together as partners, although we often found ourselves struggling to move beyond the more traditional relationship of 'white researcher' and 'interpreter' as had been standard practice during

---

<sup>3</sup> The extent to which 'participation' is pragmatic as opposed to expedient is an issue touched on throughout the thesis.



previous research projects in the community. This was true both in terms of our attitudes toward each other, as well as local residents' attitudes toward us as researchers and as a research team. In Chapter Three I elaborate on those aspects of data collection -- journal entries as well as interview questions -- which concern the participatory research process.

The public report was released in April 1992 under the title, *Community Based Tourism Development in Pangnirtung, NWT: Looking Back and Looking Ahead*. It is the result of several methods of data collection that included individual, semi-structured interviews and focus group sessions, a document review, and participant-observation in community functions, tourism-related activities and public meetings attended by different local and non-local interest groups and individuals (see Appendix I).

#### Purpose of the Dissertation

The purpose of this dissertation is to present an analysis of community-based options for research and development as effective and consistent with the current goals held by Inuit for the devolution of power to regional and local levels (Dickerson 1992). I do this by situating the evaluation of a community-based tourism development pilot-project in the Canadian Eastern Arctic within the broader theories of applied social science research and economic development. While this thesis aims at constructive analysis,

this does not preclude critical examination. Indeed, GNWT's attempt at a community-based tourism pilot-project in Pangnirtung was in itself a critical act in light of previous federal and territorial development policy. Similarly, our attempt at community-based evaluation research was a critical act in contrast to previous research practice in the North.

In a more subtle sense, this dissertation attempts to add another building block to the bridge between basic and applied anthropological research. I aim to explicate the inherent connection between the applied and academic contributions of this research project. Academically, the research is a contribution to theories of economic development and tourism in third and fourth world areas, and to theories of community participation. It also adds to current thought on alternative methodologies of social science research and of qualitative evaluation (cf. Reason 1981; Guba & Lincoln 1989). In terms of application, the research contributes to the body of knowledge for use by Inuit and government toward problem solving and future planning with regard to economic self-sufficiency and self-determination in Arctic communities. That is, an aim of applied inquiry is to address the assumptions and perceived needs "identified as having policy significance" (Chambers 1985:140). Whereas basic research components of this dissertation may help to *inform* policy, the applied components help to *confirm* and perhaps *choose* policy alternatives.

Hence, I attempt to reconcile basic and applied research by presenting the public report as a form of "critical ethnography" (as described by Thomas 1993). The methodology and results of the tourism evaluation research are embedded in the ethnographic tradition, and continue to share several characteristics belonging to ethnography. However, I argue that the cultural description contained within the report and this dissertation, possess a political agenda not usually associated with "conventional" ethnography.

Despite my efforts, there remain some ethical and political contradictions in doing applied research for academic purposes. Academically, I needed to pre-plan a project that would fit with current theoretical and methodological frameworks appropriate to doctoral requirements and time-frames. I could not wait for the people of Pangnirtung, or GNWT-ED&T to contract me to do research for them, nor could I afford to offer exclusive use of the data toward Inuit needs. My academic priorities precluded full local control and ownership of the research by the people of Pangnirtung, particularly at the proposal and planning stages of the project. To some, this situation might indicate a perpetuation of 'neo-colonial' exploitation of indigenous knowledge (cf. Warry 1990). To others, including myself, such a situation presented an opportunity for cooperative research practice that is both ethical and beneficial for researchers,

native communities, and governments alike. That is, we as anthropologists must find ways to reconcile ourselves to the notion that knowledge is as much a commodity for our own consumption and advancement, as it is a useful resource for the empowerment of those for whom we profess to work (cf. Hall 1979).

The final goal of this dissertation is related to its dual character as both basic and applied research. In examining the research process and public report, I aim to reach beyond *theoria* to a level of *praxis* that, in Partridge's meaning, creates knowledge not only for itself, but toward ethical and political ends. In this thesis I interpret *praxis* to imply the potential of shared knowledge as an instrument of self-determination and self-government as presented by Inuit in Eastern Arctic communities. Hence, I analyze theories and actions insofar as they affect the 'ethical political behaviour' of, for example, government policy-makers intervening in the social and economic life of Inuit in isolated communities, local Inuit leaders and community members ultimately striving to direct their own future, and anthropologists (and other researchers) like myself who have historically assumed exclusive possession over a body of knowledge. From this *praxis* perspective, theory and action are in "constant adjustment" (Partridge 1987:217). This dissertation is a part of that adjustment, and reflects a

learning process that involved many different participants.

The Concepts and Criteria of "Community Participation"

The methodological premise of participatory research and the theoretical premise of community-based development share an ideal of participation that is representative, if not complete. Cohen and Uphoff recognize a real danger in the "growing faddishness" that participation is currently subject to in both academic and bureaucratic circles (1980:213). As a fad, participation becomes an end only, rather than a means as well, and the promotion of community participation becomes "good by definition" (*ibid.*).

This participation is assumed to lead to significant involvement or to control by yet another, often loosely termed ideal, 'the community.' As the basic unit of analysis with respect to participation in research and development, what constitutes 'the community' must be defined. The boundaries of this definition of community need to be open enough to allow for both its structural and symbolic character. In an Inuit hamlet such as Pangnirtung, the current political structure is a relatively recent feature introduced with the settlement and centralization programs in the 1950s. This new social and political structure bears upon the formal decision-making processes that affect participation in development and research (see Chapters Three and Six). On the other hand, Pangnirtung's symbolic sense of community is shaped by an

ancient "consciousness of belonging" tied to land and kin (Nuttal 1992:9). In the process of development planning, for example, the community's "felt needs" are articulated according to a cultural identification with a geographic locality (Van Willigen 1986:96; Dickerson 1992:85).

Van Willigen summarizes these ideas in his description of a community "organized" (structural aspect) to work toward a "common good" (symbolic aspect) (*ibid.*). Such a dualistic definition encompasses not only the homogeneity that characterizes Eastern Arctic settlements, but also the diversity of communities in terms of local identity. The latter is significant with respect to territorial government efforts to create a stronger, more integrated regional economy, a matter made more difficult by the geographic isolation and distance between communities.

It is crucial to remember, however, that a community is, in itself, never a "homogenous, unfactionalized mass of cooperative persons who only need an outside motivator to initiate their communal activities" (Stone 1989:207). The problematic reality that inhibits the idea of community participation in development and in research lies in its limitation of always being partial, or in danger of manipulation and co-optation (*cf.* Rahnema 1990:208). There has been a general failure in the literature to precisely define who and what has constituted participation, and the term has

often become a vague indicator of the authors' politically correct philosophy of research and/or development (cf. Krefetz & Goodman 1973; Cohen & Uphoff 1980; Conchelos & Kassam 1981; Gaventa & Horton 1981; Vio Grossi 1981). Use of the term in this way has done nothing to enhance the reliability and validity of the results of participation. Hence, it is important that I define the boundaries of what may be considered "participatory" in the particular case under study.

Hall asserts that for research to be truly participatory, it must be "full and active participation of the community in the entire research process" (1979:407). His definition of participation suggests an ideal (and singular) phenomenon. As will be discussed in Chapter Two, this ideal has rarely, if ever, been achieved in applied social research projects. This has, in turn, contributed to a vague use of the term. On the other hand, Krefetz & Goodman suggest that, "participation is not, and therefore cannot be spoken of as though it were, a constant" (1973:370). Both the nature and the context of participation vary, and consequently so do its effects. Writers such as Stone (1989) and Gow & Vansant (1983) define "meaningful community participation" in processual terms of "discovery," "motivation," "decision-making," and "management" of development needs, choices and resources. That is, participation is not a single phenomenon, but rather a plural entity that "varies in its dimensions and contexts," as

Cohen and Uphoff (1980:214) define it. In this dissertation, I analyze participation in the community of Pangnirtung using this latter definition, as it is most consistent with the circumstantial realities of cooperative research and development.

Authors who attempt to more precisely define participatory models of development or research, generally do so by using both a quantitative and a qualitative measure of participation (Krefetz & Goodman 1973; Hall 1979, 1981; Cohen & Uphoff 1977, 1980). Quantitatively, the questions asked are what character and extent of the community is involved in the project. Qualitatively, participation is measured according to how the community is involved throughout the process of the project. Cohen & Uphoff (1977, 1980) are most prominent in their attempt to establish empirical indicators of the presence, extent and effects of participation in development activities. They outline three dimensions of participation to include "what" types of participation, "who" participates, and "how" participation occurs. Also important is the "context" in which participation occurs: the historical, environmental and societal (and I would add, cultural) characteristics that "have a strong effect on emerging patterns of participation" in a given development (or research) effort (Cohen & Uphoff 1980:218). In subsequent chapters I use these criteria to measure participation levels among the people of Pangnirtung



in both the research process (Chapter Two), and in the tourism development process (Chapter Five).

Throughout the text of this thesis, I refer to participation in development and in research by the use of several different terms, including 'participatory', 'community-based', 'collaborative', and 'cooperative.' This variety of labels follows more upon their use by different authors cited, than by their descriptive distinctions. However, I suggest that it is possible, and it may be useful, to broadly differentiate between these terms as used in the literature to distinguish specific types or aspects of participation.

The term 'participatory' is most widely used in the context of research methodology and ideology (eg., Hall 1975, 1979, 1981; Tandon 1981; Vio Grossi 1981; Jackson & Mackay 1982; Hudson 1982; Castellano 1986; Maguire 1987). The term is used to a lesser degree in the development literature, and often a participatory paradigm is indicated simply by a phrase such as 'participation in development' (eg., Cohen & Uphoff 1977, 1980; Uphoff 1985; Stone 1989; Chaiken 1990; Chopra, et al. 1990). In general, 'participatory' has come to be an overarching term that describes a model of research and/or development that includes the involvement of the project's subjects and/or beneficiaries, in a learning process that aims toward some greater degree of empowerment. This is examined

more closely in Chapter Two.

'Community-based', 'collaborative' and 'cooperative' descriptions of research and development are included under the umbrella of the participatory paradigm, and each implies a partnership role for the researcher. The term 'community-based' is widely used in the Canadian literature to describe participatory research or development projects implemented in Native communities (eg., Jackson, et al. 1982; SSHRC 1983; Hedley 1986; Lockhart & McCaskill 1986; Brizinski 1989; Price 1991; Warry 1992; Rigby & Stenton 1992; cf. Campbell 1987; Gondolf 1988). Here participation is meant to include a local or regional community of people (or representation thereof) who are ideally involved in all stages of the project and who ultimately control the project.

'Community-based' signifies the recognition of "tremendous historical, geographic, demographic, and cultural diversity among aboriginal communities" (Price 1991:58). Projects are community-based in that they aim to be appropriate to the specific community involved, their parameters based upon needs as defined by that community. So, for example, Andrew and I evaluated the community-basis of tourism development in Pangnirtung according to criteria relevant to that particular Inuit community. Despite this particularized approach, the evaluation aims to provide important lessons for other Baffin communities as well.

The label 'collaborative' is used primarily to indicate research or development that is not necessarily as 'participatory' as that described above, but which nevertheless aims to define its goals and processes in collaboration with government, the community, and whatever other interest groups might have a stake in the project (Stull & Schensul 1987; Van Willigen 1989; Warry 1990).<sup>4</sup> Because of its usually close association with government bodies, collaborative development research has, in some contexts, come to imply a risk of secrecy or co-optation by those in power (p.c. Wayne Warry, January 29, 1993; cf. Gow 1991).

'Cooperative' or shared models of research are terms favoured by several native groups in Canada, and describes a process where southern scientists and northern native residents and front-line workers are partners in the systematic search for information relevant to each others' interests and needs (Rees 1986; Lange 1987). The cooperative approach will be elaborated upon in Chapter Two with particular attention to Inuit organizations' response to research.

'Applied Dissertation Research':  
The Public Report as a Case Study

The public report is contained in its full and

---

<sup>4</sup> 'Collaborative' research has also been used to connote multi-disciplinary investigations.

original form in Chapter Four. Co-authored by Andrew Dialla and myself, the report documents the current issues involved in community-based tourism development in Pangnirtung, as perceived by different local, regional, and territorial interest-groups. This report serves as the Case Study to which the other six dissertation chapters refer. The dissertation is as much about the social processes and relations of production of the public report -- including its reception or lack thereof -- as it is about the actual contents of the report. Thus, it speaks to the **context of participation**; it is this context that binds each of the chapters together, and that influences the parallels between issues of research and development in the Canadian North.

Chapters Two and Three precede the Case Study to describe the events and discuss the issues that surrounded the production of the report. The theoretical and ideological premises of the participatory methodology employed to conduct the evaluative research are dealt with in Chapter Two. I also include an overview of scientific policy and practice in the Canadian North as it relates to the call by Native groups for greater participation and control over research in their

communities.<sup>5</sup> In Chapter Three, I relate these general issues to the specifics of the tourism evaluation research project that Andrew and I conducted in Pangnirtung. I see these two chapters as a reflexive assessment of how the subsequent Case Study represents a moment in the process of recent political and methodological trends in applied anthropology and in social science research as a whole. It is in this sense that I analyze the public report as a type of critical ethnography that engages in cultural description toward political ends.

In Chapter Four, I preface the public report with a brief discussion of how its content was influenced by its methodological and socio-political context. This introduction is immediately followed by a reprinted copy of the public report evaluating tourism development in Pangnirtung.

Chapter Five follows the Case Study and situates the community based tourism pilot-project in Pangnirtung within a broader context of development theory in third and fourth world areas. I concentrate on theories and issues of community-based or participatory development as presented in the literature. In Chapter Six I examine these issues as they apply specifically to the community-based tourism development

---

<sup>5</sup> I direct the reader to Peggy Brizinski's (1989) dissertation for detailed and well-documented information about research policy, sponsorship, regulation and conduct in the Northwest Territories. Brizinski concludes by recommending community-based research approaches, and my thesis, in part, takes up where she left off.

model as a solution to previous federal and territorial economic policy and implementation failures in the Canadian Arctic. Together, chapters Five and Six deal with the actual content of the report as it relates to recent discussions of community participation in development, and to issues of native economic self-sufficiency.

I conclude in Chapter Seven by synthesizing and distinguishing between the cultural and political processes that are evidently parallel in the practice of research and of development in the North. In essence, the analogies I draw bear upon questions of local control and native self-determination over research and development, with implications for scientific training and conduct. In the Eastern Arctic, these are salient issues in light of the recent legislation of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement, and its political meaning for Inuit self-government by the end of the century.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE PARTICIPATORY PARADIGM AND RESEARCH IN THE NORTH

The tourism evaluation report -- co-produced by Andrew, an 'insider' and myself, an 'outsider' -- is the result of a cooperative research effort. As such, it is the product of an increasingly popular move toward participatory research practice in the field of applied anthropology. In this chapter I demonstrate how this move has been prompted by both Native and social scientific concerns about the relevance of research within the context of self-determination.

I begin by briefly tracing the roots of the participatory research paradigm: the ideals underlying participatory research complement the ideals held by many applied anthropologists, and influenced the methodology I chose for field-work in Pagnirtung. This is followed by a review of case studies in which political, social and cultural constraints have compelled researchers to sacrifice participatory ideals. These case studies point to a "pragmatic" model of participatory research that is more consistent with the tourism research experience in Pagnirtung. Next, I present what Inuit groups label

"cooperative research," and why this somewhat diluted participatory model is appropriate to the history and context of research practice in the Canadian North. I conclude this chapter with a focus on evaluation research: I attempt to measure the extent of community participation in the tourism evaluation, and; to examine the circumstances that prevented the evaluation process from fulfilling the criteria set out in the ideal participatory research model.

The Ideological Roots of the Participatory Paradigm:  
Knowledge as Power and Praxis

Participatory research comes under the aegis of 'new paradigm research' that emerged out of a variety of social scientists' disillusion with orthodox positivist approaches (eg., Reason & Rowan 1981). For example, feminist perspectives contributed to the move towards a new paradigm approach in their critiques of the "scientific model" of the female. The idea that women were "mute" in terms of their history or culture, or that their lives in a community could be represented by data collected primarily through male informants, was theoretically incongruent when matched against women's own experience (Callaway 1981). Hence, feminist scholars explored and refined the use of subjective and experiential data in validating social science research.

The particulars of participatory research methodology have been heavily influenced by the seminal writings of Paulo



Freire. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire advocates a method of adult education in which the educator teaches "with" the people as opposed to "for" or "about" the people (Freire 1970:33,82). He asserts that itineraries for investigation into "another world" cannot begin from points predetermined by an outsider. Both in education and in research, Freire's message is one of cultural and political reconciliation between the "poles of the contradiction" between teachers and students or between researchers and subjects (*Ibid*:59).

Logically, adult educators who adopted Freire's philosophy later moved on to develop theories and methods of participatory research. For example, the writings of Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon consolidate the transfer of Freire's philosophy of education to an alternative paradigm of social science research. For example, Hall argues that "if one accepts Freire's point that teaching methods have ideological implications then the same holds true for research methods" (Hall 1975:26; also, 1981). Tandon outlines two basic motive forces behind participatory research: 1) the "insufficient as well as oppressive" limitations of the "classical dominant research paradigm," and; 2) knowledge as "a source of power" and the need to shift this balance of power in favour of the "have-nots" (Tandon 1981:21; also, Brown & Tandon 1983; cf. Maguire 1987). Based upon these ideals, participatory research is offered "in active opposition" to dominant positivist

paradigms that continue to divorce subject from object, and to restrict research capability to scholars of empirical ideologies (Reason & Rowan 1981:xii). Through community participation in training, investigation and analysis, participatory research promises to return and redistribute knowledge that has become the sole property of an educated elite.

The liberationist roots of participatory research have generated debates on the power of knowledge and caused social scientists to look more closely at issues of ownership and commodification of knowledge (eg., Hall 1979; Light & Kleiber 1981; Warry 1990). Research as a purely academic exercise has been accused of being "elitist" (Swantz 1975:45; cf. Krefetz & Goodman 1973). The concept of participation, on the other hand, has become a key to resolving social scientists' concern over the "colonial" nature of research (Stavenhagen 1971; Bielawski 1984; Brizinski 1989; cf. Asad 1973). For example, Canadian anthropologists concerned with Native issues increasingly advocate the idea that adherence to the principle of Native self-determination means "full partnership" in the research process (Warry 1990:62; cf. Jackson, et al. 1982; Rees 1986; Van Willigen, et al. 1989). Ethically, they insist that the goal of Native control and ownership of intellectual property is intrinsic to the self-determining principle and process.

Politics, and the principles of participatory research demand that anthropologists make their research useful, accountable, relevant and responsible to the local communities who are the subject of much of their study (Freeman 1977; Warry 1990). If applied social scientists working in Canada's North are unwilling to make such a commitment, then research will continue to suffer from political controversy and to be associated with outside colonial forces that northerners feel should be checked, rather than supported (Adams, et al. 1987:58). That is, social and political changes in the North in recent decades translate a change in the expectations and needs of science and research. Researchers have a responsibility to keep ethically and politically abreast of these changes.

Ideally, participatory research means that the knowledge is not only controlled by the community at the end of the research process, but that the shape of this knowledge has also been influenced through an exchange/dialogue relationship during the research process. Light and Kleiber (1981) demonstrate that an "interactive" research process "demystifies" and adds strength and validity to research results. For this reason, social scientists are looking to participatory research as a means toward defining and achieving praxis. Among some applied anthropologists, praxis implies the application of theory as viewed from a Native

perspective (Partridge 1987; Warry 1992). This means that university-trained social scientists -- as 'outsiders' -- need to recognize the importance of 'insiders' traditional knowledge in a dialectical process of knowing, one that does not create unnecessary distinctions about its significance and value (cf. Reason & Rowan 1981; Lockhart 1982). A praxis approach would "capture the data content of traditional knowledge in a systematic way that will build a bridge between traditional native and non-native approaches to science" (Adams, et al. 1987:43).

Participatory research lends itself to such a perspective in that it is built upon principles of learning and dialogue (Gustavsen 1986). It provides a context in which the theoretical assumptions of the anthropologist are negotiated with the theoretical understandings of the Native community to agree on what is socio-culturally 'true', to develop mutual categories of analysis, and to accurately explain practical realities (cf. Maybury-Lewis 1985:138; Arratia 1992:114).<sup>1</sup> In Chapter Three I relate how a praxis approach led Andrew and I to negotiate our different

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, during the Dene Gondie study, Rees reports that their initial theoretical assumptions and conceptualizations of Natives' problems with the Norman Wells Pipeline were "naive" and subsequently "transformed beyond recognition" (Rees 1986:153). For the North Shore Tribal Council health transfer project, a praxis approach meant a "deconstruction" of the theoretical bases of traditional, clinical and bureaucratic health care (Warry 1992:160).

definitions of 'economy' and how this affected our evaluation of tourism development in Pagnirtung.

Thus, a participatory methodology has the potential to integrate cross-cultural perspectives with western social science and to incorporate pluralist world-views to "engender a shift in the direction of the pursuit of knowledge" (Bielawski 1984:60; cf. Henriksen 1985). It means that theory formation can be a collaborative process in which interviewees are "co-researchers," and "valid knowledge" is a matter of relationship between researched and researcher (Reason & Rowan 1981:248). A *praxis* approach negates the idea that development or development research consists of a transfer of skills and information from outside experts to unskilled, uninformed insiders (Edwards 1989:18). Rather, it presents an alternative in which "intellectual and cultural traffic flow both ways" (Lockhart & McCaskill 1986:166).

#### The Pragmatic Approach to Participatory Research

Critics of participatory research claim it is a methodology based upon ideals that remain inconsistent with the socio-political realities of practising applied social science (Conchelos & Kassam 1981; Vio Grossi 1981; Hedley 1986; Warry 1992). Some anthropologists and other social scientists who have adopted the participatory research paradigm and adapted it to different community-based research situations, have frequently had less-than-successful results.

These researchers argue that unless the concepts and character of participatory research are more precisely defined, it will remain prone to manipulation and co-optation by those in power: politicians, developers and academics may use the label to legitimate their own agendas (Hedley 1986; Warry 1992). Furthermore, until agreed upon criteria of participation are tested in practical research situations and are shown to enhance the relevance and usefulness of research results toward the achievement of peoples' self-determination, the concept of participation in research (or in development) will itself be in danger of becoming a "new fetish" (Rahnema 1990:222).<sup>2</sup> Because participatory research is at risk of becoming a label of **expediency**, there a need to redefine it in more **pragmatic** terms.

David Campbell (1987) draws a distinction between those who approach participatory research from a "pragmatic" viewpoint, versus those, as discussed above, who emphasize it as a method of "liberation." He states: "The pragmatic view allows that the form of [participatory research] will adapt to

---

<sup>2</sup> Rahnema's critique will be elaborated on in Chapter Five. For the moment it is sufficient to indicate that Rahnema is critical of intervention of any sort on the grounds that nothing is innocent, a-political, or a-ideological. He is likely the harshest critic of participatory research activists, saying that the "belief in their science is so strong that whenever the theory fails to corroborate a fact, they question the fact rather than the theory" (Rahnema 1990:206).

specific contexts in order to develop concrete actions to deal with local problems" (Campbell 1987:160). Drawing upon his experience in two projects, Campbell concludes that successful participatory research depends upon a variety of local circumstances outside the control of its ideal methodology. According to Campbell, a researchers' commitment to participation is, by itself, illusory: "Without the acceptance and involvement of a community, such an approach to research, while well-meaning, will only serve to reinforce the domination and manipulation of people..." (*ibid.*:165; cf. Krefetz & Goodman 1973; Vio Grossi 1981). A pragmatic approach to participatory research assumes that there are varying levels of exchange and power in any given research situation, no matter how noble the ideals upon which its methodology is based (cf. Hessler, et al. 1979).

The implication is that successful research is a reciprocal process. This is shown to be particularly true in the research contexts of Native communities in the Canadian North, where reciprocity is a cultural expectation, and power-exchange relationships are a political constant (Brizinski 1989). In fact, as will be discussed later, Native groups are now demanding this reciprocity if they are to participate at all in research initiated by, or involving, southern scientists. In this sense, participatory research is both consistent with, and offers a means by which to further the

goals of applied anthropological work generally, and in the Canadian North specifically.

A variety of case studies serve to support and/or critique participatory and community-based ideals as the basis of a viable, pragmatic approach to research. My primary interest here is with northern research practice in Canada, although a variety of published case studies of participatory research projects exist for third world areas and in regions of the U.S.A.<sup>3</sup>

Those case studies that support the theories of participatory research generally conclude that the methodology: 1) bridges the communication gap between 'scientists' and 'the community'; 2) promotes more culturally-appropriate research which is, therefore, more relevant to meeting the needs of the community, and/or; 3) enhances self-determination by lending greater local control over research and development.

In Canada, the majority of published case studies of community-based research have come out of applied projects in Native communities (eg., Jackson, et al. 1982). Hudson (1982) and Castellano (1986) each document the role participatory

---

<sup>3</sup> Examples include: Swantz 1975 (Villagization program in Tanzania); Campbell 1987 (Development project among the Masai in Kenya); Gaventa & Horton 1981 (Land-ownership issues in Appalachia); Nalven 1987 (Illegal alien study in San Diego); Turner 1987 (Development on a Paiute Reserve); Barger & Reza 1989 (Farm Labour Movement in California).



research played in generating Native "collective analysis" and "collective wisdom" toward the resolution of employment needs and family and child welfare issues respectively. The use of a community-based methodology in evaluating a socio-economic development program with the North Coast Tribal Council led Lockhart to conclude that participatory research -- as an educational process -- is one step toward "many different resolution attempts resulting in the emergence of a whole new collective consciousness of what causes problems and what represents solutions" (Lockhart 1982:168). Likewise, a collaborative project between the University of Windsor and the Walpole Island Indian Reserve demonstrates that a community-based research unit enhanced local control over the research process, while at the same time harnessed university expertise in a non-hierarchical way "to further the objective of self-determination" (Hedley 1986:100). Similar results have been reported by Warray (1990) with regard to Native health projects in Ontario. Rees (1986) also advocates a role for the university in promoting self-determination via a community-based research process as demonstrated in the "Dene Gondie" study, a collaboration between the University of British Columbia and the Dene Nation.

Several archaeologists working in the Northwest Territories have adopted a community-based methodology in response to heavy criticism and strict limitations placed upon

them by Inuit communities. In some cases, proposals to conduct archaeological work, especially at or near Inuit burial sites, have been rejected outright (p.c. Anne Keenleyside, March 1993). Thus, for archaeologists and physical anthropologists to conduct research in the Arctic, developing more acceptable methods is an expedient concern.<sup>4</sup> For example, Bielawski (1984) seriously considers the "social context" of her research to include how the process and results are relevant to and involved in the community. Likewise, Rigby and Stenton (1992) view community-based approaches to archaeological projects as vital to the current political and cultural concerns of Inuit in the Eastern Arctic town of Iqaluit. In both cases, increased local participation in and control over the research helped to resolve residents' suspicious and negative attitudes toward research in general, and archaeological research in particular. In each case study, the educative value of the research process was both explicit and integral to the projects.

While comparatively more case studies have been written to support the theoretical basis of participatory research, several also exist to criticize the methodology. In

---

<sup>4</sup> The Nunavut Agreement (1992) devotes an entire Article (23) to Archaeology, detailing strict procedures for approval of project proposals, excavation permits, artifact removal, interpretation and preservation, and participation by Inuit organizations and individuals in conducting archaeological work.

general, these find that: 1) success depends upon careful planning plus a variety of special social and political circumstances; 2) the approach is highly prone to manipulation by different interest groups, or; 3) community participation is not always guaranteed (cf. Vio Grossi 1981; Campbell 1987; Gaventa & Horton 1982). Furthermore, there exists a danger in participatory research whereby practitioners, "create an illusion of community-spawned research when, in fact, social activists or activist academics generate the research problem from their own experience or interest" (Gaventa & Horton 1982:37; cf. Light & Kleiber 1981). Projects have been manipulated in the name of the people to justify academic efforts that did not necessarily arise from the needs of the people. This scenario points to a tension between academic and applied goals of research, and the potential difficulty when a researcher, as in my case, attempts applied work for dissertation purposes (see Chapters One and Seven).

For example, in the Walpole Island case study cited above, Hedley illustrates the volatile nature of community-based research that is dependent on the financial support gained from contracts with the federal government. Control over the research unit was not, in the end, held by the Native Band Council, but rather by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) who, as client, retained the ultimate power of determination (Hedley 1986:98). Warry's case

study of participatory research regarding the Aboriginal Health Transfer Policy with the North Shore Tribal Council showed that, "community involvement in the research process did not translate into widespread interest in the health transfer initiative" (Warry 1992:158). He attributes this failure to time and policy constraints, as well as a lack of community development in research and analytic skills. Price (1991) also finds that education and training for native participants are crucial components in community-based research if it is to be a pathway to self-determination.

Consequently, a commitment to the participatory paradigm causes anthropologists not to discard, but to expand their ethnographic approach and their use of the method of participant observation. Methodologically the 'subject' is included as a valid participant, observer, and interpreter of their situation: the presentation of cultural meaning is a result of a dialogic and communicative process.<sup>5</sup> The participant observation method is widely applicable in that it can be 'transferred' and conducted by trained host-community

---

<sup>5</sup> Lawrence Salmen (1987) argues convincingly for the use of participant observation in development evaluations because of its capacity to provide both quantitative outcome and qualitative environment of a project. However, he does not go so far as to include beneficiaries as full participants in evaluation planning and research. Rather, he sees the participant observation method as important to the provision of information to administrators who are trying to help 'others', as opposed to those 'others' empowered to help themselves.

residents. Conventionally, participant observation is a method that refers primarily to the researcher's degree of participation in a community. It is the anthropologist who ultimately controls the level of participation in the research, although this level can certainly be influenced by the character of the community. Participatory research, on the other hand, causes anthropologists to seriously and explicitly consider community control over participation in the research.

Having considered the political and methodological response to participatory research by social science researchers, I turn now to contextual issues that also bear upon pragmatic issues of research in the Canadian North. I pay particular attention to previous government research policies as they affect current Inuit responses to research in their communities.

#### Research Practice and Policy in Northern Communities

In 1983 a Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Task Force reported that in Canada, most publicly funded northern research had been focused on land claim issues, native cultural development, departmental policy and program evaluation. Relatively little funding was available "for development research or for research on priorities determined by native people themselves" (SSHRC 1983:8). Brizinski (1989) notes that because universities are responsible for training northern specialists, federal funds

for research in the North are generally channelled through universities in the south. Previously, university-based researchers have acted independently and tended to have little concern about community members actively participating in the research. Residents' response to research methods have been taken seriously only to the extent that it affects or contributes to immediate interaction between data collectors and informants. Furthermore, universities have had no "watch-dog mechanism" to ensure or encourage students or faculty researchers to send copies of results back to the people with whom they work (Kurelek 1992:109). Hence, native leaders and educators continue to assert that most university-based northern research is biased toward academic needs of teaching and publications (Brizinski 1989:262). It is in this sense that northerners consider research as a colonial activity.

*Canada and Polar Science*, a report designed to advise the federal government on the need for a new national polar institute, is, in part, a response to the decline in federal support for polar science and research since the early 1970s (Adams, et al. 1987). This decline is associated with a move away from long-term, sustained research and systematic data gathering, and a move toward urgent short-term policy and political problems associated with non-renewable resource development or surveillance for defence (*ibid*:vi; Brizinski 1989). As will be seen in Chapter Five, this short-term policy

of research activity is familiar to northerners who also witnessed policies that allowed boom and bust resource development in the Arctic.

The other main avenue of research sponsorship in the North has been for private industrial or development purposes, the majority of which is based in the south (SSHRC 1983; Adams, et al. 1987). This was especially true during the oil and gas exploration and development boom during the 1970s (Brizinski 1989:150). As well, research in arctic Canada is unique to the extent that priorities are determined by public interest groups in the south who are prepared to take political or public action on behalf of the North. These are groups with a basically intellectual or emotional stake in the outcome, motivated by "a feeling that the few inhabitants of the North are relatively powerless to speak for their large land and vulnerable to exploitation, a feeling that short-sighted policies will cause or have caused environmental and cultural damage in the rest of the country, and that the North provides a last opportunity to do it right" (Adams, et al. 1987:35). In sum, research has historically been directed toward meeting objectives defined by individuals and agencies outside northern communities, and generally lacked applicability to local needs (SSHRC 1983; Bielawski 1984; Adams et al. 1987; Brizinski 1989; Rigby & Stenton 1992).

This problem is exacerbated by a serious lack of

coordination among researchers working in the North. Northern research lacks coherent, relevant, or collective qualities. For this reason, Native groups complain of being "studied to death" by what they view as overlapping and repetitive topics of study (Lange 1987; Adams, et al. 1987:53; Brizinski 1989:256). During my own period of field-research, several territorial officials and local people asked why researchers were so poor at communicating with each other, and why the same questions were asked over and over again. While many arctic researchers, including myself, are frustrated with the problem of poor co-ordination and have heard northerners' demands for personal accountability and responsibility, there remains a certain feeling of powerlessness among researchers to solve the problem.

This is despite the fact that since 1974, GNWT has legislated scientists to obtain permission from communities as a pre-requisite to licensing, in an attempt to encourage the latter to more closely monitor research activities in their local area. However, academics have mixed reactions over GNWT's policies, arguing that native northerners should not justify science unless they can make an informed decision. They refer to the tendency of Hamlet Councils to 'rubber-stamp' permission letters to researchers. For instance, I was told by Councillors in Pangnirtung that their rejection of a researcher usually led to an inquiry by GNWT who would often



override the local Council's decision. Academics also point a finger at the inequity of GNWT's licensing regulation which does not strictly apply to government-sponsored researchers. Arguments have also been made that licensing is an unenforceable form of regulation. In 1985, for example, a student researcher wanting to conduct a tourism survey in Pangnirtung was denied permission by the Hamlet Council, on the advice of the local Tourism Committee that a similar study had been completed that spring. Regardless, the student flew to Pangnirtung and after "lengthy discussion" the Council approved his study "because he was already (t)here" (Pangnirtung Tourism Committee Minutes, July 1985).

Incidents like this, added to years of watching northern research serve southern needs, have caused Native groups throughout Canada to demand greater involvement in research conducted in their communities (SSHRC 1983).<sup>6</sup> Brizinski documents the rapid increase in Native organizations' involvement in research activities in the Northwest Territories since the mid-1970s, when non-renewable resource development prompted Native groups to sponsor studies

---

<sup>6</sup> Twenty years ago, for example, Efrat & Mitchell report that Native communities in British Columbia insisted upon "contractual arrangements" between anthropologists and band councils in order that research be conducted "under terms more explicitly favourable to the native peoples" (1974:405). As will be discussed in Chapter Seven, this type of demand has implications for future Ph.D. research.

that would back their political and economic interests. Most significantly, she concludes that Native organizations "have been among the strongest critics of the conduct and utilization of much northern research, and they have sought involvement in revising research methods and context" (Brizinski 1989:151).

While Brizinski's discussion will not be repeated here, an overview of responses to research by Inuit groups will lend an historical context to the research project Andrew and I conducted. Organizations like the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (ITC) and the former Tungavik Federation of Nunavut (TFN)<sup>7</sup> have published official statements on research, in view of apathetic, resentful, and/or hostile attitudes toward research in Inuit communities (cf. Adams, et al. 1987; Brizinski 1989). ITC has been the most forceful in detailing their criticisms of previous research, and in their recommendations for a new "cooperative/partnership" model of research in the Arctic:

(I)t is ITC's position that an entirely new approach to research in the north must be developed... (T)he concept of **cooperative research** is a step towards readdressing the present situation. [...] A fundamental principle of cooperative research is that the work must be meaningful and relevant to local groups, and that the work will contribute to the

---

<sup>7</sup> Since the ratification and legislation of the Nunavut Land Claim Agreement in May 1993, TFN has changed its name to Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. (NTI), to reflect its shift from a negotiating body, to an implementation body.

development of the region or community by seeking to address local research and informational needs. Cooperative research implies a willingness within the mainstream scientific community to work within a framework that includes traditional knowledge, skills, and expertise, and which allows for perspectives and approaches to a problem that are not always going to be consistent with their own training and experience (in Lange 1987:43, my emphasis).

ITC's commitment to cooperative research is as much about process as it is about the informational needs of Inuit communities. They address the view of research history in the North as an expedient exercise conducive to the careers of southern academics or to the agendas of central governments, and they propose a pragmatic model that considers the causes, effects, and practical lessons embedded in that history of research.

The Baffin Divisional Board of Education, Baffin Regional Inuit Association and the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation have each expressed similar concerns, agreeing to only cooperate with applied research which relates to their own informational needs, and which promotes local skill development (in Lange 1987). The Tungavik Federation of Nunavut expressed disappointment at "the lack of research support from Canadian universities for research of interest to them" and has called attention to the "desirability of research done by academics in cooperation with Native

organizations" (Ibid:66).<sup>8</sup>

The message from Inuit organizations is corroborated in *Canada and Polar Science*; the Working Group on this study concludes that:

Northern Canadian, particularly northern aboriginal people, are alienated from and resentful of much of the polar research that has been and continues to be conducted in northern Canada. The contribution of the polar research community to the resolution of the problems of northern society is insufficient and there is little sense of accountability to northerners by those supporting science or setting its priorities. Although research in the social and human sciences is belatedly increasing, many northern residents remain suspicious of studies in which they are objects and not participants (Adams, et al. 1987:ix-x).

To this end, the Working Group recommends that federal policies on polar research adopt new priorities to support northern-based and indigenous research institutes, and to increase financial and other support for the effective participation of northerners in national institutions concerned with polar research. However, national and territorial Native organizations remain critical of the lack of native representation in, for example, the Science Institute of the Northwest Territories (SINT), which, they claim, disables it from effectively promoting relevant

---

<sup>8</sup> Makivik, an Inuit development corporation that resulted from the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement (JBNQA), has in a sense "institutionalized" this concept of cooperative research by creating a research unit located in the Northern Quebec Inuit regional community, with a branch office in Montreal (Kemp 1986).

research priorities (in Lange 1987:24).<sup>9</sup>

Inuit and non-Inuit criticize the SINT for failing to coordinate, regulate, and monitor the activities of researchers. Some accuse the SINT of not fulfilling their mandate to encourage and ensure quality research in the Arctic. On the other hand, the administrator of the SINT Research Centre in Iqaluit states that generating community participation or interest in the centre is difficult, although weekly radio shows attempt to arbitrate and communicate scientific and local/Native opinion (p.c. June 1992). Nevertheless, local residents tend to consider the Research Centre as merely a transit rest-stop for southern researchers on their way to archaeological field-sites or to other Baffin communities. To a large extent, this is an accurate perception.

Some Inuit organizations are no longer willing to offer time or permission to student researchers, by whom northerners feel exploited and excluded from the research process. Most importantly, Inuit organizations agree on the

---

<sup>9</sup> In 1987, just after the SINT was formed as a Territorial institution, the TFN notes that, "(we) have not received any communication from the new Science Institute of the Northwest Territories at all"; they question, "what clientele the Institute sees itself as serving" (in Lange 1987:67). Since then, Native groups have gained representation in bodies like the SINT, but have remained far from being in a position to challenge the dispersement of funds from sponsoring agencies (Brizinski 1989:296).

importance of communicating the results of research to the community; they point to the dearth of research reports returned, in relation to the number of researchers received into their communities. Furthermore, those few reports that are sent back are not translated into Inuktitut, and hence, fail to communicate knowledge back to the people who offered it. Consequently, Inuit now demand not only a copy of the product, but that they should comprehend the product's contents and purpose (cf. Brizinski 1989:248).

Lange's report indicates that a committed researcher is obligated to return and personalize the findings to the community. Native accessibility to research knowledge is crucial to community-based research: lack of feedback can negate the rapport and communication built during the participatory research process itself. Furthermore, returning findings to an aboriginal community may mean that results will have to be translated not only into their language, but also into a medium that is meaningful to them. This was evident in Pangnirtung where people were unwilling or unable to read what they considered "a long" written report, despite the fact that it was translated into Inuktitut syllabics. To accommodate this view, we held a community radio show and gave oral presentations of the results during various meetings with local groups such as the Elders and the Tourism Committee.

Many Native groups hold the opinion that non-literary

forms of research results would be better than written reports (Brizinski 1989:250). In a culture where the written word generally does not get the message across, other media -- videos, for example -- need to be considered. This is especially vital with regard to applied research and critical ethnography: as Thomas suggests, "research is a communication enterprise, and our guiding principle should be one of finding ways to communicate what we feel is important in a language understandable to our audience" (1993:66).<sup>10</sup>

The fundamental message from Inuit groups is their demand for "far greater self-determination" with regard to research in the North, "in a relationship of equal partnership" (Lange 1987:6). The Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (TFN & DIAND 1993) contains a provision whereby Inuit should participate effectively at all levels and in all parts of research. This includes research proposal approval and rejection, granting of permits, and priority in employment with regard to wildlife (Article 5.2.37), social and cultural

---

<sup>10</sup> In fact, during another project in Pangnirtung a year later, we tried to communicate research findings by producing a video that included footage from interviews along with a narration (in Inuktitut) of the research results. The idea for a video to replace a written report was suggested by the Mayor as a more effective way to get the message across to local people. The video-project was enthusiastically supported by the other research participants, but due to technical and personnel problems, the video has, to date, not been completed. Consequently, I have no basis on which to judge the communication-success of such a medium.

issues (Article 32.3.3), archaeology (Article 33) and development socio-economic impact reviews (Article 12). For Inuit, at least two kinds of benefit accrue from increased control over northern research: 1) greater economic benefit, either directly through employment in projects or indirectly through the application of findings to the local economy, and; 2) social and educational benefits through exerting an influence on the knowledge obtained and basing decisions on that knowledge, and in learning to generate relevant and understandable information about their institutions and culture (Adams, et al. 1987:44). They agree that control over research includes a concern for training Inuit young people and for the integration of indigenous and scientific knowledge (Higgins 1986; Kemp 1986; Lange 1987). These are vital policy and theoretical concerns shared by a pragmatic approach to the participatory methodology of research.

#### Measuring Community Participation in Evaluation Research

The type of research Andrew and I conducted was essentially "accountability evaluation" research that sought to assess the effectiveness of community-based development policies and programs in an Eastern Arctic community (Rossi & Berk 1981:294). I distinguish evaluation research from action or problem-oriented research in two ways: 1) it does not aim to intervene *per se*, but rather to identify and summarize past interventions, and then to analytically relate these to what



is presently occurring within a community, and; 2) it is directed at the measurement of processes and outcomes of a program or project, as opposed to the solution of a pre-determined problem.

This distinction is important because groups with a stake in the Pangnirtung tourism evaluation chose to distance themselves from the research process in the interest of objectivity. Members of both the community and the government openly stated they would participate only to the extent that they would not jeopardize an open and honest evaluation of all aspects of the pilot-project. Had the research been action or problem-oriented, stakeholders may have chosen to participate more actively to control the process and the outcome. This implies that evaluation research may logically be unable to fulfil the ideal requirements of participatory research. On the other hand, recent approaches to evaluation research -- the "stakeholder" model, for example (see below) -- rely on a principle of multiple (subjective) perspectives that require a level of participation greater than that used in conventional evaluation research.

A truly participatory process was hindered at the outset, due to three factors during the evaluation planning phase: 1) as a Ph.D. candidate, I initiated the research problem and negotiations, motivated primarily by the expediency of my academic interests and requirements; 2) the

GNWT Department of Economic Development and Tourism was a necessary partner politically in terms of their high profile in developing tourism in the community, and financially in terms of support for the local co-researcher, and; 3) although we had hoped that the Panguit Tourism Committee (PTC) would act as a 'local research committee' to participate in what they saw to be important and relevant tourism research, the PTC was inactive during the data-collection stages. Hence, the Hamlet Council of Panguit took responsibility in supporting the evaluation project, but they were reluctant to take a leadership role in the process.

In contrast to the planning stages, the evaluation implementation process in Panguit took on more of a participatory character. Once I was in Panguit working together with Andrew, the research design was oriented toward community needs, perspectives, and character. Our openly community-oriented bias guided what questions we asked, how we asked them, and who we selected for interviews, group discussions, and consultation about the research process.<sup>11</sup> Most importantly, Andrew administered the research process to include the advice and leadership of the elders, as well as the Hamlet Council and other relevant local committees. In

---

<sup>11</sup> During our feedback interviews, two individuals -- one a local Inuk and the other an ED&T official -- stated that this bias favouring the community compromised the objectivity of the report.

this way, the research was generally seen by community residents as both sanctioned and legitimate, if not important.

Informally, local leaders in the Hamlet Council and other committees -- the Outfitters Association, for example -- involved themselves by recommending areas of concern that needed to be researched. These individuals constituted only about 1% of the local population. If I were to label the numerous interviews we conducted as informal participation, the level of community representation would reach approximately 10%. However, neither of these latter two means of informal participation necessarily involved or led to local control over the research process. Rather, they served to increase community awareness of research generally, and of the tourism evaluation specifically. To the extent that community participation at the proposal stage was limited to the Council's approval -- as with any other type of research -- this research process poses questions of "pseudo-participation" or "symbolic" participation (Uphoff 1985:369; Krefetz & Goodman 1973:373). I suspect that the community's lack of involvement at the "front end" of the evaluation, seriously limited its full success as a participatory research project (Greene 1988:102).

In the view of Rossi and Berk: "Virtually all evaluation research begins with one or more policy questions in search of relevant answers" (1981:287). In our case, the

research was to provide an instrument for cost/benefit accountability, policy analysis and future development planning by government, regional and community leaders. The research took place in a context of existing economic policy and programs in which Andrew and I were required to evaluate: a) whether GNWT policy was appropriate, and; b) whether the program was achieving its intended effects.<sup>12</sup>

Some social scientists take the stance that evaluation is an integral and necessary part of any social planning process: it attempts to determine if a program is meeting the goals set out in its plans by stressing the relationship between cause and effect (Karapin 1986; Heighton & Heighton 1987; Nas, et al. 1987). However, there are also social scientists who are critical of evaluation research on the grounds that it is often low in scientific quality, with a tendency to be a-theoretical (Karapin 1986; Lawrence 1989). Furthermore, because it is usually commissioned and paid for by government, evaluation research has gained a reputation of expediency, used to justify governments' policies and legislation, or as a "substitute, rather than a prelude to,

---

<sup>12</sup> This is in contrast to the initial research into community-based tourism development in 1980 by Marshall Macklin Monaghan, in which the evaluative context was one of policy and program formation. At that time, GNWT administrators needed information that would change development policy and programs to be more relevant to the economic problems unique to Baffin communities.

decisive action" (Cassidy 1991:138).

To some extent, evaluations are under-utilized due to existing power structures that reject or restrict research results because of their politically dangerous critiques of government goals and agendas, or because they 'offend' a small group of powerful bureaucrats. This has been a source of "serious discontent" among Canadian academics conducting applied research in the North, particularly in the 1960s and '70s (Brizinski 1989:265-66). The under-utilization of evaluation research, as with other forms of applied social science research, continues to be a major issue. The ineffectiveness of evaluation research is blamed mainly on poor levels of communication and bases of understanding between administrators and social science researchers (Karapin 1986). I would argue that this blame extends also to researchers' poor communication with representatives of the local community under evaluation, and to researchers' neglect of how local and administrative people can participate in project evaluations (cf. Cohen & Uphoff 1980).

For example, Canadian researchers engaged in northern science have, to a large extent, remained isolated from the evolving political, economic, and social context in which they work. While this is true more so in the case of natural scientists, many social scientists are also included in the general unwillingness or inability to relate their academic

studies to the research needs of government, industry and northern aboriginal society (cf. Weaver 1985; Hinshaw 1980). At the same time, senior decision-makers in both the public and private sector possess little knowledge of what and how research results can be used to serve their needs (Adams, et al. 1987:52). It appears that social researchers and evaluators suffer from what Sansom describes as the "inverse responsibility and distance principle" and that unless we begin to "mediate" a discourse between interest groups, we will fail in our social responsibilities (Sansom 1985:9-12).

Consequently, there is a call to find ways of increasing the relevance of evaluations (Lawrence 1989). Several social science evaluators argue for an alternative "anti-scientific" paradigm of evaluation research that shares many of the educative and empowering values held by participatory research (Parlett 1981; Mark & Shotland 1985; Greene 1988; Guba & Lincoln 1989; Lawrence 1989; Lee & Shute 1991). Coined the "stakeholders approach," these evaluators advocate the need to incorporate the interests of multiple groups who have a "stake" in the results of an evaluation. In Pangnirtung, these included groups whose lives were affected by the tourism development program -- eg., outfitters, arts and crafts producers, local and outside tour operators, hotel management, and visitor centre staff -- and those whose decisions affected the future of tourism in the community --

eg., GNWT ED&T, Hamlet Council, and the Tourism Committee.

In general, evaluators list three rationales for involving stakeholders in an evaluation: 1) utilization - participation in planning relevant questions for evaluation leads to a commitment to its results; 2) accurate representation of the pluralistic decision-making process that generally involves multiple groups, and; 3) empowerment - less powerful stakeholders are given "voice" (Mark & Shotland 1985).<sup>13</sup> Ongoing communication and dialogue is important to this participatory process, in order to provide full access and potential control over the data. For applied anthropologists, the method of participant observation is again logical to this approach to evaluation, particularly in developing regions where the quantitative data base may be poor and the need for cultural, contextual understanding is great (Salmen 1987:8).

Although the stakeholders evaluation model is criticized for recommending ambiguous solutions, it is useful when applied to a research situation like the one in which

---

<sup>13</sup> Mark & Shotland also point out a problem of "pseudoempowerment" not unlike the problem of manipulation discussed earlier with regard to participatory research. They describe some researchers' attempts to ward off potential criticism by co-opting would-be critics in the evaluation. This results in a reduction of power, rather than empowerment. In this way, the powerful sponsors of the evaluation can appease the less powerful by giving the appearance of control without relinquishing any actual power.

Andrew and I were involved.<sup>14</sup> In our case, the sponsoring client (GNWT-ED&T), as well as community leaders were more interested in a summary of conclusions about development policy, then they were about concrete recommendations. In fact, we were advised at the outset not to venture a set of recommendations, but rather to provide the evaluative data necessary for government and the community to direct their own changes.<sup>15</sup> Hence, the ethnographic approach we took to the evaluation is effective in determining the nature of tourism development and its benefits to the people of Pangnirtung, as well as the context and processes involved in the successes and failures of that development (cf. Rossi & Berk 1981; Salmen 1987).

Approximately two months after the public report was released, Andrew and I returned to as many key consultants as possible to obtain feedback and to allow them an opportunity to voice their opinions and ask questions. The fact that our report deliberately avoids making outright recommendations was generally seen as an appropriate approach. Although the report

---

<sup>14</sup> We followed the stakeholders approach somewhat unwittingly; at the time of field-work, neither Andrew nor I were aware of the term or of the literature dealing with this model.

<sup>15</sup> A critical question that follows is to what extent this approach in fact led to increased power within the community to direct its own changes. This will be examined in Chapters Three and Seven.



does not outline a process whereby interest-groups can come together to discuss issues and work toward solutions, most did not see this as a shortcoming. Many respondents stated that this was not the responsibility of the authors, but of the stakeholding individuals and groups. Several people with previous experience in reading consultant reports filled with recommendations, were disappointed that these "sat on a shelf" never again to be considered. On these grounds, they preferred a resource document that could continue to provide the basis for self-initiated recommendations. However, at least three people were of the opinion that the report fell short of providing strong and clear statements that could lead to implementation by either local or regional bodies.

The evaluation report evolved out of what Guba & Lincoln (1989) call a "responsive constructivist" research experience which recognized that stakeholders held different "social constructions of reality". Also known as "illuminative evaluation," this approach emphasizes negotiation and exploration between researcher and stakeholders to "capture a recognizable reality" (Parlett 1981:224). Hence, the Case Study is essentially a presentation of different perceptions of the tourism development reality as constructed by local,

regional, and territorial participants.<sup>16</sup>

The "dialogues" at the end of each chapter in the public report exemplify these constructions.<sup>17</sup> Interestingly, the dialogues in our report received both the most negative and the most positive reactions, which in turn serves to demonstrate some important distinctions between stakeholders. From a negative point of view, government officials and *Qallunaat* (non-Inuit) business-people felt uncomfortable about being quoted *verbatim*. They accused us of being too "journalistic," and they felt that more editorial comments are needed to balance what they considered "extreme" quotations. On the other hand, it was primarily local Inuit respondents who viewed the dialogues as a unique and refreshingly "blunt" way to present issues, that they felt should no longer be "swept under the rug" (eg., p.c. June 22, 1992). In their opinion, the dialogues are one of the most valuable aspects of the report. From our point of view, the dialogues were one

---

<sup>16</sup> Most stakeholders welcomed the report's issue-oriented format because it offers a means by which to understand the different perceptions and positions held by the other interest groups.

<sup>17</sup> Lee & Shute (1991) employ a similar technique in their evaluation of a WUSC (World University Services of Canada) project in Mali, West Africa. Through interview-discussions they created "verbal images" -- a series of quotations in a sequence that reflect the main issues as experienced and expressed by different participants (*Ibid*:257; cf. Richards 1982). Unlike our dialogues, however, Lee & Shute's verbal images were discussed and agreed upon by participants before they were finalized in print.

means of incorporating 'voice' into the written evaluation, in a way that they had to be taken at face value. Although Andrew and I did not expect such contentious reactions, we did both recognize that differences of opinion among participants were more remarkable when seen side by side on the same page, as presented in the dialogues.

The stakeholders approach Andrew and I took to the research and the evaluation report, is effective at least to some degree.<sup>18</sup> While this is discussed in greater detail in Chapter Three, I will point out several relevant factors here. I believe that the fact we attended to the goals which different groups held for the tourism evaluation, and that we returned to the key participants for feedback on the report, caused stakeholders to more seriously consider how the findings could be useful toward particular ends.<sup>19</sup> Meeting with stakeholders before data collection allowed them the opportunity to contribute to what "indices of change" would be

---

<sup>18</sup> There do not appear to exist any systematic studies that compare the extent of effectiveness or utilization of evaluation findings between studies that involve stakeholder participation and those that did not. However, critical commentaries on specific studies speculate that it would have been beneficial (eg., Mark & Shotland 1985; Lawrence 1989; Richards 1982; Light & Klieber 1981; Greene 1988; Lee & Shute 1991).

<sup>19</sup> See: "A Supplement to Community Based Tourism Development in Pangnirtung, NWT: Looking Back and Looking Ahead -- Summary of Responses to the Public Report" by Gwen Reimer, Field Report (Unpublished) July 1992.

most useful (cf. Salmen 1987:5). Meeting with them again after the evaluation report was released compelled them to first read the report, and then to comment on its usefulness toward implementing change. In this way, applied researchers may be able to increase the 'utilization value' of their evaluations (cf. Freeman 1977).

One of the pragmatic advantages of stakeholder participation is in addressing historical and cultural issues that might affect how evaluation research should be conducted in developing areas. Lawrence (1989) reports that aid recipients in Africa and Asia generally hold a negative attitude toward program evaluation because it is perceived as a threat to the continuation of aid. In Pagnirtung, I confronted a local fear that the final report would paint the community in a negative light, and which might then fall into the hands of Greenpeace or other animal rights organizations; discourage tourists from visiting the community, or; cause government to withdraw funds. In this instance, we solicited community participation and communication to help create "a collaborative atmosphere in a cooperative endeavour" (Lawrence 1989:255).

Contrary to some writings on participatory research (eg., Maguire 1987), and based on historical accounts of research in the north, together with the research experience

in Pangnirtung as documented here, I contend that one cannot measure the failure or success of a project solely upon an achieved (or hoped for) level of local participation within the 'subject' community. For an anthropologist, the use of such a singular criterion is troublesome because it ignores the ways in which the concept of participation is, or is not appropriate to the historical and cultural context in which it is supposed to operate.<sup>20</sup>

The colonial character of both research and development has fed derogatory and suspicious attitudes toward researchers who are often government sponsored, and if not, are viewed as such by local residents.<sup>21</sup> Consequently, developing the climate necessary for an authentic participatory research process poses a difficult problem, one primarily of attitudes (Bielawski 1986). In the following chapter I discuss how these attitudes are obstacles that Andrew and I worked to overcome in promoting participation in the tourism development evaluation research project.

---

<sup>20</sup> Nor does it pay attention to how participatory research might reinforce cultural identity (cf. Rigby & Stenton 1992; Warry 1990; Brizinski 1989). Hence, participation risks becoming an end in itself, rather than a means toward self-determination. In Chapter Three, I more carefully consider this pitfall in an analysis of the cultural meaning of community-based research as it unfolded in Pangnirtung.

<sup>21</sup> People in Pangnirtung continually asked if, or assumed that, I was doing research for the government.

### CHAPTER 3

#### PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH IN PANGNIRTUNG

This chapter deals with relevant political, social and cultural aspects of the tourism evaluation research project, as a participatory process that occurred at two levels. At a micro-level, I consider the co-researcher relationship in which Andrew Dialla represented the focal point of community participation in Pangnirtung. Then, at a broader level, I analyze how participation in the research process was affected by the local, regional and territorial socio-political context in which we conducted the evaluation. At that same contextual level, I also discuss the degree to which our goals of community participation in cooperative research were culturally appropriate and potentially an enhancement of Inuit self-determination. I conclude this chapter by situating our participatory effort, and current local attitudes toward research, into the historical context of previous research

practice in Pagnirtung.<sup>1</sup>

The field-data on the participatory research process presented in this chapter was collected partly in conjunction with, but also separate from the data-collection on tourism development in Pagnirtung. For example, Andrew and I concluded almost every interview by asking individuals what they expected from the evaluation research on tourism, and what they thought about the way in which we were conducting the research. I also kept journal notes from informal conversations and from public events that inadvertently commented in some way upon our research in particular, or upon previous research/researchers in the community. In addition, I was able to arrange for a fellow anthropologist to conduct formal and open-ended interviews with both Andrew and myself at about the mid-way point of our project. The transcripts and the brief evaluation that summarize these interviews are an insightful and valuable record of the research partnership that Andrew and I struggled to create and maintain (see

---

<sup>1</sup> While Andrew was the focus of community participation in the tourism evaluation project, he declined to participate in the final assessment of the research process as presented in this thesis. I submitted a draft copy of this chapter to Andrew in the Spring of 1993, but received no reply. When I spoke with him during a research visit to Pagnirtung in the Summer of 1993, Andrew commented that he thought the chapter was "fine", but declined further comment. My thought on the matter is that he had little time or interest to contribute to what he considered "my" thesis, of sole benefit to my career. This is in contrast to the tourism evaluation, which Andrew certainly viewed as relevant and important to his community.

Appendix II). Finally, data was obtained when, approximately two months after the final report was released, I returned to Iqaluit and Pangnirtung to listen to stakeholders' reactions and opinions to the report and to their view of our performance as co-researchers.

#### The Co-Researcher Relationship as a Participatory Process

The notion of "co-researchers" as introduced by Reason & Rowan, is defined as "a collaboration between 'researcher' and 'subjects' so that they may work together... and [that a true human inquiry] be intimately involved in the lives and praxis of these co-researchers" (1981:113). Our co-researcher relationship was less collective than implied in the quote above. Rather, the co-researcher relationship developed on a more individualized level: Andrew Dialla's role was in effect the focus of the participatory research process. Andrew's training period was brief, constrained primarily by what I perceived as a lack of time; it consisted of one afternoon where I explained the project's objectives and what our plan of action would be for the next few months. In retrospect, a more rigorous training period might have been more productive, but at the time I assumed that an "on-the-job" training approach would suffice. I also recall repeatedly stressing that Andrew was my 'partner' -- a co-researcher and not an interpreter.

Our co-researcher relationship was an educational



process that required Andrew and me to recognize and to resolve two basic problems. The first was in attempting to overcome a legacy of negative Inuit-White relations in the Arctic, a problem amplified by our distinct cultural differences regarding the concept and priorities of 'work.'<sup>2</sup> The second problem involved our differences of social and educational status and the effects this had on the relations of power in our daily interaction. The next few paragraphs elaborate on these basic issues as a function of the pragmatic participatory process. I include descriptions of how the community viewed each of us in our research roles, how people viewed us as a team, and how these community perceptions influenced the participatory process and our research relationship.

Several authors -- most notably Hugh Brody (1975) -- describe the Inuit/White relationship in the Arctic as

---

<sup>2</sup> At first I thought that some of our communication problems stemmed from the fact that we were a man and woman working together, each with our distinct cultural perspectives regarding gender relationships. In other words, I wondered if it was difficult for Andrew as an Inuk male to work for a (white) woman, or if perhaps he did not take me seriously as a 'professional' because I am a woman. Andrew rejected this explanation when we discussed the matter early on in the project, and upon reflection, I am inclined to agree with him. In fact, hiring a male co-researcher was intentional in that it allowed us a fuller range of social skills in conducting interviews -- Andrew spoke with men and I with women. Nevertheless, we recognized that our culturally different ideas about the male/female relationship sometimes, and inevitably, created unintentional barriers.

"colonial" wherein Inuit have been considered and made to feel subordinate to *Qallunaat* missionaries, traders, police, teachers, and others from the South who came to administer the North. This was particularly true after the camps were evacuated and most Inuit moved into larger settlements like Pagnirtung where, elders tell us, *Qallunaat* influences became more blatant and constant.<sup>3</sup> Tourist and research activities have further encouraged this presence and influence of southern culture in Pagnirtung.

An elder who worked for the Anglican Mission hospital since his early twenties, claimed that Inuit had a good working relationships with their *Qallunaat* "bosses"<sup>4</sup> :

In the Pagnirtung area the Inuit really welcomed the *Qallunaat*, so there was never any bad feelings between

---

<sup>3</sup> Elders in Pagnirtung today differentiate between the *Qallunaat* they knew in earlier years, from those they have known in more recent times. While several elders told stories of how, as young girls and boys, they were "scared" or "in awe" of *Qallunaat*, they also considered these earlier white residents more generous in times of need (p.c. December 9;17;20, 1991). Early White residents in the Arctic were necessarily more dependent on Inuit in terms of survival, which in one elder's view, caused *Qallunaat* to respect Inuit (p.c. December 13, 1991).

<sup>4</sup> In Inuktitut, the word for "boss" or "leader" is *isumataq* -- "one who thinks" (*isuma-* is the root verb for "think"). In some dialects, *angajuqqaq* (from the root noun for "parent") is used to specifically refer to a *Qallunaat* boss. This translation may linguistically shed new light on the history of paternalism in the Arctic (Mallon 1991:1.6). However, Wenzel (p.c. 1994) suggests that non-Inuit bosses are *angajuqqaq* in the way older siblings are, which is different from parents. Furthermore, to be *isumataq* connotes considerably more than genealogical superiority.

them and there has always been a very good working relationship between the Inuit and the Qallunaat. However, in other parts of the Baffin and the North, I have heard that this was not the case, that there were bad feelings towards the Qallunaat, but never around here. [...] In the old days, the Qallunaat were seen as the bosses. [...] Its not so bad now; in the old days, every Qallunaat was the boss, but not today. Its very different today (p.c. December 11, 1991).

While a number of administrative positions in Pangnirtung are now held by Inuit, white professionals continue to dominate top positions on the local economic, educational, and bureaucratic scene. In a practical sense, they continue to wield a considerable amount of power in community affairs, and from my observations, the White boss/Inuit worker relationship continues in fact, if not in attitude. This may be partly due to cultural values related to non-interference, whereby "a significant number of [Inuit] occasionally feel uncomfortable with making decisions that exert authority over other people" (Pauktuutit 1991:18). Certain positions that require a lot of decision making, and which directly affect other people, are likely to have a high turnover of Inuit personnel, or be staffed by non-Inuit. The high turnover rates in the Angmarlik Centre General Manager position and the difficulties the Lodge Manager faced in finding a local person to take over her position while on holiday, may be examples of this phenomenon (see the Case Study, Section 5.1).

Politically, however, most white professionals are subordinate to local or regional Inuit Councils. During my

year in Pangnirtung, for example, the high school principal was dismissed by recommendation of the Community Education Council and the Senior Administrative Officer was dismissed by decision of the Hamlet Council. While it appears that in some cases local Councils must first make recommendations to territorial bodies who authorize their decisions, community bodies have increasingly turned their advisory rights into decision-making capacities.

It was in this context that Andrew and I negotiated our co-researcher relationship. Although we struggled to practice as co-workers defined in terms of Andrew as the 'community expert' and myself as the 'agenda leader,' we frequently found ourselves digressing into the all too familiar worker/boss relationship with its historical and political ramifications. From the government's point of view, I was Andrew's supervisor responsible for such tasks as signing and submitting his pay-sheets. When, in November, Andrew was temporarily laid-off while ED&T renewed his 'casual labour' contract, I acted as his employer and paid his wages from personal research funds earmarked for interpreter fees. These somewhat mundane realities often made it difficult -- if not pretentious -- for Andrew and me to maintain a sense of equal partnership. Furthermore, it soon became obvious that we possessed divergent financial status that fit in well with the

stereotypical White/Inuit dichotomy of 'rich and 'poor.'<sup>5</sup> These factors reinforced the boss/employee aspect of our co-researcher relationship, both between ourselves, and in the eyes of most of the community.

In the community's view, particularly at the beginning of the project, Andrew was categorized as my interpreter and I as the chief investigator in yet one more research project.<sup>6</sup> This relationship was further complicated by the fact that the idea of a co-researcher relationship was new to the community, and people -- both Inuit and non-Inuit -- had difficulty understanding its exact nature. To fellow residents, Andrew's role in the research project was confusing at first, and framed in an historical reference of previous

---

<sup>5</sup> Andrew frequently came to me for advances on his pay or loans, and occasionally I 'forgave' the loans as gifts. Although he knew I was a student and hence not wealthy, he also knew that I always had some disposable income. (This is consistent with local attitudes towards resident whites and tourists.) That he had to come to me for cash was a frequent embarrassment to Andrew, but I willingly became part of his financial network that helped to support his immediate and extended family.

<sup>6</sup> This does not necessarily mean that working as an interpreter was an unimportant job. Language is critical and I was told that I could never really understand what Inuit thought unless I learned to speak Inuktitut. Good interpreters are highly respected and the credibility of research is judged locally by whether or not the interpreter is considered reliable. Unfortunately, many younger people have not retained enough of the Inuktitut language skills to fully understand terms and phrases used by elders (Pauktuutit 1991:13). A few elders, for example, doubted some of what had been written in the Kekerten Island study because they doubted the ability of the interpreter involved in that project.

research practice in the community (see below). Andrew stated:

It was difficult in the beginning to try to persuade people that I am part of this, that I am not just a translator which is usually the case when researchers are in town. Personally, I have had a really hard time explaining that I am not a token local. Surprisingly, the reaction has been positive all around, with the people I have spoken with (p.c. October 30, 1991).

Andrew himself was ambivalent about his status as co-researcher. In part, his ambivalence was due to my own failure to adequately train Andrew about the concept and expectation of a co-researcher partnership or about methods of research. My own familiarity with participatory concepts and with research methods caused me to assume that Andrew understood more than he could have. Furthermore, as Gow and Vansant point out, participatory arrangements by nature add elements of "ambiguity and lack of clarity about respective roles and responsibilities" (1983:437).

It was not until October that Andrew refrained from introducing himself as "Gwen's assistant" and referred to the project as "our" research. To my mind, this was a significant sign that Andrew was taking equal ownership of the tourism evaluation project. In retrospect, it also demonstrates an aspect of Freire's pedagogy whereby Andrew was learning to be more confident and assertive in the methods of research, and more aware of issues affecting his community. In this sense, **the co-researcher approach is an effective method in support of the participatory research premise that people are not**

"passive learners who require the input of knowledge or information from the outside" (Edwards 1989:128). As will be seen below, Andrew in turn persisted in subtly teaching me important lessons about the community, about Inuit culture, and about myself as an outsider looking in.

While he knew his role encompassed much more than interpreting, Andrew was quick to point out that in the eyes of other community members, he could not really "be" a researcher, since he had not received any formal training:

We tried to basically make each other the same. However, I have trouble with that because Gwen has been preparing this whole thing for a few years, and I just sort of tagged along at the tail end of it. [...] We tried to explain it to the community, but there is a problem with that because the community knows me, knows the work I have done in the past. They know I am no scientist or anthropologist. Then all of a sudden the next day he is a researcher? Yeah right! (December 13, 1991).

According to local perceptions, then, the fact that I was not only a *Qallunaaq* (non-Inuk), but also university educated, lent me, and not Andrew, the title of 'expert.' Andrew believed that most residents who did not have direct involvement in the project could see him as nothing other than 'Gwen's helper.' In the sense that being *Qallunaaq* and educated are co-incident to many Inuit minds, the colonial character of the research enterprise in the Arctic -- including the value of scientific over local knowledge, of academic over pragmatic wisdom -- is difficult to overcome.

Andrew frequently mentioned that he felt intimidated by my university background. Also, he was confused about how my status as a student coincided with my status as an applied researcher doing work for both the community and the government. Months into the project, it became clear that he was unsure of how my academic goals meshed with the goals of the tourism evaluation at hand, and had suspicions about what I would write once I returned to the university.<sup>7</sup>

In our daily tasks, the co-researcher relationship required that Andrew and I deal in very practical terms with our culturally different work ethics. On many occasions I was confused and frustrated over what I perceived as Andrew's unwillingness to work the hours required to get the job done. For example, in the first two months of the project, Andrew conducted approximately five of the thirty interviews with outfitters for which he had agreed to take responsibility. Throughout the project, Andrew was often late for, forgot, or failed to notify me of his inability to attend appointments, meetings, or interviews. According to my own standards and expectations, Andrew was slow to complete tasks, particularly written projects such as field-reports. To my mind, this

---

<sup>7</sup> I had greater specific knowledge of Andrew's experience than he knew of my training as a Ph.D student, or my academic requirements and expectations regarding the study. If I had it to do over again, I would incorporate a short, intensive phase of debriefing about the university training, background and programs of graduate students.



demonstrated either a lack of commitment to the research, or an incapacity to stick to a job. On the other hand, I recognized this type of behaviour as consistent with other local Inuit interpreters I had worked with previously.<sup>8</sup>

Andrew was surprised when I confronted him in September about the issue of his commitment to our work. In part, he saw the problem as a lack of direction, rooted in my own ideas about equal partnership:

I think that it would have worked better in some ways if Gwen had been more of a boss... if she took more control of the whole project. It seems enough to say that I am a researcher, but actually I am not. I am not a professional researcher. She seems reluctant to take charge, to point me in a certain direction. I know her whole point of having a co-researcher. However, I think it would have worked better for us -- because I started at the tail end -- if she had pushed me harder (December 13, 1991).

Andrew defined his commitment by doing his best to juggle his research responsibilities together with his ongoing social and cultural obligations to family and community. For example, when his brother needed him to help save his drifting boat during a storm, it was inappropriate for Andrew to refuse on the grounds that he had to "work." Likewise, because Andrew

---

<sup>8</sup> In Inuit society, people have the right to exercise a considerable amount of control over their lives by doing what they like without the need to inform others of their actions, or sudden changes of plans (Pauktuutit 1991:17). Hence, Inuit often feel uncomfortable with rigid work schedules and strict punctuality, a cultural trait that often creates misunderstanding and frustration for non-Inuit managers and employers.

was himself a boat-owner, he felt obliged to take family members fishing or berry picking when they asked. His election to the Education Council and then later to the Hamlet Council and the Co-op Board also compelled Andrew to frequently re-prioritize his time without notice. Part of our problem also stemmed from local people's poor understanding of what kind of work Andrew did, the outward appearance being that he and I simply 'talked' with people when we could. Coupled with generally apathetic attitudes toward research, local Inuit seemed less hesitant to make demands on Andrew's time than they were to an individual with a more recognizable type of full-time job.

Andrew demonstrated his commitment to the research when, for example, he cancelled his annual caribou hunting trip with his sister's family, and forfeited seal hunting several times. Although in his words, he was able to find an "even balance" between subsistence and wage activities, this remained a difficult inner conflict for him right through to the end of the project (p.c. December 15, 1991). This is a conflict confronted by many Inuit men of Andrew's age and education. The struggle to balance subsistence activities with wage employment -- as discussed in the Case Study -- is common in virtually all Inuit families in the community. I was frequently told about employee-relation problems stemming from this situation, and while many businesses attempt to come to

terms with absentee problems by providing vacation periods and leaves that coincide with the annual hunting cycle, this does not provide a fool-proof solution.

The point is that in order for participatory research to be practice-able, researchers coming from an academic culture need to be flexible. We need to be able to make changes in project goals and deadlines that can accommodate the participation of local researchers who have their own social and cultural obligations to family and community.<sup>9</sup> This is particularly true in Native communities where kinship forms the basis of identity and where the needs of kin-members play an important part in an individual's daily life. Family loyalties generally outweigh other obligations an individual may have, including those to the community at large (Pauktuutit 1991:13).

**Most importantly, participatory research is possible**

---

<sup>9</sup> In June while I was in Iqaluit, I was asked by the Research Centre Manager to counsel a graduate student who was having difficulty with informants postponing or forgetting interview appointments, or with people who were not interested in being interviewed at all. Having scheduled a very short period of time in the community, she panicked at the thought of "going home with nothing." She was dismayed when I advised her to be more flexible with regard to time, and astonished when I recommended that she pay her informants for their time.

only if one is willing to relinquish ownership of the project.<sup>10</sup> Our co-researcher relationship was political in that it was a constant struggle of control between Andrew and myself. Differences in social and educational status affected the levels and roles of power we each took in the research project. Andrew's highest degree of formal education is a high school diploma. As a university-trained investigator, I tended to overpower Andrew in project-related decisions, often forcing unreasonable expectations upon him. He once told me that my "language" -- my vocabulary and use of jargon -- caused him to doubt his own grasp of the English language (which was excellent). By means of unintentional intimidation, I jeopardized our "equality." Furthermore, my hold on the research finances left Andrew in a vulnerable position that would not have been true had ours been an equal partnership.

In part, our struggle involved negotiating a balance between my own academically-set, time-bound ideals -- which were to some extent unrealistic in terms of being participatory -- and Andrew's expectations, goals and responsibilities toward both the research and his community.

---

<sup>10</sup> Kurelek (1992) and Arratia (1992) each point out that participatory research involves a loss of power and control on the part of academics. For some, this translates into "contaminated" scholarship. For others, it is a sacrifice expedient to both the cutbacks on funding and availability of university positions, and the employment opportunities that come from Native groups who have their own research agendas.

At the same time, we felt pressure<sup>1</sup> by the very real time and money restrictions within which we had to complete our work. For myself, I had to learn to adapt my expectations to align with the cultural context of the project, to be more flexible and less anxious about time and deadlines, and to be open to solutions other than what I believed correct. Andrew was a strong influence in this regard:

I take the research very seriously because it is going to affect my future directly. I really have to consider that Gwen is doing this basically to get her doctorate. I have to look very carefully at what we do and what we say, because Gwen will be gone but I have to live with it. So I've been sort of forcing her to slow down. She wanted things done by a certain date, to set deadlines... but she should take more time. That's one cultural thing that is quite different between us. Without talking about it, I am trying to force her to go slower than she planned (December 15, 1991).

Despite our differences in degree of formal education, Andrew wielded considerable, albeit subtle, influence during the research with regard to interpretation and process. As mentioned in Chapter Two, Andrew guided much of the process by which we conducted our data collection, making sure we followed the correct channels of authority, and insisting we never bypass local representatives that might be affected.

Our co-researcher relationship was an "interactive exchange" of interpretation and analysis (Light & Kleiber 1981). In my view, Andrew's co-researcher role as community expert made possible what Brizinski (1989:208) proposes as a

participatory research process "supported by *praxis*." A brief example of this interaction concerns our different interpretations of the concept of economy. From Andrew's point of view, "economy" is a *Qallunaag* word strictly defined in terms of cash only, one that does not include hunting. Because hunting requires cash, it is an expense ("a luxury") and not a resource. Andrew's concept of economy segregates cash activities -- craft sales, wage work, etc. -- from hunting activities, a way of life that now requires an "economy" to support it.<sup>11</sup> I, on the other hand, have been taught to include hunting as an economic resource alongside, and potentially as important as cash. It became clear that both of our pre-defined categories of economy needed to be adjusted to more accurately measure the economic benefits of tourism development from an Inuit perspective. We decided to evaluate the costs and benefits of tourism not only in terms of cash returns on government investment, but also in terms of cash supplements to subsistence activities on the land, as well as other daily expenses.

Generally, Andrew took what I would call a "proactive"

---

<sup>11</sup> Theoretically, Andrew's concept of economy helps explain certain *Qallunaag* perceptions of Inuit as generally lacking a full commitment to tourism development in their community. For most local Inuit, tourism is not an end in itself, but rather one of a few supplemental means toward sustaining a way of life. This will be discussed further in Chapter Six.

approach to the data. This was both logical and significant in view of Andrew's personal investment in the research as a resident of Pagnirtung. For example, he took a much more active interest in negative comments made by tourists about the community, and insisted that recommendations be made in our field-report as a result. Because he believed in tourism as an avenue to greater economic benefits for the people of Pagnirtung, including himself, Andrew's first thought tended toward how our data could help to improve the local tourism industry.<sup>12</sup>

Andrew's more pragmatic view of our data collection was reflected almost daily in our reactions to whether an interview had been good or bad. Where he was disappointed because a person's answers had been "too vague" and "not concrete" enough, I was pleased because the interview had revealed some important basic attitudes and perspectives toward relevant policy issues. Because I was not a (permanent) community member, it was not -- rightly or wrongly -- as much in my interest to be proactive, and I tended rather to analyze data within academic categories that might be useful to the final evaluation and subsequently to my dissertation. In general, Andrew tended to agree with my direction for

---

<sup>12</sup> Arratia (1992:116) also found that projects in Chilean communities were given priority when they "at least offered a hope for higher productivity... (for) something tangible and concrete."

interview content and format, stating that I was the "expert" in research methods. However, I soon discovered that I could count on Andrew's local expertise to suggest relevant interview questions or to recommend omitting questions that he deemed insensitive or unproductive. In this direct way, Andrew affirmed his right and capability to initiate ideas and to recommend changes to the project.

As co-researchers, ours was an insider/outsider relationship, a dialectic not uncommon in anthropological analyses. This character of our research relationship satisfied the expectations held by both community and government stakeholders. As an insider, Andrew gained the community's confidence as a reliable representative of their views and concerns. Several local Inuit and non-Inuit residents confided that they believed I had made a wise choice of co-researcher for the project. The department of Economic Development & Tourism, although unsure of my choice at first, was by mid-project pleased with Andrew's performance and deemed him an integral part of the research in terms of contributing the local point of view. As an outsider, I was seen by both community and government to be responsible for presenting an independent and objective picture of tourism development, as well as providing the technical skills necessary to coordinate and conduct such a research project.

For myself as an outside researcher coming into the



community, commitment and communication were viewed as essential to ensure that research results were in line with local expectations. A few Inuit respondents characterized my commitment to the research in terms of the length of time I lived in Pangnirtung:

I am very happy about you because you have been here since early summer and I like that. It is very rare for people like you to stay for very long (p.c. January 15, 1992).

Andrew added that people were surprised we were still conducting the research months after my arrival; furthermore, my length of stay in Pangnirtung demonstrated to the community that "she meant what she said" (December 15, 1991).<sup>13</sup> The fact that this was also my third visit in as many years, also contributed to this view.

Andrew experienced some doubts as an inside researcher, relating primarily to his subjective position in Pangnirtung;

I've had to re-adjust myself in that I have to sort of detach myself from the community -- not physically, but mentally. I have to look at myself as sitting on one side and the community is sitting facing me on the other side (December 13, 1991).

He also expressed personal risks to his reputation, fearing that we would be unable to satisfy the expectations held by

---

<sup>13</sup> Brizinski (1989) was also told by residents of Aklavik and Inuvik that researchers who came for long periods and who kept returning were more highly valued because perhaps they 'knew what native people are like.'

fellow community members with regard to our conclusions and recommendations. He viewed our continual communication with the community via radio reports and Council meetings as a double-edged sword: while on the one hand we believed it imperative to promote awareness and participation, at the same time we raised expectations that Andrew feared we might not be able to meet.

Andrew's independence and initiative in arranging and conducting interviews was an obvious advantage from an insider point of view, noticed and used by several local Inuit individuals. Apparently, residents felt free to privately ask Andrew about the research findings: "Every interview they ask, 'what have you found out so far?'" (December 13, 1991). This rarely happened between local people and myself as an outside researcher, and indicates that Inuit feel more comfortable to ask questions of a fellow resident, and in their own language. It may also indicate that Andrew's status in the community -- as a member with social responsibilities -- and his role in the project -- as the key to local participation -- allowed room for fellow residents to exert their rights for greater insight and input into the research.

Not only did Andrew represent an opportunity for the community to better access the information produced during the research process, but he also provided a viable channel for Inuit **indigenous** knowledge to influence the theoretical and

practical assumptions of scientific research. The Inuktitut word for "research" -- *gaujisaq* ("researcher" is *gaujisaqtik*), has its root in the verb *qajui-* meaning to "discover" (*qaujima* is to "know").<sup>14</sup> However, it is significant to note that Inuit traditionally measure and value knowledge primarily by its origin in direct experience, rather than by abstract learning through books or second-hand sources. As one elder expressed it:

Inuit have always lived here and have always observed where the wildlife are. But the researchers who come up here only come for a short period of time and they don't have time to experience what it is like. [...] Comparing *Qallunaat* when they are at home -- they are [big] and the Inuit are [small]. But when they come up here, their knowledge [shrinks to almost nothing] (p.c. December 12, 1991).

Hence, many local respondents felt that while an outsider was necessary to add an independent and more impartial analysis of issues, an insider added the necessary community viewpoint and understanding of issues through experience. The view most prominently expressed by both community and government leaders, was the importance of the research as a partnership effort, and the need for local participation in all types of

---

<sup>14</sup> In some dialects, *gaujisaq* means to "spy" upon, a translation that lends a rather sobering linguistic meaning to Inuit peoples' attitudes toward research (Rigby & Stenton 1992).

research conducted in the North.<sup>15</sup>

The Socio-Political Context of the Tourism Evaluation Project

In Chapter Two I pointed out that the social and political context in which research takes place, prompted applied social scientists to redefine participatory research in more pragmatic terms. This means adapting the research methodology to a specific context, in light of local problems and varying levels of exchange and power (cf. Hessler, et al. 1979; Campbell 1987).

In the Northwest Territories, structural relations of power between central and local governments continue to be characterized by municipal governing bodies which possess minimal ultimate authority over much of what affects their communities (cf. Dickerson 1992). Nevertheless, in the past decade local advisory committees and municipal Councils have become a significant political force in the Eastern Arctic.<sup>16</sup> As the public report indicates, although tourism in Pangnirtung has been developed according to a community-based approach, it is still considered locally as a territorial

---

<sup>15</sup> To this end, two individuals suggested that the Science Institute of the Northwest Territories [SINT] needs to go much further in emphasizing participatory methods of research, and in imposing some form of quality control on the types of proposals for research in Arctic communities (p.c. June 19; July 9, 1992).

<sup>16</sup> For an expanded discussion of the evolution of local governments in the NWT, see Mark Dickerson 1992:96-100.

government project because, in the end, ED&T holds the purse strings and continues to initiate and decide upon major developments.

Participation in the evaluation research was shaped by the same political situation. The historical nature of that power structure manifests itself in local bodies that tend to defer decision-making and responsibility to the next-highest authority. In Pangnirtung this is appropriate in most cases, but in others it served to frustrate our expectations that the community would take more control over the research project.

The socio-political context in which our evaluation project took place, was also characterized by relations of general mistrust and uncertainty between government officials, community members, and researchers. At the same time, these apprehensions were tempered by the fact that all stakeholders in the tourism evaluation shared certain research objectives. This somewhat compromising situation affected the research process in three major ways<sup>17</sup>: 1) individuals and groups at all levels were cautious about committing themselves to such a new type of project, and hence full and broad participation in the ideal sense was impossible to achieve; 2) Andrew's role in the research was legitimized by both the community and the

---

<sup>17</sup> This is aside from the fact that we were conducting evaluation research which, as mentioned earlier, served to curtail participation.

government as an efficient way of achieving community participation as well as a measure of local control over the research, and; 3) Andrew and I were left virtually on our own to follow a direction of research openly biased toward community needs and perceptions.

The insight and understanding about research by a few key individuals -- most prominently Andrew and the former PTC Chairman -- lent potential to our research as a participatory process within the community. At the same time, however, the Hamlet Council hesitated to take an active role in the research process, preferring to trust Andrew as their research representative.<sup>18</sup> Other Inuit residents also voiced the demand for more local input by focusing on Andrew's role as co-researcher. A carver told us:

I have seen that you [two] are working together and that Andrew is not just a translator. I would like that to continue. If anyone else comes, I would like to see it done in the same way that [Andrew and Gwen] did it. [...] I agree that [the Hamlet Council] should be able to say, "you [the researcher] have to work with a local person." The biggest reason has to do with language differences. A translator has to know the work you are doing and why you are doing it. [...] A lot of the questions some other researchers have

---

<sup>18</sup> In a cultural sense, this can be seen as consistent with traditional Inuit leadership practices that were situational: a hunter, for instance, was 'selected' as a leader in certain situations or for certain tasks, but he led more by example and by taking the initiative rather than delegating people to certain tasks (Pauktuutit 1991:17). In the research situation, the Council may have seen Andrew as a leader and so they felt confident to leave the task in his hands.

asked have nothing to do with Pangnirtung (p.c. January 15, 1992).

It is important to realize that as far as we knew, this tourism evaluation represents the first occasion in which the Pangnirtung Hamlet Council was presented with an opportunity to so directly participate in and commit to a research project and its results. In Andrew's view, local politics has been controlled by what he called "the old boys" -- Councillors in the over-40 age-group who are generally unilingual Inuktitut with little or no formal education, and who possess a minimal understanding of what research is about. With a new Council inaugurated in 1992, Andrew hoped that younger, better educated, bi-lingual members would possess a greater understanding of research and its value, and that attitudes, among the Councillors at any rate, would begin to change. Andrew himself was elected a Councillor for the first time, an event which in my opinion was significant in terms of local political input into present and future research in the community.

When the research was complete, the Mayor told me that the report was "more believable" because Andrew's name was on the front cover as evidence of local input (p.c. July 3, 1992). Most respondents to the final report suggested that the local co-researcher lent a significant validity to the evaluation that could not have been achieved by an outside

consultant alone. Andrew's contribution was critical with regard to what a few local leaders as well as private industry representatives perceived as a danger that the government would co-opt the research results and recommendations. That is, Economic Development & Tourism might justify government-initiated projects by having first garnered the opinions, and subsequent approval from the local community. It was hoped that community participation in the role of Andrew would guarantee this would not occur, and that the evaluation research would not be biased toward government objectives.

On the other hand, the GNWT ED&T's hands-off attitude was prompted by the Superintendent's (a Non-Inuk) belief that a local co-researcher was "integral to the project" in order for the research to be community-based (p.c. June 19, 1992). To this extent at least, the government and the community shared a commitment to the ideology of community-based research and development. The contractual basis of the co-researcher position ensured both continuity and reliability. Economic Development & Tourism allowed me the freedom to hire the local co-researcher of my choice, and subsequently allowed Andrew and me the leeway needed to pursue a direction of research appropriate to community needs and concerns. The Economic Development Officer (EDO) in Pangnirtung was instructed to and willingly offered considerable logistic and moral support to our project. At the end of the project, the



EDO echoed the Mayor in saying the local co-researcher's input served to "increase the validity of the report and its relevance to local groups, because it is not only an 'outsider's report'" (p.c. June 23, 1992). Economic Development & Tourism officials in Iqaluit stated that Andrew's role was "essential to learning the value of research at the local level" and proposed that future support for research by the department should be premised on our cooperative experience (p.c. June 19, 1992).

In spite of this generally positive and supportive attitude among GNWT ED&T bureaucrats toward the research project, I suspect they were aware of risks as well. They had no guarantee of the type of product I was capable of producing and they were very aware of my bias in favour of the community. Hence, they were correct in fearing a certain level of criticism about government practice, or perhaps the revelation of some politically offensive or dangerous information within our public report. For example, a section of our report succeeded in personally offending one official, who felt he had been misrepresented; he feared the information might affect his annual professional appraisal. I suspect that due to his unfortunate response, the report has been de-valued in this official's eyes, although he concurred with other parts of the report as useful to his work. To my knowledge, this official experienced no negative repercussions, but

incidents like this can affect the utility value of a report and, while sometimes unavoidable, may threaten the future sponsorship of social science research by government departments.

Although I have no evidence of motive, it is ironic that one month before the report deadline, the ED&T Superintendent rejected our requisition for funds to cover printing and distribution costs of the final evaluation. While we knew that GNWT was under severe financial restraining measures at the time, we also assumed that these costs were included in the initial (verbal) research agreement. Nevertheless, in February 1992 I was relayed a FAX via the EDO stating that the department was willing to "buy" only ten copies of "our" final tourism evaluation report. Somewhat stunned, and also confused as to why ED&T seemed to be distancing itself from the project at this late date, Andrew and I approached the Hamlet Council about the matter.

The local leaders with whom we discussed the issue of printing and distributing the report, felt that the ED&T's refusal was another case of broken government promises. When Andrew and I presented this as an opportunity for the Hamlet Council to partly control the distribution of the final report, councillors responded by saying that because this was a "government project," it was also the government's financial responsibility (Hamlet Council Meeting, March 16, 1992).

The Council's reaction to this situation was consistent in view of the historical structure of power relations between central and local governments in the Northwest Territories. While the Council's attitude contradicted a local concern that the government might co-opt the research results, it was consistent with generally apathetic attitudes toward research (see below). It was also consistent with cultural values that accept resignation and withdrawal in the face of realities beyond one's control (Pauktuutit 1991:16). Hamlet Council members viewed our research as somewhat of an unavoidable event that was "fine" if it provided some benefit to the community.<sup>19</sup> From another point of view, the Hamlet Council's apparent failure to take control of tourism development (as discussed in the Case Study), was mirrored in their reluctance and eventual decision to refuse responsibility for dissemination of the final

---

<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, when we asked the Council to decide what should be done with the interview tapes and transcripts, councillors unanimously voted to keep "their knowledge" in the community rather than have it taken "south" at the end of the project. However, in July 1992 when Andrew and I were conducting feedback interviews, we needed to access some information from one of our field reports which had been packed together with the original tapes and transcripts in a box marked "Confidential" and stored in a locked cupboard in the Angmarlik Visitor Centre. However, we discovered that the box was gone, and although we reported the loss to the RCMP, the Hamlet Council, and conducted our own investigation, this box of data has not been relocated. Most individuals consulted suspected it was stolen for the audio-tapes which could be re-used to record music.

report. In the end, however, another official in the Iqaluit office lobbied on our behalf and was able to arrange for full payment of printing and distribution.

Andrew and I were both personally disappointed by the Council members' general lack of commitment to this body of knowledge and lack of appreciation that this was something they might want to control.<sup>20</sup> It is probable to assume that if the Hamlet Council had greater input into the research **planning** and in its **funding**, Council members might have taken greater responsibility toward the research implementation and results. The community played no part in terms of the monies to pay for the project, except in giving approval to my proposal and encouragement to hiring a local co-researcher. Funds for the project were accumulated entirely through sources I was able to access either through university channels, or through negotiations with GNWT ED&T. Hence, Andrew and I were both seen as some variety of government employee, the research as government funded, and the community

---

<sup>20</sup> In fact, one member so much as suggested that we should not try to 'sell' to the Council, copies of a final report which they felt was theirs by rights as a government contribution. In part the response by the Hamlet Council was also understandable in light of their present financial difficulties. In October 1991, the Hamlet Council found themselves bankrupt and with the election of a new Council in early 1992, the Council's current pre-occupation was with restructuring their budget. Hence, when Andrew and I suggested that Council commit a small amount of funds toward the printing and distribution of the final evaluation report, members responded vehemently against the motion.

as without authority to say how these monies were spent. I suggest that the objectives of participatory research, as with the goals of community-based development, can only be reached when participation in the process is matched with a devolution of financial control to the community level (see also Chapters Four and Six).

In the final analysis, Andrew and I consoled ourselves with the hope and belief that we had made an important and educational first step toward instilling a more positive value of research among local leaders, and toward promoting greater local control over research matters. For example, during the final few Council meetings we attended, I advocated a stance that the community indeed had the legal authority to accept, reject, or set conditions upon researchers and proposed research projects. I expressed the view that Council could more actively exercise their authority by perhaps qualifying their letters of approval to researchers with some set criteria as to the type and conduct of research in their community. For example, Council could approve requests to conduct research with the condition that an English/Inuktitut translation of the final report be returned to the community. In this way local Councils could encourage accountable research, and attempt to meet demands for more relevant research.

In addition to stressing that research could be

valuable in terms of organizing local knowledge to address community issues, I also pointed out the benefits that a research project can bring to the local economy in terms of employment, interview fees, and living expenses.<sup>21</sup> However, it is apparent that my own careful planning and research commitment to the participatory research process was not enough to guarantee community participation, and in this sense, participation was "illusory" (Campbell 1987:165; cf. Vio Grossi 1981; Gaventa & Horton 1982).

The ongoing communication Andrew and I maintained with both the community Council and the GNWT ED&T, was initiated by our own belief in the importance of keeping people informed and in creating a research process that was less mysterious, and hence more comprehensible and accessible. Later, both the community and the government were convinced of the need for consultation about the initial goals and purpose of the research project. For example, the former Mayor of Pangnirtung stated:

So many times I have seen white researchers come into the community and basically just go off on their own, and just do what they want, and look at what THEY want... just coming into the community from the south, looking around and saying, "OK, this is what I'll do now," without consulting any local people on what they

---

<sup>21</sup> I presented Council with a balance sheet of research expenses that directly affected the local economy. Co-researcher wages, interpreter fees, interview fees, and goods and services purchased in Pangnirtung amounted to over \$33,000.

think should be done. But the fact that you two do it together and have gone basically in front of the community for permission about quite a few things, is very good. Your work here, I feel, in the next and for many years to come, will be remembered and it will help a great deal. It will force people to think about tourism and what the future is (p.c. November 19, 1991).

Part of our rationale for frequent communication, was the demand by some local groups and individuals for greater local input into the objectives and conduct of the research project. This was evident with regard to a tourism-related study conducted in 1985. At that time, the Pangnirtung Tourism Committee expressed concern that the study "attempt to look at not only the negative, but also the positive aspects of tourism and the PTC" (PTC Minutes July 1985). Minutes also show that the PTC encouraged that researcher to lobby GNWT to pay for an Inuktitut translation of the final report (*ibid.*).

However, at no time were we requested to report on our progress or to explain our activities. As an actively political member of the community, Andrew knew that for our research to be legitimate (and useful), we would need to respect the proper local chain of command and he insisted upon appropriate political behaviour in every aspect of our research. For example, when we embarked on our plan to instruct a high school class as participants of a household economic survey, Andrew made arrangements to first present our proposal to the local Education Council, who recommended we

also consult with the Hamlet Council. Had I been an independent researcher, I may well have viewed this project as solely school-related and consulted only with the non-Inuit school principle and teachers. Andrew, however, viewed this as a community concern, and it was only after we received approval from the appropriate local councils that we were able to make concrete arrangements with the school teachers involved.

On several occasions we were complimented on our efforts to keep people informed, and it soon became apparent that this was a rare occurrence. The ED&T Superintendent -- who had extensive contact with researchers -- expressed both appreciation and surprise when I returned to Baffin Island to give stakeholders an opportunity to respond to the contents in the final report after its release. However, the evidence presented here suggests that ongoing dialogue and communication between scientists and the community does not necessarily lead to an appreciable increase in local access or control of the research, although it certainly appears to be an important element in that process.

While it is safe to say that in our case, the socio-political context had greater influence on the research process and results, the project also became a part of the socio-political changes taking place in the community during that year. The resident GNWT Economic Development Officer was



convinced that because we had been "talking tourism all around town," local people were more keenly aware of tourism related issues (p.c. February 17, 1992). For example, a meeting called by the Outfitters Association occurred in the same month that Andrew was concentrating on interviews with individual outfitters; according to the EDO, this was "too much to be coincidence."

The revival of the previously defunct Tourism Committee was viewed by some as a direct result of the topic and method of our research. In January, when the newly elected Council was delegating portfolios, a resolution was passed to formally dissolve the existing PTC, and to form a new subcommittee in charge of tourism. Specifically, this subcommittee would begin a selection process of interested members from various businesses in the community. According to Andrew who attended this meeting, several of the councillors' comments during this first session, focused on their concerns about the tourist industry in Pangnirtung, and that they were "eagerly awaiting" our report (p.c. Andrew Dialla, January 8, 1992). Later, in July, there was an excellent turn-out to a meeting called by the newly formed PTC to hear a summary of our report findings and how these directly related to the

function of the committee.<sup>22</sup>

#### Participation in Research: A Culturally Appropriate Process

Because we were evaluating community-based tourism development, we as co-researchers, together with the primary stakeholders, believed that a community-based research process was appropriate to the task. That is, if the goal of community-based tourism is to involve people in the community as much as possible and to ultimately meet an objective of local control over development and a measure of economic self-sufficiency, then the evaluation of that development should have similar goals and objectives. Because the community was already familiar with the concept of community-based development, leaders were open to approve and support what we termed community-based research although, as indicated above, their understanding of the concept was limited in the area of ownership and control. Nevertheless, local people were generally very willing to be interviewed about an aspect of their social and economic life they considered to be theirs by right, if not by practice. Furthermore, as pointed out in the Case Study, most local respondents were proud of the Pagnirtung Tourism Committee's accomplishments, viewed as

---

<sup>22</sup> Research in 1993 revealed that this new Tourism Committee was relatively inactive and that nothing had really changed in the tourism sector since 1991. This has negative implications with regard to the effectiveness of the evaluation report.

proof of what community participation could achieve.

The concept of participation in research is also appropriate with regard to its educative value, and in terms of reinforcing cultural identity (as raised in Chapter Two). Andrew claimed that people in Arctic communities have seen so many researchers come and go, that there is a perceived danger that *Qallunaat* in the south possess more information on Inuit than Inuit do themselves. The long-term implication for a community-based research process is in its potential to help correct an imbalance where governments have greater access to a knowledge-based source of decision-making power that, from an Inuit point of view, is either outdated or inaccurate. As well, Andrew's comment speaks to the need for a more appropriate format by which to communicate research results in an attempt to equalize the discourse between local people, researchers, and government officials.

Ethnographers, as well as advocates of participatory research processes, need to enter into a relationship of reciprocity -- the common sharing of cash, food, equipment, and, I would add, skills and knowledge. This is essential to gaining rapport, trust, and acceptance. Traditionally, Inuit tend to be cautious about interacting with strangers; researchers who begin to ask questions without building up any sort of relationship are likely to be considered aggressive and somewhat rude (Pauktuutit 1991:18).

The length of time a researcher spends in a community is important also in light of a history of resentment among Inuit toward southerners coming North without the commitment to stay.<sup>23</sup> This resentment is directed particularly at those who stay in the community for only a short period of time, and who are thus seen to have come to exploit high incomes, Inuit knowledge, or non-renewable resources on Arctic lands.<sup>24</sup> Qallunaat residents in Pangnirtung are able to overcome this resentment to a large extent if they take an active and genuine interest in community events and in visiting neighbours. In other words, if one participates, one is accepted. My own observations -- particularly during Christmas festivities -- led me to believe that Inuit are enthusiastic participants regardless of age or gender. Qallunaat are urged to join in the Inuit way.

It seems obvious to me now that to do participatory research, one must be a participatory type of person. While this is true for doing ethnography of any kind, it<sup>3</sup> is

---

<sup>23</sup> Economic Development & Tourism officials agreed that "length of stay" was important as a measure of the quality of results. They added that it was partly the amount of time proposed for data collection that motivated the department to support our project.

<sup>24</sup> Among Inuit, Qallunaat have a reputation of transience, of self-imposed social seclusion from the Inuit in the community, and as generally uncaring about the community as a whole. Teachers who had been in Pangnirtung for three or four years complained that they were still judged as Qallunaat first, and rarely as individuals.

poignantly so for participatory researchers: to expect others to participate in what is important to you, you must be willing to participate in what is important to them. Several comments made to me during the course of research, indicate that local people accepted me as someone who was visibly involved in the community (p.c. September 1991). To a large extent, my involvement in the community was due to the ethnographic type and topic of research we were conducting. The tourism evaluation required that I interact with many local people on a face-to-face basis, but also that I mingle with tourists, attend events that might be of interest to tourists, or sit in on public meetings that might reflect on tourism development. Hence the research itself was very 'public' and, as an outsider, my presence was by default very visible.

A demand for greater local participation in our research was reflected in the desire for greater community awareness (see Chapter Four, Section Five). Awareness about and attitudes toward research differ somewhat in relation to age group and level of formal education. Rapid social and cultural change in Inuit communities has created unprecedented 'generation gaps' that render local attitudes as anything but homogenous. Hence, as mentioned earlier, older unilingual Council members had less comprehension and a more indifferent attitude toward research than did the younger Council members

who were literate in both Inuktitut and English, and who possessed some formal education. However, among a group of high-school students, familiarity with the purposes or extent of research within their community (or the Arctic) was almost non-existent.

For local leaders, including Andrew, the poor level of awareness among local youth is disturbing, although not surprising, because it is coupled with a poor understanding of tourism development in Pangnirtung. It demonstrates that young people -- as future leaders -- possess little knowledge about processes of research and development occurring within, and its implications for the future of, their own community. Hence, Andrew queried toward the end of the project that perhaps we should have included more participation -- in the form of interviews -- by teenagers and young adults, because "it is their future we (local leaders) are planning" (December 15, 1991).

From a pedagogic viewpoint, it was Andrew and myself who benefitted most from what was to be learned through a participatory research process and it is difficult to determine to what extent the community embraced the concept of cooperative or participatory research. In part, this was due to a long history of research practice in Pangnirtung, and I now turn to a discussion of how that history has influenced attitudes and reactions (or the lack thereof) toward our

attempt at an inclusive methodology.

The Historical Context of Research in Pangnirtung:  
Attitudes and Participation

Researchers have been plying their trade in the Pangnirtung area for almost as long as have the whalers, Hudson Bay Company, Royal Canadian Mounted Police and missionaries.<sup>25</sup> The bulk of research in the Arctic, like tourism, occurs during the summer months. Local attitudes toward research have been shaped by their contact with researchers over the years who, for the most part, "have shown up for a couple of weeks and then they are gone" (p.c. Andrew Dialla, December 13, 1991). The character of previous research practice in a community is an important pre-condition to doing

---

<sup>25</sup> In 1883-1884, the celebrated anthropologist Franz Boas pioneered one of the first ethnographic field-studies among the 'Eskimo.' Boas spent twelve months living and travelling with Cumberland Sound Inuit whose descendants now comprise the community of Pangnirtung (Boas 1888). Boas was welcomed hospitably; once he learned the Inuktitut language, Inuit generously offered stories and knowledge of their land and life-ways (In Boas 1888:v-xi). Approximately thirty years later, the Geological Survey of Canada sent two geologists to Pangnirtung in 1926-1927, where they built a small research station (Haycock 1991). Although there is little published information on the relations between these latter researchers and the local Inuit, there is indication that they received a relatively open to indifferent welcome and developed good working relationships with, for example, local guides. Apparently, contact between the researchers and local Inuit was minimal; the program of research is described as completely separate from Inuit interests, and solely for the purpose of meeting academic objectives. In the early 1980s, the Geological Survey research station was converted into the first Visitor Centre as part of the tourism pilot-project initiative.

participatory research, because overtly negative attitudes toward research and/or researchers will erect serious obstacles to, if not preclude, any attempt at participation in a research process.

Since 1980, numerous social and archaeological research projects have been conducted in the Pagnirtung area as a direct result of the tourism pilot-project. The majority, seventeen of twenty projects in total, were consultant studies commissioned by the Government of the Northwest Territories, while a few were conducted independently by students from southern universities (see Chapter Four, Appendix A). Two tourism-related reports figure most prominently in local peoples' memories. The first is the Marshall Macklin Monaghan (MMM) study (1981), a formative evaluation which helped initiate the tourism pilot-project in Pagnirtung. The second was Marc Stevenson's subsequent archaeological work on the interpretation of the Kekerten Whaling Station. While both these studies occurred at a time before participatory research **processes** were well accepted in social science circles, the **results** of these latter pieces of research were significant to the economic and cultural well-being of the community.

The MMM report provided local people with optional strategies of tourism development and outlined a Five-Year Plan of development that the Pagnirtung Tourism Committee could follow. One result of this plan was the construction of



the Angmarlik Visitor Centre and Museum, a significant contribution to the preservation of Cumberland Sound Inuit heritage. The process by which this research project was conducted, however, was viewed in a less positive light. For example, the Superintendent of ED&T recalled that "a white consultant group along with white government officials cannot just call a meeting, throw a 500 page [English] report at the community [Council] and expect feedback!" In retrospect, she concluded this had been the wrong way to go about encouraging community participation in the implementation of report recommendations (p.c. July 9, 1991).

Stevenson's archaeological research (1983, 1984) at Kekerten Island was initiated as a tourist-site project, but had cultural significance for the people of Pangnirtung, some of whom grew up at the Whaling Station. Elders in particular were very involved in the interpretation of the Kekerten site, and favourably recall their involvement in the revival and preservation of the past in this way. The participation of local people in this type of tourism-related research has been an important aspect of the community-based initiative in Pangnirtung. Community participation was generated by the Pangnirtung Tourism Committee (PTC), which had a strong leader at the time. The PTC was very active throughout this period (c. 1983-1989), and maintained a high level of community awareness of tourism developments. The PTC acted as a local

'research committee' by representing the community to sanction, support, and monitor the progress of such research projects. Unfortunately, as indicated in the Case Study, when it came time to evaluate the tourism pilot-project in 1991, the PTC was inactive and consequently, Andrew and I found ourselves without a research committee to rely upon as an avenue to community participation.

As the tourism pilot-project progressed throughout the 1980s, consultants and government representatives were increasingly attentive to processes of community consultation and awareness of tourism development recommendations and plans (PTC Minutes 1981-1988). However, the meaning and relative success of their attempts fluctuated in direct proportion to the priorities and strength of local leadership in the Tourism Committee and Hamlet Council, and to the degree that local priorities complemented the interests of government or professional consultants.

For example, a proposal for research on a comprehensive "Heritage Plan" (1990) for Pangnirtung came at a time when the PTC was at its weakest in terms of leadership and community activity. Community awareness and participation in approving, planning and implementing this report's recommendations was a dim memory for most Pangnirtung residents, particularly in comparison with previous tourism projects. Nevertheless, ED&T bureaucrats and the consultant

involved were successful in obtaining official community support for their proposal -- necessary to justify public funding -- through the Hamlet Council. There was some suggestion that the Council merely 'rubber stamped' what it felt to be inevitable and harmless (see Section 3.3 of the Case Study). It was inevitable in light of the Council's previous experiences of difficulty in preventing research, especially a government-initiated project (see Chapter Two). It was harmless in light of benefits from previous tourism-related research, not only culturally, as mentioned above, but economically as well. Such research tended to create temporary employment for local interpreters, guides, and assistants and to promote the attractiveness of Pangnirtung as a tourist destination. From a regional perspective, a refusal by Council might be interpreted by government as a discouragement for development activity in Pangnirtung, to the advantage of other Baffin communities who were also vying for their share of the 'development pie' (see the Case Study, Section 3).

In all fairness, ED&T and the consultants they hired developed a practice whereby they consulted with and obtained permission from local bodies before they went ahead with development research and planning. As I indicated above, the level of community participation in these projects continued to depend, to a large extent, upon the particular character of local leadership at the time. When Hamlet Council or Tourism

Committee leadership and enthusiasm was lacking, GNWT-ED&T continued to use their finances and power to move forward with plans they saw as consistent with their mandate to develop and invest in the future of Inuit communities. Hence, although in theory the Pangnirtung Hamlet Council has some control over research in the community, in practice it has been GNWT who initiates, implements, and decides upon what is relevant research. As I discussed above, the tourism evaluation project evolved in a similar type of situation which subsequently worked toward defining the community's weak sense of participation in our research.

Andrew believed that most Inuit residents view government-hired researchers to have a more direct influence for change in the community. He countered this with a statement that student researchers seem to enter the community with fewer preconceptions, and hence are "more bound to tell the truth than the government" (December 13, 1991). Apparently several year-long, Ph.D. field-work studies have been conducted in and around the Pangnirtung area. Although I have record of only one such study -- by R.G. Mayes (1978) -- other university researchers are remembered by those families who extended room and board to students. However, more often than not, local families had little to no idea what the students were exactly studying. One Inuk man who had much previous contact with student researchers asked me, "where do

the ideas for research come from?" and "where do the results go to?" (p.c. October 1, 1991).

Other smaller studies were conducted by graduate students during my own stays in Pangnirtung, but I found no local records of these projects in the form of reports returned to the community.<sup>26</sup> Nor did these researchers appear to publicize the purpose or relevance of their activities. There has been a tendency among student researchers to falsely build expectations that our research will "help the community" (cf. Pigozzi 1982). On several occasions I was asked if I could wield influence in "Yellowknife;" for instance, one outfitter wanted me to help pass a law about destructive sportsfishing practices. This, of course, I could not do and at the time I sensed a loss of credibility, or at the very least, disappointment in the eyes of local Inuit making such requests. This type of incident is related to a tendency among community members to link concurrent research projects -- government or independent -- as related, if not as a single enterprise.

Local attitudes toward activities by both past and present researchers thus affects the activities of other researchers entering the community. For example, a woman who

---

<sup>26</sup> To my knowledge, only one of several student researchers returned any kind of summary report to the community. It is probable that most data is used exclusively by the students to gain a Masters or Doctoral degree.

was conducting a beluga whale study during the time I was in Pangnirtung in 1989, had difficulty gaining rapport with many local people. I was subsequently refused interviews either because people felt turned-off by researchers as a whole, or because they confused me with the other woman. Two years later I was asked by an elder if we "white researchers" were the reason quotas had been placed on beluga and bowhead whale hunting. Again, this incident indicates that we as researchers may be viewed to have influential power -- in this case negative -- to affect change in Inuit communities.<sup>27</sup>

Andrew suggested that local people do, in fact, perceive negative effects as a consequence of their openness with *Qallunaat*: in particular, they point to the effects of the Greenpeace movement, which escalated an already prevalent mistrust of whites in the North. The perception is that if, perhaps, Inuit had "kept their mouths shut" about their hunting and subsistence practices, then perhaps Greenpeace would have had less cause to lobby as hard as they did against the seal hunt. Andrew indicated that local Inuit have become extremely reluctant to talk to any *Qallunaaq* about animals and hunting, an attitude confirmed above by the elder's comment to

---

<sup>27</sup> Stone (1989) reports a similar, but positive, experience in Nepal where she was asked to act as liaison between villagers and developments agencies in the hope that her presence would influence development decisions in local favour.

me about whale quotas.<sup>28</sup> Another local woman, explaining why she refused to be interviewed, told me in conversation that she is "tired of giving her knowledge away... Inuit should be giving their knowledge to their own young people, not people from the south" (p.c. February 17, 1992).

Another problem with social research in Inuit communities is that data collection methods are often considered culturally inappropriate. In particular, the use of house-to-house surveys has met with failure in several instances in Pangnirtung. Documents from an evaluation of a previous economic survey (1981) in Pangnirtung states that;

...the people welcomed us as visitors but when we took out the questionnaire they seemed to back off or become silent and treat us as if we were intruders. They seemed to say, "another one again?", as if they were tired of being bombarded with surveys.

(Survey Evaluation by the EDO Trainee, July 9, 1981)

Closed-questionnaire format posed a problem in that many questions were considered "more or less Kabloona-oriented" and hence "useless" in the eyes of Inuit respondents (*ibid.*).

Ten years later, Andrew and I found this still to be true in the survey work we attempted: local people were either

---

<sup>28</sup> As an aside, Article 5.5 of the Nunavut Agreement proposes an "Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study" in response to the near extinction of bowheads due to European and American commercial whaling in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. This study will be implemented in recognition of the value of local Inuit knowledge of whale harvesting and management since that time, and will document the number and location of bowhead whales as seen by hunters.

reluctant to take part in the survey at all, or they were hesitant to answer certain hunting and/or cash related questions. The high school students who helped conduct our household economic survey stated that many quantitative questions were impossible to answer. This was because people "did not keep records", because the questions were considered an "invasion of privacy", and because people neither understood nor trusted the purpose behind the questions. This was despite our efforts to communicate its contents and goals by both radio and mail prior to the survey.

It was also extremely difficult to hire local people - - either students or adults -- to help conduct the survey, although we offered to pay the surveyors generously. A major problem was younger peoples' reluctance to ask direct questions of their elders. Direct requests are traditionally considered rude; children and youth are taught to act respectfully toward elders, and not to express knowledge towards elders unless they are asked (Pauktuutit 1991:13).<sup>29</sup> Another was their hesitancy to enter the homes of "strangers," a disruption of normal Inuit visiting patterns which focuses primarily on kin: "I'm not the kind of person to go house to house to ask questions. We don't usually go... we're not used

---

<sup>29</sup> During her research with Innu in Nitassinan, Labrador, Kurelek (1992:189) was informed by a local leader that questionnaires were culturally inappropriate because "it is rude and insensitive to ask elders direct questions."



to doing that" (p.c. December 3, 1991). While Andrew viewed the problem as one primarily of apathy on the part of teenagers, the fact that the survey method ran against certain cultural norms has implications for participatory research both in terms of involving youth and in "visiting" homes with the express purpose of asking questions.

Andrew asserted that a "free-style" interview method was preferable and more effective than a list of pre-set questions. From his previous experience as an interpreter, Andrew advised me that researchers who hesitate to stray from their pre-set questions tend to make people "uncomfortable." On the other hand, allowing them to "give the information their own way" tends to "relax" people. This is particularly true among the elders and the over-40 generation who know little or no English, and who are less familiar with formal question-answer techniques than are younger people who attend school.

In this way, Andrew's participation in the project gave rise to more culturally appropriate research methods. At the same time, Andrew pointed to an inherent weakness and potential danger in the time and context boundaries of the interview method and of social research as a whole:

People are always changing. I could be interviewing one man who says, 'I love these tourists,' and then he will meet [someone bad]... and the next week he will have a totally different idea about Qallunaat and visitors in general (December 13, 1991).

A sense of how local people define research participation and relevance, is clarified to some extent by the lack of responses to questions about research in Pangnirtung. As mentioned earlier, following each interview, Andrew and I asked what expectations the individuals might hold for the tourism research project. Most local Inuit were unsure of how to answer this question, and many had no answer. Generally, I attribute this to their perceived lack of immediate, or even delayed research results to the community. For example, according to an interpreter who frequently works with the elders, the most tangible result of research is the money they receive in payment for time and information:<sup>30</sup>

Elders used to expect results right away, but this did not happen. So elders began to ask for payment because then at least they got something out of it. Researchers always say that their research will be good for them and the community, but they never say the results (p.c. August 21, 1991).

The evaluation of the 1981 economic survey project mentioned above suggests that this perception is not a recent one in Pangnirtung:

[The people] seem to be reluctant in answering because

---

<sup>30</sup> Local people expect a "thanking with cash" when they participate in research (cf. Efrat & Mitchell 1974). This expectation of payment for time and knowledge has recently been extended to story-telling, and on several occasions I heard complaints from Inuit young people that their own elders refuse to give them information about the past -- for a school project, for example -- unless they are paid. Participation in any type of research is an expensive commodity in Arctic communities.

the other surveys that were done never gave back any results and that upset them. Their reaction, after reading the questionnaire over, seemed to be something like, "What is this and how is it going to help us?" (EDO Trainee, September 7, 1981).

Historically shaped attitudes place research to be placed on a low rung of people's ladder of priorities. This was evident in our tourism research project, where, although we focused on a topic that most Pangiirtung people agreed was important for the community, many individuals postponed, cancelled, forgot, or were unable to attend pre-arranged interviews. I soon learned that an interview was generally agreed to only if nothing else conflicted with the time we arranged. In particular, family and community concerns or events that came up between the time we set up the interview and the actual interview itself, meant that our session was foregone.<sup>31</sup> While this fact would likely not surprise any researcher who has worked in a Northern community, it is nevertheless significant in that any research enterprise -- participatory or not -- is affected in part by the context of previous research in which it occurs. It also means that any researcher coming into a community must be cognizant and understanding of this context, as well as flexible in their research design and time-line. On this final note, one

---

<sup>31</sup> Each time this happened, I marked a "no-show" in my journal. For example, of the 30 or so interviews I conducted with local women between August 15 and November 1, I recorded 22 "no-shows" in my journal.

prominent local woman lectured me on the need for local Inuit "professors" to supervise and evaluate student researchers who come to the North, and to communicate with the professors in universities in the South (p.c. October 6, 1991).

Negative and "mildly hostile" attitudes toward research in Pangnirtung have grown out of years of local residents watching researchers come and go during the summer months, and most times, neither seeing nor hearing of them again. Related to this problem is the perception -- to varying degrees, rightly so -- that white researchers profit from the lives of Inuit.<sup>32</sup> Andrew reported several instances where local people at first refused to be interviewed because they did "not want to make money for that Qallunaq person" (December 13, 1991). Andrew went on to explain that: "With Gwen's situation, people still look at it like she is a student now, she is doing research, but she is using Inuit in order to get that education and later on she will be making very nice money out of it." In each instance, Andrew said he was able to "set them straight" and convince people that the research was a joint project in which he too was "making money", and in which a primary objective was to provide useful and relevant information to the community.

---

<sup>32</sup> In part, this may be one reason why Inuit expect something in exchange for interviews (see footnote #30).

The following chapter introduces the evaluation report as the product of a collaborative process in which Andrew and I attempted to meet the types of demands and concerns discussed above. Following that introduction, I include a reprint of the original public report that will continue to serve as the Case Study for the remainder of my thesis.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE CASE STUDY:

### *Community Based Tourism in Pangnirtung, Northwest Territories: Looking Back and Looking Ahead*

#### Preface to the Case Study

Both the community context and the context of the co-researcher relationship in which Andrew and I collected the data and wrote the report, influenced the content of the Case Study that follows. The collaborative nature of the project meant that we needed to convey messages to several distinct audiences, each of whom had a stake in Pangnirtung's tourism development. The political context described in the previous chapter, in which the territorial government exercised final decision-making power over community Councils and Committees, led us to write the report in a way that the 'local voice' would be heard. The numerous quotations and the "Dialogues" at the end of report sections were the most obvious way we could accomplish this objective. We hoped this format would contribute to the report's potential as a source of empowerment to the less powerful stakeholders (cf. Mark & Shotland 1985).

While some stakeholders were critical of the report's apparent bias toward community concerns, others' appreciated

its obvious subjectivity as intrinsic to the community-based character of the research (p.c. June 30, 1992). Territorial bureaucrats were somewhat suspicious of what they considered the report's "academic model" approach, evaluating the good or bad of government performance in relation to an ideal of community development (p.c. June 19, 1992). At the same time, they felt that the quotations balanced this approach by reflecting the human experience of northern development.

The report appears more problem-oriented, or negative, than it does success or solution-oriented. This may be due, in part, to what Economic Development and Tourism officials identified as my academic, and hence critical approach. Several respondents felt the contents conveyed an overly pessimistic picture of tourism development in Pangnirtung. Interestingly, it was mostly resident and non-resident Qallunaat who were concerned with what they considered a "negative" report. In retrospect, Andrew and I recognized that an emphasis on the problems and failures over the past ten years of the tourism development pilot-project may have overshadowed its successes. However, local Inuit politicians, PTC members, and private entrepreneurs disagreed that the report was a negative or pessimistic study: most felt that the community needed to realize and to "face-up" to the problems, before solutions were beyond their reach. For example, one local individual believed that the report did not go far

enough in criticizing Inuit entrepreneurs for their lack of self-initiative and their over-dependence on government (p.c. July 9, 1992).

The format and style of the report were highly influenced by Andrew's proactive stance to the research. I was comfortable writing about the various perspectives on tourism as it had developed in the community, allowing the audiences to draw their own conclusions and recommendations. Andrew, on the other hand, insisted that for the report to be useful to the community, we would have to find a way to suggest practical changes that would eliminate barriers to, and encourage continued tourism development. Our different viewpoints concerning how the report should be written demonstrates not only our insider/outsider positions in relation to the community, but may also illustrate the distinction between academic versus folk, or western versus indigenous approaches to knowledge.

For example, Andrew suggested that we include a recommendation with regard to the outfitters' demand for increased local control over inspections and licensing (see Section 7.1). Because of his position in the community, Andrew took a much more applied and specific approach to the report's conclusions, as opposed to my own academic tendency to make generalizations about self-sufficiency and self-determination. It was under Andrew's direction that we included the



"Possibilities" proposed in the report's conclusion (Section 7).

My academic training influenced much of the general issue-oriented content of the report. For example, it was due to current academic concerns about "women and development" that I initiated a women's study in Pangnirtung to determine and include their social and economic concerns. Andrew was initially opposed to this idea, believing it was not relevant enough to the issues at hand to warrant the time spent on interviews. The fact that women had been virtually ignored throughout the tourism development process was to my mind an issue in itself, and one that could not be ignored in an evaluation.

For me, the importance of women's opinions and concerns regarding an economic activity as prevalent as tourism was underlined when a Pangnirtung woman was elected the first female Member of the Legislative Assembly (MLA) from the Eastern Arctic. When Andrew read my field-report on the women's interviews, he concurred and after adding his own clarifications and suggestions, felt that women's issues needed to be addressed in the final report. The section on culture (6. "Culture as a Tourist Attraction") was also a product of my academic readings on history and the invention of culture, although once Andrew discovered the concept, he was excited about it and believed it to be one of the more

important issues to be included in the evaluation.

It was difficult to measure the report's usefulness so soon after its release, but the initial reaction confirmed the idea that a participatory stakeholders approach was potentially effective in terms of knowledge utilization. Stakeholders viewed the report as a fair and accurate representation of the pluralistic decision-making and advisory process, saying the report reflected that its authors had "spent a year in the community" (p.c. June 19, 1992).<sup>1</sup> In most cases, participants recognized their own involvement in the evaluation. Although the report was not treated as an 'imposition from the outside' (Richards 1982:295), I suspect that the failure to secure community participation in the planning stages compromised local commitment to the research results.

Primarily, stakeholders viewed the report as a useful "resource document" for future tourism development planning at both the local and regional levels. For example, the Baffin Tourism Association executive director saw the report as useful in planning issue-oriented workshops at their next annual general meeting (p.c. June 18, 1992). Economic Development & Tourism officials intended to use the report as

---

<sup>1</sup> Significant in this regard is that, upon the Hamlet Council's advice, I was invited to return to Pangnirtung in 1993 to conduct a case study on the economy under contract with the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.

a guide during a development conference they sponsored in the winter of 1992 (p.c. June 19, 1992). Of direct concern to Pangnirtung, the ED&T Tourism Development Supervisor met with the Outfitters Association shortly after the report was released to discuss a locally controlled procedure of inspection and licensing (p.c. June 1 & 19, 1992). Finally, members of the new Pangnirtung Tourism Committee agreed that the report would help to set new Committee objectives (PTC Meeting, July 9, 1992).<sup>2</sup>

One of the primary concerns Andrew and I shared during the report-writing phase of the project, was to find a way in which the information could be accessible to as many people as possible. We were especially concerned that the knowledge that local people had shared, would be returned to them in a useful format. This is, I believe, an applied skill that academics have the ability, as well as the obligation to develop.

The principle of local participation in this research project meant that the report had to be written in a way that could be comprehensible and useful to Inuit with little "formal" education, as well as to highly educated *Qallunaat*. For Andrew and I, this meant writing to satisfy audiences with varying degrees of ability in reading generally, and in

---

<sup>2</sup> I learned during my visit in 1993 that this has apparently not occurred. The PTC has remained inactive, and it seems there is little concern among community members about the need for a local tourism committee.

English vocabulary in particular. It was Andrew who pointed out that, although the report was being fully translated into Inuktitut, many Inuit preferred to read English orthography rather than syllabics. Hence, I was prompted to translate my own 'academic' use of English, especially the use of specialized jargon, into a vocabulary understandable by people for whom English was a second language. At the same time, we needed to maintain a certain degree of sophistication that would appeal to and convince government officials expecting a professional report.

M.L.Swantz documents a similar experience in writing her report for Tanzanian villagers and government officials, where it became necessary to "operate at two levels of analysis without separating one from the other" (Swantz 1975:46). Like Swantz, our task was to create a keener awareness among the people of Pangnirtung to the context of problems with tourism development in their community, and the direction from which solutions could be sought. At the same time, we needed to offer a level of "abstract" analysis which may not have been appreciated by most local Inuit, but which was expected and required by those in administration positions.

Virtually all respondents applauded the full Inuktitut syllabic translation of the final report. However, the Inuktitut version was apparently more important on political

as opposed to practical grounds. We encountered only two Inuktitut-speakers who actually read the syllabic version; one of these individuals was bi-lingual and read the Inuktitut translation only to help interpret concepts he was unsure of in the English version. Many unilingual-Inuktitut speaking adults find reading syllabics a slow and laborious process; several people offered this reasoning to explain why so few local Inuit had read the report. Nevertheless, it was politically important that all of the information in the report was available to both Inuktitut and English speakers. However, as mentioned in Chapter Two, it remained necessary from a practical point of view to try to distribute the research findings in a medium other than the written word.

Part of the reason why the Inuktitut version was viewed as politically significant, is that in the past, Inuit have felt excluded from the research process and its written results. This was confirmed by both Inuit and *Qallunaat* respondents. For this reason, Andrew insisted that all field-reports also be translated into Inuktitut, a very time-consuming endeavour. Because only parts of some research reports -- primarily the executive summaries -- have been translated from English into Inuktitut syllabics, unilingual Inuit have the impression that some information is "too secret" to be translated and that Inuit are deliberately not being told the "whole story."

There was general agreement that the entire report must, therefore, be returned to the community. One ED&T official stated:

I am critical of whether the report is coming back to the community. Most often they do not, and (community people) become offended by that. There is a need for coordination (of research topics) and the need for relevance (p.c. July 9, 1991).

The challenge is to find a meaningful medium and a means of open access to local people who are interested in the research findings.

Elders in particular seemed both frustrated and concerned about the low level of local awareness about topics they knew had been researched. For them, it seemed knowledge was trickling out of the community, because no-one had found a way to plug the leak.<sup>3</sup> To this end, we provided an Inuktitut oral summary of the report's conclusions over community radio (July 6, 1992). Although only one caller (an elder) responded to our invitation for questions and comments, we believed this radio program to have been an important attempt at greater community awareness of both tourism development and research activity.

---

<sup>3</sup> One elder suggested that researchers should return to key informants and conduct "debriefing sessions" on an individual basis. He stated that he had been interviewed many times by many researchers, but they "never came back" to tell him what they learned or what they did with the knowledge he had given them (p.c. Summer 1993).

What follows is the English version of: *Community Based Tourism Development in Pangnirtung, Northwest Territories: Looking Back and Looking Ahead.*<sup>4</sup> As released in April 1992, the report consisted of both the English and the Inuktitut translations 'tumbled' back-to-back. For readers unfamiliar with, and/or interested in Inuktitut syllabics, I have included a reprint of Andrew's translation of the "Summary" (see page 118).

---

<sup>4</sup> The copy of the report contained in this thesis is complete except for several preliminary pages. The substance of the report's original "Acknowledgements" and "Table of Contents" has been incorporated into the preliminary pages of this thesis.

Permission is granted by the School of Graduate Studies to re-print the report in its original, single-spaced format (David Counts, Associate Dean: March 12, 1993). However, pagination has been altered in keeping with the report's placement within the thesis.

---

**COMMUNITY BASED TOURISM DEVELOPMENT  
IN PANGNIRTUNG, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES:  
LOOKING BACK AND LOOKING AHEAD**

---

**GWEN REIMER  
ANDREW DIALLA**

**APRIL 1992**

**A Report Prepared for:  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM, BAFFIN REGION  
(GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES)  
HAMLET OF PANGNIRTUNG**



## SUMMARY

This report reviews the community based development of tourism in Pangnirtung, Northwest Territories from 1980 to 1991. It deals with the benefits and difficulties tourism has brought to people living in the community. This is a study of the process of development in Pangnirtung; it is not an analysis of its tourism as an industry.

The research project was sponsored by the Pangnirtung Hamlet Council and by Economic Development and Tourism [ED&T], Government of the N.W.T. Research was carried out over a nine-month period by two co-investigators who conducted interviews, studied files, and co-ordinated household surveys. Funding was provided by ED&T, Social Science & Humanities Research Council of Canada, Northern Studies Training Program, Canadian Anthropology Society, and McMaster University.

Issues that relate to the political, economic, educational, and cultural consequences of community based tourism development are each dealt with separately. Overall, this type of development has not given the community control over tourism. Rather, it has been a means for greater community involvement in economic development. In the final analysis, government agencies have held financial, and hence political control over the tourism development in Pangnirtung. Tourism's economic benefits have been significant and appropriate. In particular, local people have been able to supplement their family income by informal, direct sales to tourists. However, training and management skills have not kept pace with capital development. This has presented problems in terms of keeping command over the industry at the local-level. Culturally, tourism has focused on the unique whaling heritage of the Cumberland Sound Inuit; this has not always been wholly acceptable to Inuit residents in Pangnirtung.

This study concludes that, in general, the Pangnirtung pilot-project serves as a good model for tourism development in the Eastern Arctic. Other Baffin communities can learn what priorities, risks and difficulties need to be considered should they wish to promote tourism as a viable and controlled form of economic development.



## GLOSSARY

Inuktitut - The Inuit language, or; 'the Inuit way'.  
Qallunaaq(t) - Non-Inuit, or White person (people).  
Qallunaatitut - The English language, or; 'the White way'.

AEDO - Area Economic Development Officer (GNWT)  
ADI - Auyuttuq Development Incorporated  
BRC - Baffin Regional Council  
BTA - Baffin Tourism Association  
CPS - Canadian Parks Service  
ED&T - (Department of) Economic Development and Tourism (GNWT)  
GM - General Manager (Angmarlik Visitor Centre)  
GNWT - Government of the Northwest Territories  
HAP - Home-owners Assistance Plan  
ITC - Inuit Tapirisat of Canada  
MMM - Marshall Macklin Monaghan Limited (Consultants)  
NWT - Northwest Territories  
PTC - Pangnirtung Tourism Committee  
TFN - Tungavik Federation of Nunavut  
TIA - Tourism Industry Association (of NWT)

### A NOTE ON STYLE

The English report is written in a style that we hope will be meaningful to everyone, including those for whom English is a second language. Also, in order to protect confidentiality, quotations taken from interviews are generally not referenced. Many quotations have been translated from Inuktitut into English, and have been edited for grammar only.

1.

## INTRODUCTION

After ten years of community based tourism, the time had come to look back and take stock of what this development had brought to the people living in Pangnirtung. Both government officials and community leaders believed that a review of the successes and failures of the pilot-project was important to building a stronger future for the development of tourism resources. This was true not only for Pangnirtung, but also for the Baffin region as a whole. Pangnirtung was, after all, to be the 'model' for community based tourism development within the Eastern Arctic.

The goal of this study is to look back at what happened in Pangnirtung over the past ten years, and also to look ahead to tourism's potential for the years to come. Because the object of our research has been 'community based' tourism development, this study emphasizes how it has affected the 'community.' Also, it is more about the consequences of 'development' than it is about the industry itself. Our report attempts to describe how different people view tourism development, and to draw some general conclusions from what has been learned.

The information in this report was gathered during nine months (July 1991 - March 1992) of joint research efforts by two co-workers: a Ph.D. candidate from McMaster University, Hamilton, and a local co-researcher from Pangnirtung. This type of research partnership is relatively new in the North, and has lent a unique and valuable quality to the research process. For example, we believe that our partnership helped to create a more responsive attitude among community residents, who were otherwise reluctant to be interviewed for yet another study by a southern researcher.

We conducted approximately 100 interviews with a variety of groups and individuals, including residents, visitors, business-people and government officials in Pangnirtung and Iqaluit. Together with the help of high-school students, we co-ordinated a household economic study, but the survey method proved to be relatively unsuccessful. Reliable economic data was, overall, difficult to obtain. Information was also taken from files, minutes, and correspondence dating back to 1981. Observations, notes and casual conversations added to the context of data the co-researchers collected more formally.

This study approaches the data by discussing important issues that people presented to us during the interviews. Different people held different perceptions about various aspects of tourism, depending on where they were situated in the development process. A variety of perceptions is both a strong

and a natural element of any evaluation. They combine to build a valuable body of knowledge about tourism development. What this report attempts to do, is to bring the different parties together by making this knowledge available to everyone. It provides a forum in which the different parties can discuss and make their own recommendations for the future of tourism development in Pangnirtung and in the Baffin region. The "Dialogues" at the end of chapters have been created to illustrate this idea: different groups -- sometimes in conflict -- together in the same 'room' voicing their perspectives and arguing for their positions.

Chapter 2 outlines a brief history of tourism development in Pangnirtung from 1980-1991. The political implications of community based development are discussed in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 focuses on economic benefits and barriers, and Chapters 5 and 6 discuss educational and cultural issues. Chapter 7 concludes this study by re-stating the most important outcomes of tourism development, plus a few possible areas for growth.

2.

## LOOKING BACK:

### TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN PANGNIRTUNG, 1980-1991

Before 1980, Pangnirtung's blend of cultural, historical, and environmental attractions were already drawing a small but steady flow of visitors. Pangnirtung was the main gateway to Auyittuq National Park Reserve (established in 1972). The Inuit of the Cumberland Sound Area had a unique cultural heritage that included their participation in 19th Century commercial whaling. There were also rich Arctic Char resources for sportsfishing. These features provided the foundation upon which tourism was built.

This past decade of tourism development in Pangnirtung can be divided into two major phases. The first phase included what was called the 'Five-Year Plan', but which stretched into almost seven years from 1982 to mid-1988. These years marked a flurry of activity in planning and constructing Pangnirtung's basic tourism structure. The second phase -- from mid-1988 to the time of writing -- was characterized by a decrease in capital projects and an increase in operation and management of the local tourist industry. This chapter introduces the various participants and their roles in this process of tourism development in Pangnirtung as it occurred over the past ten years.<sup>1</sup>

#### 2.1. THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN AND BEYOND, 1980-1987

The 'Five-Year Plan' was preceded by two important and related events. First, in 1979-80, the Baffin Regional Council [BRC] conducted a study (by request of GNWT Economic Development & Tourism [ED&T]), to determine the viability of a tourism committee in Pangnirtung. The BRC offered the people of Pangnirtung the opportunity to form the first Tourism Committee in the Baffin Region. Six members were selected from different organizations in the community and two others sat as members-at-large.

---

<sup>1</sup> The majority of information contained in this section was taken from the PTC Minutes and Correspondence files, plus ED&T Correspondence files, 1981-1991. Only quotations are referenced specifically.

Second, Marshall Macklin Monaghan Ltd. [MMM] was asked by GNWT ED&T to study different community tourism development strategies. These were proposed in the PANGNIRTUNG COMMUNITY TOURISM STUDY completed in December 1981. The Pangnirtung Tourism Committee [PTC] also hosted a series of radio shows to hear what local people had to say about tourism. The PTC then presented eight guidelines to the Hamlet Council and the MMM consultants. Together they selected 'The Tour Group Approach' as best suited to the wishes of the community. In particular, this strategy would provide a means to direct tourist activity out to fish camps, hiking trails, and Auyuttuq Park. That is, tourists' influences within the community could be controlled. Government personnel assigned to the pilot-project approved this strategy.

Ten tourist activity projects -- eg., hiking trails, day-fishing camps, Kekerten historic park -- were suggested for implementation according to the 'Five-Year Plan'. With the advice and approval of the PTC, professional consultants were hired to plan and implement the projects (See Appendix A). Elders were often consulted for their knowledge about relevant traditional matters; for example, the style and construction of Inukshuks to mark trails or the interpretation of archaeological findings at the Kekerten site.

Throughout this planning and implementation phase, the local Tourism Committee was unsure of its powers. PTC Minutes recorded several discussions on the idea of incorporation in order to gain greater authority. Although the PTC was considered a sub-committee of the Hamlet Council, the relationship between the two seemed to be unofficial (and often confused throughout this period). The PTC enjoyed a fair measure of autonomy. The Committee was assured by ED&T staff that if they believed any project should be halted for whatever reason, they had the authority to do so.

What the Tourism Committee was not in control of, however, was the budget. This raised several difficulties: for example, some workers quit because of irregular pay-schedules when cheques did not arrive on time from the Iqaluit office. By Year III, a contribution was given to PTC through the GNWT Regional Capital budget so that wages could be paid directly to the employees whom the PTC supervised. The administration of these funds was handled by the Hamlet Office. Nevertheless, the PTC had continual problems acquiring adequate and consistent funding for their Tourism Manager position. In the course of the first six years of tourism development, the PTC experienced more than annual changeovers in management personnel (this will be discussed further in Chapter 5).

Imperfect and irregular membership attendance at Tourism Committee meetings became a problem already in their first year

of operation.<sup>2</sup> Although consistent membership and attendance was viewed to be important to progress -- and despite honorariums -- this remained an issue throughout the history of the committee.<sup>3</sup> As well, instances arose where the Chairperson was involved in certain decisions and negotiations, quite apart from the knowledge of the rest of the membership. PTC Minutes from 1986 suggest that the Chairperson had difficulty maintaining support from the general membership: "he (did not) want to run things by himself... and (needed) more input from the committee."<sup>4</sup>

The need for continued and improved communication between the Tourism Committee and the rest of the community was a matter often discussed during PTC meetings. They held radio shows and distributed one or two newsletters. They also held a community-wide competition in naming the new Visitor Centre, and believed that community residents needed to be informed of the design and cultural content of the museum. For the community, the Angmarlik Centre helped to fulfil their responsibility to the Elders and showed a commitment to their heritage. In 1988, the Pangnirtung Tourism Committee was awarded the 'Canadian Parks Service Heritage Award' for their efforts "in the preservation and integration of natural and human resources."<sup>5</sup>

In a very real sense, the PTC became the regional experts in community tourism development. The PTC eventually drafted a "Terms of Reference" for their own use, but also as a guideline for tourism committees in other regions. One of the Committee's functions was to present tourism workshops in other Baffin and Keewatin communities. These trips were paid for by a NWT Service Contract (\$3,000/year) to the PTC for "advisory services... on behalf of our Department (of Economic Development & Tourism, Iqaluit) to deliver workshops on the tourism development

---

<sup>2</sup> PTC Minutes 1982-1989 showed attendance records ranging anywhere from 60% - 80% of its membership. From 1983 to 1986, the Committee held an average of 14 meetings per year. There was a sharp decline after 1987. It was unclear whether this was due to the lack of recorded minutes or the lack of actual meetings.

<sup>3</sup> In 1983, one member was dismissed for non-attendance. A policy was agreed on in which general members could sit on the committee for a three year term, and the Chairperson was elected for a two year term (PTC Minutes, February 1983).

<sup>4</sup> PTC Minutes, October 1986.

<sup>5</sup> "Profiles of the Canadian Parks Service Heritage Award Winners 1988." Canadian Parks Service Newsletter, February, 1988.



process."<sup>6</sup> Pangnirtung's Tourism Committee gained credibility throughout the region for its commitment to controlled community based tourism.

The role of GNWT Economic Development & Tourism at the local level was to provide assistance to the Pangnirtung residents in realizing business opportunities. At the regional level, it was committed to building basic capital development structures, and to long-term product and marketing projects. ED&T was the licensing and regulatory body for outfitters. ED&T also sponsored Tourism Managers to attend training workshops whenever possible.

Each of the Area Economic Development Officers [AEDO] stationed in Pangnirtung during this period of development were visibly involved in the tourism development process. They were ex-officio members of the Tourism Committee and their responsibility was as a resource person, with certain secretarial duties. For local individuals interested in tourism marketing and development assistance -- to establish a sportsfishing camp, for example -- the AEDO was generally the first point of contact.

PTC Minutes showed that the AEDOs reminded the PTC of the 'community-basis' of tourism development in Pangnirtung. They stressed tourism's importance for local employment and income, and the need for community involvement and awareness. The AEDO was instrumental in obtaining funds on behalf of the PTC from various Federal and Territorial sources, particularly with regard to summer student employment initiatives for tourism projects and hospitality programs.

Canadian Parks Service [CPS] was the most active Federal player in the development of tourism in Pangnirtung. When the Tourism Committee was first formed, a member of the CPS staff sat as an advisor to the committee. As well, Parks personnel participated in hospitality training workshops for the PTC summer student host programs. In 1983 a Local Parks Advisory Board was established to advise the Superintendent of Auyuittuq National Park Reserve concerning the management and development of the Park. They also endorsed a local oral history project. This Advisory board shared a concern for tourism growth, as "a benefit to everyone and a source of income for the community."<sup>7</sup>

Private sector involvement in the tourism process to this point was limited primarily to Baffin Tourism Association [BTA] activity. BTA's role was to support the PTC at the regional level. As one of the six zone representatives of the Tourism Industry Association [TIA] of the NWT, the BTA was established in 1984 and received CORE funding from GNWT. BTA's aim was "to

---

<sup>6</sup> Letter from ED&T Business Development Supervisor to Pangnirtung AEDO, May 30, 1983. As well, the PTC Chairperson made a presentation at a Baffin Regional Economic Development Conference sponsored by Canadian Arctic Resources Committee [CARC] in 1986.

<sup>7</sup> Local Parks Advisory Committee Minutes, November 1987.

represent the travel industry in the Baffin and to assist in the development of community based tourism."<sup>9</sup> BTA promoted Pangnirtung as the model destination for other community representatives to observe and consider.

BTA's role in relation to the public sector, was to commit itself to short-term marketing and product development, and to advise the government on the needs of the industry. For example, BTA representatives met with ED&T and Arctic College to create tourism hospitality programs. BTA and ED&T also worked together to establish Outfitters' Training and by 1986, Level I and II courses were being taught (through Arctic College) in Inuktitut by an instructor from Pangnirtung.<sup>9</sup> The PTC stressed the importance of training courses in teaching outfitters to be more than mere taxi-drivers. Tourists were already complaining about high outfitter rates, and quality of service soon became an issue. In 1987 the BTA expressed concern over the quality of outfitter service throughout the region, and recommended training toward certification.

Private business interests were active at the local level primarily in the accommodation sector. The existing hotel -- Peyton Lodge -- was in need of repair, and was eventually closed due to violations of health and safety standards. Tour companies and airlines -- along with the PTC and ED&T -- believed that "without a decent hotel the tourist prospects of Pangnirtung cannot be realized to their fullest."<sup>10</sup> Since 1982, private business people held discussions and submitted proposals to ED&T and the PTC concerning new or upgraded hotel facilities in Pangnirtung. ED&T encouraged the private sector to solicit proposals in this regard, but also recommended that "in theory, the 'community' should... play the role of the initiator."<sup>11</sup>

In 1985 a hotel committee consisting of representatives from GNWT, the private sector (local and non-local), Hamlet Council, and the PTC was formed to seek alternatives to existing accommodation in Pangnirtung. Proposals from various private groups -- Canada North Outfitting, First Air, Eastern Arctic Developments Ltd., Pangnirtung Inuit Co-op, and Nunasi

---

<sup>9</sup> Introduction: Tourism Awareness Program, 1984. Later, in 1987, the BTA released a document stressing the importance of a strong and formal relationship between the Tourism Committee and the Hamlet Council. However, there was no official association between the BTA and the PTC.

<sup>9</sup> Joavie Alivaktuk was the first Inuk Guide and Outfitter instructor in the Northwest Territories.

<sup>10</sup> Letter from Canada North Outfitting Inc. to Chief of Tourism and Parks, GNWT, May 1985.

<sup>11</sup> Letter from Acting chief, GNWT Tourism & Parks to the Baffin Regional Tourism Development Officer, July 1982.

Corporation -- recommended joint government and private financing. More importantly, they suggested that ownership should be at least 51% Inuit. In 1987, the newly formed Auyuittuq Development Incorporated [ADI] renovated the old hotel and opened the Auyuittuq Lodge in June 1988.<sup>12</sup>

By the end of this development phase, tourist visitation numbers had increased by over 100% in the Baffin Region. Other than Iqaluit -- the transit point -- Pangnirtung was visited by approximately 500 visitors, almost 20% of total Baffin region visitation.

## 2.2. OPERATING A FLEDGLING TOURIST INDUSTRY, 1988-1991

Kekerten Historic Park and the Angmarlik Visitors' Centre were officially opened in July 1988. Two months after the opening, the AEDO stated that the Tourism Committee was now "on a new plateau... and should look at new things and new activities."<sup>13</sup> In short, the big projects were finished and it was time to direct attention to quality service, marketing, and management. To this end, the PTC Chairperson again recommended in late 1988 that the Committee seriously consider incorporating as an Association and promote more private business involvement. It was felt this new status might provide more consistent access to funds, which was now a major issue for the PTC. However, in Spring 1989, the Chairperson resigned from the PTC. This coincided with a changeover in personnel in the AEDO position in Pangnirtung. PTC incorporation status did not materialize.

In 1990, very few PTC meetings were held and membership attendance was low. This was despite the fact that the PTC had "given strong support" to the new HERITAGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN.<sup>14</sup> This project had been commissioned by GNWT ED&T to restore the Old Hudson Bay Company Blubber Station, among other things. The new AEDO advised the PTC to inform the community of the HERITAGE PLAN and he encouraged the Committee to more actively promote community awareness. Rather, the Tourism Committee faded further into the background of community affairs. Consequently, the General Manager [GM] of the Angmarlik Visitor Centre, together with the outfitters, took on increased responsibilities in operating the local tourist industry.

There was indication of increased involvement by local businesses in the tourist industry during this phase. In 1989, the Uqqurmiut Inuit Artists Association announced that it was "now open to tourism" and willing to become more closely involved

---

<sup>12</sup> Auyuittuq Development Inc. included 60% Inuit ownership, of which 40% of shares were held locally.

<sup>13</sup> PTC Minutes, September 1988.

<sup>14</sup> PTC Minutes, March 1990.

with the Angmarlik Centre.<sup>15</sup> As well, the Auyuittuq Lodge manager was asked to join in plans to establish guided town-tours. There was little private sector support from the regional level during this time. The BTA was experiencing fiscal problems and by 1990 the Association had collapsed. It then entered a period of major restructuring.

Nevertheless, there was increased interest about Pangnirtung as a destination among southern-based tour operators. Several operators joined Familiarization Trips to see the product, to meet local outfitters and to determine the quality and reliability of service. Both BTA and TIA had begun to place heavy emphasis on the importance of training as the link to quality service, and hence, to higher tourism earnings. Auyuittuq Park staff also expressed concerns about reliable transportation service to the Park entrance and back. GNWT then announced that by 1993, guide training would be mandatory to obtain a licence. Meanwhile, outfitters in Pangnirtung struggled with the idea of becoming 'private businessmen' and what this would mean in terms of operation and advertising.<sup>16</sup> Also during this period, tour operators and local women each expressed interest in some type of 'home-stay' accommodation alternative to the Lodge. This grew into a hot debate that involved private and public parties at all levels (See Dialogue 4).

By 1989, plans for a new Eastern Arctic Parks Visitor Centre were well under way. Discussions between Parks, ED&T, PTC, and community residents focused on its integration and design with the Angmarlik Centre next door. A phone-in radio show demonstrated the community's concern that the design not overshadow or compromise community activities such as in the Elders Room. Federal, Territorial, and community co-operation was fundamental to this new development in Pangnirtung's tourism sector.

Throughout 1991, the Pangnirtung Tourism Committee met only once. It remained virtually non-existent, despite the GM's urging that "the community is depending on you."<sup>17</sup> In the summer of 1990, the AEDO met with the Hamlet Council to discuss the PTC's lack of effectiveness. By January 1991, discussions again focused on the need for a restructuring of the Committee to an industry-type of Association that could better represent direct interests in tourism.

---

<sup>15</sup> Pangnirtung ED&T Minutes, October 1989.

<sup>16</sup> PTC Minutes, March 1989.

<sup>17</sup> For example, the PTC usually voted on which applicants would fill the student summer hosting positions at the Angmarlik Centre, but were unable to do so due to a lack of meetings. (January 1991 - Letter from the Angmarlik GM to the PTC members regarding the need for a meeting.)

3.

## WHAT IS 'COMMUNITY BASED' TOURISM ?

In 1980-81 we were using a buzz word that no-one really understood -- 'community based tourism development' -- a catchy new word that implied that the community would drive the direction of their tourism development.  
[ED&T Baffin Regional Superintendent]

### 3.1. POLICY AND PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNITY BASED TOURISM

'Community based' was a new concept in GNWT's approach to economic development in the early 1980s. To Economic Development and Tourism personnel, it meant both an economic and a political shift in Territorial policy and practice. With regard to tourism development in the Baffin Region, it announced a development plan to replace the haphazard tourism projects carried out in Eastern Arctic communities in the 1970s. Also, this strategy called for community advice, participation, and support in all proposed tourism plans and projects.

Before this time, there had been changes in decision-making at the community level: municipal powers were handed down from Area Administrators to Hamlet and Settlement Councils. At the national level, Native organizations such as the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada [ITC], the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut [TFN], and Pauktuutit [Inuit Women's Association] were formed. These groups caused Territorial bureaucrats to recognize that community involvement in all matters, including economic development, could no longer be ignored. Hence, Pangnirtung was actually presented with optional paths to tourism -- from full-scale development to no development at all. This was an important policy change from how GNWT had done things in the past.

The government recognized tourism as one of the few resources to be exploited in the Eastern Arctic. However, little had been done to devise any long-term plan for its development in the region. A document put out by GNWT in 1983 outlined the principles of community based tourism:

The intention of community based tourism is to allow communities to use the tourism industry as a means to self determination, especially economically. This Government's role in community based tourism is that of a consultant in the planning stages, and that of a

provider of direct financial support in the developmental stage.<sup>1</sup>

This document described a type of small-scale tourism designed for and directed by a specific community. It was aimed at creating a private sector industry in which the government provided support services. On the basis of these principles, the Baffin Regional Council chose Pangnirtung as the pilot-project site for tourism development in the Eastern Arctic (see Chapter 2). This meant that for a time, Pangnirtung would serve as a test-case for tourism development in the Baffin region. Pangnirtung would also receive special attention in terms of GNWT investment and administrative support. The fact that there was little turn-over in ED&T local and regional staff throughout the first ten years of the pilot-project, helped to promote a consistent plan of development in Pangnirtung.<sup>2</sup>

It is important to note that the 1983 document clearly stated the goal of "community control" (Sections 7.4; 8.4). However, this new approach did not necessarily mean a full transfer of power over tourism development to the people of Pangnirtung. Rather it meant the community would be involved in making decisions about tourism development. The ED&T Baffin Regional Superintendent explained:

The ability to make decisions and to control money and outcomes of situations, is something we know NOW to be part of community development. But this was not thought out very well in the '80s. As a result, a lot of the projects that were completed in the pilot-project -- while well intentioned and certainly contributed to the attraction of Pangnirtung as a tourist destination -- probably fell short of empowering the community or building its capacity to direct its own tourism.

### 3.2. THE 'COMMUNITY' AND LOCAL CONTROL

I used to think of (community based) to mean the community really involved and making the decisions. However, it has not worked out that way. It was just involvement, not decision-making. [PTC Member, 1992]

---

<sup>1</sup> COMMUNITY BASED TOURISM: A STRATEGY FOR THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES TOURISM INDUSTRY. Yellowknife: Department of Economic Development & Tourism, GNWT, 1983:14.

<sup>2</sup> The individuals who made up the Baffin ED&T supervisory staff in 1991, had all lived in the region and/or been involved with the department for 10-15 years.

For many local people, community based tourism meant more than being involved -- it meant being in control. The guidelines taken from the radio shows sponsored by the Pangnirtung Tourism Committee in 1982, showed the community's wish for more control over the tourist industry in Pangnirtung. They demanded that a local group act as representatives of the whole community -- hence, the Tourism Committee would become 'the community' when it came to local interests in tourism. However, it was equally important the rest of the community be kept informed about the progress of tourism development. A Tourism Committee was needed to guide all developments, to make sure local labour was hired in the construction, maintenance and operation of tourist facilities, to control tourist numbers and activities, and to seek training and employment opportunities for local outfitters and guides.<sup>3</sup>

The former Mayor of Pangnirtung stated the matter in similar terms:

The PTC's biggest responsibility would be to control tourism in the community. If there is a Tourism Committee that is functioning properly, they can get more control in the community from the government. I have nothing against the government; I know that the government has helped the community a great deal. But if we are going to control tourism, it has to be controlled from the inside.

The Elders we spoke with also stressed the importance of both a Tourism Committee and a Parks Advisory Board to oversee tourist activity. Elders emphasized a need for continued community support for tourism: the Tourism Committee would need to communicate with the community in order to represent the community.

Unfortunately, since 1990 or so, the activity level of the PTC decreased considerably. This had a negative effect on local control:

It worked very well in the first few years. Local control seemed to be there. However, as the years went by, it disappeared a little bit and then it was completely gone this past year. There has been no local control now. It started off like a very good idea and for the first few years it seemed like the community was behind it. But then they lost it.

Several people we spoke with were unsure if the Tourism Committee still existed. This caused serious concerns, particularly among

---

<sup>3</sup> PTC Recommendation to Hamlet Council on the Tourist Study, 1982.

local people directly involved in the industry. One outfitter stated:

Pangnirtung will fall behind in tourism if the PTC doesn't meet often enough. Right now Pangnirtung receives the most visitors, but other communities are realizing that tourism is important. Perhaps we need another type of organization in order to get things moving again.

There were several reasons behind the failure of the Tourism Committee. As outlined in Chapter 2, the PTC began to weaken just after the Angmarlik Visitor Centre and Kekerten Historic Park were completed in 1988. ED&T officials believed that capital projects helped to maintain a high level of PTC enthusiasm. When these two major projects were finished, the PTC was left without any major goals to work toward. Most sources also suspected that the end of honorariums marked an end to some members' motivation. Furthermore, there had never been very good co-ordination between the local organizations represented on the PTC. Few PTC representatives understood their responsibilities to communicate between and to build support for tourism among these groups.

However, to the former Chairperson, the PTC was as important to the community as ever:

People up here should not lay off because tourism seems to be doing OK right now. If they still want tourism here after ten years, they are the ones who should be out there getting the money, getting the training, planning step by step to see what needs to be developed now. We must review and re-evaluate where we are now and which direction we should go.

The most recent Tourism Committee had difficulty achieving their goals because of membership and leadership turn-overs. Also, they lacked the business and management experience to successfully run the committee. Many local people we spoke with linked strong leadership to the strength of any committee: they felt that the changeover in the PTC chairperson's position in 1989, was a direct cause of its breakdown. The Angmarlik Centre General Manager who worked together with the PTC from 1990 to 1991, agreed there was a leadership problem: too often the Tourism Committee left their responsibilities to the GM.

The General Manager of the Uqqurmiut Inuit Artists Association stressed the importance of leadership to any organization:

(Inuit) people know when someone is effective in standing up to and dealing with people from outside the community, and who has no fear when it comes to dealing with bureaucrats... My experience has been that leadership is extremely important and traditionally was



important too, even if we couldn't identify how (Inuit) people selected those leaders, and so imposed this democratic election on them.

The effectiveness of committees and chairpersons within an Inuit cultural context was raised several times during our conversations with Non-Inuit businessman in Pangnirtung. Some saw that local committees were able to exercise little real authority. Traditionally, leadership was achieved and practised according to different situations. However, this did not translate well into the modern Inuit context. Hence, a former PTC member urged that, "the PTC definitely has to be revitalized -- not just replaced by something else, but revitalized."

Several local leaders noted that because the Tourism Committee was not active, the community was being by-passed when tourism-related decisions were being made. The former Mayor said;

A big problem now is that the ED&T and BTA are working together and are making decisions for Pangnirtung. The chairman of BTA is a 'Pang-person'. ED&T works with that person and makes decisions for the whole community, side-stepping the Tourism Committee. That has to stop.

There were local people who realized the importance of getting and keeping control over tourism and their economy as a whole. A previous Angmarlik GM stated:

People have been trying to come up with an economic alternative but its very difficult to find something feasible for the long-term. We have to look at something that has unlimited resource -- tourism is an unlimited resource. So, its something that we have to handle really well -- treat it as if its a one-time deal, as if we don't have a second chance.

The demand for local control over the tourism industry and its development became clear early on in our research. What was less clear, was how and over what that control should be exercised. Nevertheless, people did share a few common concerns. First, local people wanted to control where tourists could and could not go both inside the community and outside on the land:

One reason for starting a Tourism Committee was that we wanted to control where the Qallunaat could go. We didn't want them to go all over the place -- not just in the community -- but we didn't want them interfering with the hunting in Cumberland Sound.

In other destinations, tourists control the community, and this community does not want that here.

Several Elders warned they would no longer support the idea of tourism if they noticed tourists interfering with hunting or damaging the land in any way.

Few local people worried about 'carrying capacity' -- the need to control the numbers of tourists coming into the Pangnirtung area. Most saw the opposite as more of a problem: for example, carvers and outfitters who earned income directly from tourists were hoping for growth in tourist numbers:

I do not foresee any trouble with the number of tourists coming in. In the past and up to now, there has never been enough tourists. So there is a lot of room for more Qallunaat for the outfitters and the carvers. Carvers can never sell enough carvings to tourists.

Limits to tourist growth were seen to come from outside factors like the high cost of airline tickets to the Baffin region and the lack of awareness among southerners about Baffin as a destination. However, both the BTA and ED&T believed that growth in tourist numbers was an issue that must be kept in check and defined by the community.

Some local residents also saw a need to better control the relationship between southern tour operators and local guides and outfitters. The Angmarlik General Manager explained:

Control should stay in the town. It would notify the tour operators from the south that the (local Tourism Committee) is in control and they are the ones who know about the North and giving service to the visitors. I've had tour operators here who think they know everything. We tried to give them advice; but one guide said he's read about it, done tests about it, and then he got stuck in two feet of quicksand. One outfitter came to me and asked, 'what can we do to make these operators realize that we know this area and that we can give the service to satisfy them'? I even had tourists coming to me complaining about their tour operators, asking if they are doing things right.

The issue was not only that southern tour operators lacked confidence in local services, nor that there were communication difficulties. The issue also concerned growth in local economic opportunities. If outfitters and guides in the community could convince southern operators that they were able to care for a tour group, tourism employment opportunities would increase (See also Chapters 4 and 5). As the former Mayor pointed out, control in the form of local employment and business opportunities was a key concern from the very beginning of tourism development in Pangnirtung.

### 3.3. THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN COMMUNITY BASED TOURISM

The Territorial Government's involvement in and control over community based tourism development in the Baffin region was vital but not always certain. The ED&T Baffin Regional Superintendent stated:

Where (government involvement) falls down a bit, is (with regard to) the development of Nunavut -- growing demands by the aboriginal people to be involved in the process. And we have not ignored those demands; that's the tension, the tugging that's always taking place.

The issue of local control -- for example, handing down authority over the development budget to the community -- was apparently not what the government meant by 'community based' in practical terms. Ideally, the role of government in this overall scheme, was to provide financial and administrative support as required by the steering committee and/or private sectors within the community. In reality, project ideas usually came down from government personnel or outside consultants. This was likely necessary in the first stages of development when few, if any local individuals had the knowledge to recommend suitable tourism projects.

However, ten years later, development plans continued to be initiated from the 'outside'. The HERITAGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PANGNIRTUNG was the most recent example.<sup>4</sup> Interviews showed that community awareness of and involvement in this particular project plan was low. Although the Hamlet Council approved the plan, they did so mainly as the legal body through whom Federal and Territorial funding could be obtained. Unfortunately, this resulted in a situation where official community support was used merely to 'rubber stamp' a project that a government department believed was good for the community.

Pangnirtung's desire for control over their own affairs was frequently at odds with the government's regional mandate. ED&T had to try to develop an economic basis for small local business ventures distributed among thirteen communities. The regional ED&T office in Iqaluit was under considerable pressure to shift their focus away from Pangnirtung which, as the pilot-project community, had received more capital investment than other Baffin communities. This pressure flowed from two sources. First, from the twelve other Baffin communities who believed that enough attention had been paid to Pangnirtung and that it was now their turn for a piece of the pie. Second, from Territorial Ministers who were sensitive to the political dangers of lopsided development that focused on one community for too long.

---

<sup>4</sup> A HERITAGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PANGNIRTUNG, BAFFIN ISLAND, N.W.T. Prepared for Pangnirtung Hamlet Council and Economic Development & Tourism, GNWT, by Stevenson & Associates. Edmonton: 1990.

In Pangnirtung, people who sensed a decline in GNWT's capital investment in their community, criticized ED&T for going 'into the background'. Criticisms tended to be directed at the resident AEDO who represented ED&T's role at the community level. The two former AEDOs in Pangnirtung (1980-1983; 1983-1989) emphasized the active aspect of their job. Each worked closely with the Tourism Committee in suggesting new projects and opportunities. Their terms matched precisely with the peak of tourism capital projects in the community. Consequently, the government's role within the community was obvious and seemingly positive. The Chairperson of the PTC during that time, said:

One person that no-one really recognized is (the AEDO). He did a very good job and put a lot of energy into putting this whole idea together by working with the Committee. Then he gave this information to the Department and to find (consultants). To me, he was doing his job with the people here, and responsible in helping the community to develop economically. Plus he communicated with the people through the Committee. Every time we met or needed him, he was there.

The current AEDO, however, was admittedly less active; he interpreted his role more in terms of giving advice and assistance to individuals and groups who requested it. This latest change-over in ED&T staff in the community occurred at the same time as the shift toward 'operation and management' of the tourist industry. Thus, in the past few years, the ED&T office in Pangnirtung had come to be viewed as merely a processing centre for funding applications. Tourism development was perceived to have come to a standstill.

The Federal Government's role in Pangnirtung's tourism development was less obvious than that of GNWT. The Superintendent of Canadian Parks Service, Eastern Arctic District said:

I see our role as the Parks Service, as providing opportunities to the community. We are not in the business of financing development here in town -- that belongs to other government departments -- but we will certainly identify opportunities to the local Council, the outfitters, and then its up to them to decide whether they will go ahead and do it. The whole focus of our operation here and in all the Northern Parks, is basically a 'community-up' approach to doing business.

The CPS and the GNWT Department of Economic Development held different values with respect to tourism development in the Pangnirtung area. ED&T looked at Auyuittuq Park as one path toward economic growth via tourism. The purpose of CPS, on the other hand, was to 'preserve, present, and protect' Auyuittuq Park. Their policy was to support community based management of

Auyuttuq through a local Parks Advisory Board. In the opinion of the Parks Superintendent, the Territorial government was a driving force toward development. The Federal administration, on the other hand, was more of a supporter of community driven development concerns.

Not unlike the Tourism Committee, the Parks Advisory Board did not have any legal authority.' In the end, the Federal definition of community based -- as practised by Canadian Parks Services in Pangnirtung -- was similar to the Territorial definition: local people involved in development, but ultimately not in control. In the case of Parks, however, stronger local decision-making and management was being formally negotiated in the **NUNAVUT AGREEMENT-IN-PRINCIPLE**.'

#### 3.4. WHEN SHOULD THE PILOT-PROJECT END?

After ten years as a pilot-project, people at all levels were wondering if, when, and how Pangnirtung would be ready to command its own tourist industry. One of the goals of community based tourism was that it become mainly a private sector industry. Thus, there should come a time when tourism in Pangnirtung is owned and operated at a distance from the public sector. The community and the government shared a challenge to negotiate a balance between local 'involvement' versus 'control.'

Both the Pangnirtung Tourism Committee and the Department of ED&T were trying to figure out where to go from here. The question that remained in the public mind was, when should government 'back off' and finally 'walk away' from the pilot-project? In ED&T's view, community based tourism was moving along a slow and gradual line of development. Their sense was that community based tourism was still in its beginning stages, both in Pangnirtung and in the Baffin region as a whole:

We are not there. We are on a continuum here -- we are ten years ahead of where we were ten years ago, and we're ten years behind where we will be ten years from now. As long as we are deemed to be making progress -- which I think we are.

---

' For example, the Advisory Board was in no position to direct the tendering of new Parks Visitor Centre construction contracts to local crews.

' **AGREEMENT-IN-PRINCIPLE BETWEEN THE INUIT OF THE NUNAVUT SETTLEMENT AREA AND HER MAJESTY IN RIGHT OF CANADA**. Article 8: "Parks" provides for an Inuit Impact & Benefit Agreement [IIBA] in which a Nunavut Impact Review Board [NIRB] will be involved in managing all of Nunavut's land and resources, including crown lands.

In the words of the Regional Superintendent, determining the end of the pilot-project was an issue of "the push-pull of development":

Government is sometimes reluctant to give control, and sometimes communities are reluctant to take control -- that tension always exists... It is not a simple statement that government is not willing to give up control, because the other side of that equation is that someone else is prepared to take it. [...] Development in the communities will take another 'x' number of years before more people in the community feel strong and confident enough to demand things.

Government officials emphasized the importance of strong local leadership. There was a need for local spokespersons to voice demands about which direction the community wanted tourism to develop in the future. From 1982 to 1989, two active and outspoken local Inuit PTC chairpersons were successful in motivating committee members, gaining support from the rest of the community, and making demands on government agencies. This leadership was lacking in recent years.

One of the problems, from both the community's and the government's point of view, was a lack of local drive. This was in spite of the fact that ED&T personnel viewed 'Pang-people' as 'confident,' 'aggressive,' 'motivated,' and 'good fighters.' Nevertheless, one local outfitter stated:

I think local people have not worked on it enough, and that's why ED&T creates and tries to develop things to help our economy. That's important, but local people are not involved enough.

For instance, previous representatives from the local Women's Auxiliary described their role on the Tourism Committee as "just to sit there and listen." Female PTC members made few demands during the early development years -- demands that might have reaped more tourism benefits for women.<sup>7</sup>

Non-Inuit local business people agreed that the issue was one of too little local demand:

Projects are started in communities by somebody somewhere else without the (local) committee saying 'we want this' or 'we need that'. It seems that the 'hands-on' is never passed to where it should be, to the communities. Did the Tourism Committee ever say, 'this thing is necessary?' So, with all the politics playing up here... maybe the committee just feels they

---

<sup>7</sup> See Chapters 4 and 5 for more information about criticisms of tourism's few opportunities for women in Pangnirtung.

don't have any power anyway. Information is given to the committee, who just digests it and says 'fine'. I think the big impasse is government policy, and the lack of initiative on the part of the Tourism Committee. Its going to take strong people to change things. Change doesn't happen on its own.

Pangnirtung can truly do it on their own -- can take care of itself without government money or administrative help. What is needed, however, is a local leader with a voice, as well as someone with administrative abilities: 'a person who is gung-ho and a person who is a pencil pusher'.

Perhaps because of this view, several Non-Inuit business people tended to bypass local Committees and Councils when they needed to get a job done. They preferred to lobby directly to government personnel -- the people with authority -- for solutions to their problems (See Dialogue 4). Some of these same business people were openly disturbed by views -- held by tourists, for example -- that 'Pangnirtung' was owned and operated by 'outsiders.' During two 'Visitor Voices' sessions, tourists were critical about what they saw as government and outside investors' control over the economy. In reply, the President of Auyuittuq Development Inc. was quick to point out that the Lodge was 60% owned by Inuit.\*

One of the areas in which local people wanted to see a greater balance of control was in financial matters. Because in the end, ED&T held the 'purse strings', it was difficult for the PTC to direct tourism development in the way they saw fit. Some residents saw the takeover by GNWT of the Angmarlik Centre as an example of weakening local authority over the tourism industry:

Ever since the Angmarlik Centre came about, the control has gone back to the government. When the Tourism Committee does not have absolute control over that employee, because he is a Territorial employee, then you get conflicting mandates.'

---

\* However, local shareholders claimed that the President of Auyuittuq Development Inc. desired local Inuit participation in order to qualify for government 'native development' funding. Also, it 'looked good to ask native people to join.'

\* It should be noted that the PTC felt it best that ED&T take over the GM position. In light of their previous problems with management, the PTC believed this would give the position greater financial and administrative security (See Section 5.1).

From the BTA Executive Director's point of view, communities had to start fighting for their dollars and showing why they were good at what they did:

Once things are developed to a point -- like the Angmarlik Visitors' Centre -- up and running with a role and a function, then they can redefine that... That is what Pangnirtung as a community must define.

To this end, BTA had been trying to create a closer link with local tourism committees. They hoped to help local representatives come together as a regional body to make decisions about long-term development. BTA also attempted to lobby for or against what they believed was good or bad government policy.

BTA's goal was to actively work towards building a better regional understanding: the future of tourism and of Nunavut depended upon a collective effort on the part of all Baffin communities. At the local level, there tended to be a lack of understanding about the importance of Pangnirtung as a vital piece in the regional puzzle. Several local people were nervous about looking beyond the community, to more regional concerns. They feared that the money contributed by government agencies would be taken from Pangnirtung and given to other communities.

Nevertheless, there was a sense among a number of Inuit in Pangnirtung that the end of the tourism pilot-project was related to the beginning of Nunavut:

Its going to be very beneficial and educational for the local people -- if they know they can be in control (of tourism here) then they can be in control of Nunavut... People who are at the top are stuck into their desks so much with their paper, they forget what is the reality of each community. If each community can be in control, (it can) get experience from what has been done.

The former Mayor believed this meant that groups within the community, and communities within Baffin must work together:

The trend in the past few years has been that each little society and group is trying to be fiercely independent from the other committees. That has to stop to prepare for Nunavut. They have to start working together -- for example, the PTC has to work closely together with the Hamlet, we have to get together in order to prepare for Nunavut -- the Inuit way is that we work together. If Nunavut is to become a reality, we have to start working together now, if we are going to have any chance at all once Nunavut gets here.



### DIALOGUE 3 : OUTFITTER INSPECTIONS AND LICENSING

The following dialogue is about the very practical matter of inspections and licensing. It shows how groups at local, regional, and territorial levels think differently about the balance between government involvement versus local control.

RESEARCHER: What is your department's policy on outfitter inspections?

ED&T SUPERVISOR: I'm supposed to do 50% of all outfitters every year -- Pangnirtung, Broughton Island, and Clyde River one year, and then others the next year. I go by regulations that state what an outfitter must have and must do.

OUTFITTER: Nobody came and looked at my gear this year. I just got a phone call asking me if I still had the same equipment I had last year. I said 'yes', and that was it! I have seen some outfitters starting off with almost no equipment. I do not know how they could pass inspections. I feel there should be more strict inspections.

ED&T SUPERVISOR: When I issue an outfitting licence, we ask him to go to Hamlet Council or HTA or Tourism Committee, saying, 'here is what I plan to do with my outfitting service.' Each outfitter must send along a letter of support on his behalf saying, 'this guy has the equipment and he'll do a good job, and he won't conflict with the kinds of things we're doing.' Then we give him a licence.

ANGMARLIK GN: I asked the Tourism Committee about a certain outfitter to be approved. They didn't have enough power.

ED&T SUPERVISOR: We give an outfitter a licence because we trusted this guy that he is telling the truth. Then, the next year, we come and say, 'Hi, I'd like to see your equipment,' and off we go.

RESEARCHER: Outfitters say that's kind of a lax way of doing things. They think the licensing process is meaningless if their equipment is not checked.

ED&T SUPERVISOR: Wow, are you guys out in left field on that one! Say we didn't licence any of the outfitters. The reason licensing was put in place and the reason we push it to this day, is because if we don't, the retailer would bring their own

guides and outfitters up here. The local guides would be losing their jobs left, right and centre. But, us saying, 'you must be a licensed outfitter of the NWT, you must be supported by local agencies and Councils, and must be inspected once a year,' is to make sure that those jobs are protected for local folks.

OUTFITTER: Having licences just insures outfitters in case something happens. I have been told that if I do not have a licence and insurance, I might get into trouble... if one of my passengers gets hurt and takes me to court. There should be two separate systems for experienced hunters and outfitters and young outfitters. The Outfitters Association could decide on who would need a licence and who would not. But in the Qallunaaq way, everybody needs a licence.

BTA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: I think that one of the roles of the government is as a regulatory body; it is their 'forte'. I believe that one of their focal points should be inspection. By government recognizing, approving and licensing an outfitter, they are saying that the outfitter has met with the minimum level of standards applicable. Then, the BTA says, 'OK, we can offer low cost insurance.'

OUTFITTER: The outfitters themselves should inspect each other's boats -- perhaps the Outfitters Association could do this. Everybody here knows what each man has and hasn't got, so it would be much harder to fool the inspectors.

INUK INSTRUCTOR: I would like it if the people in the community could recommend licences to those they feel should have licences. This recommendation has to come from the community.

PANGNIRTUNG AEDO: People interested and involved in tourism should change it themselves. If a few outfitters here are interested, I will help, but I will not do it. I want you to come to me and say you want change.

4.

## THE ECONOMICS OF TOURISM IN PANGNIRTUNG

(We need) more businesses run by local people and more local people realizing that tourism is here to stay, and to take part... I have liked what I've seen so far: outfitters are making money and other people too. That is good because we can't hunt to make a living any more. [A Pangnirtung Outfitter]

Tourism development brought economic benefits to Inuit residents in Pangnirtung involved in both the 'formal' and the 'informal' economy. However, certain barriers made it difficult for many local people to participate more fully in tourism. This chapter focuses on those issues and relations that pertain to private sector growth and to government investment and involvement in Pangnirtung's tourism industry.

### 4.1. TOURISM AND THE 'FORMAL' ECONOMY

The 'formal' economy includes all registered businesses and government agencies that pay wages to their employees, or that contract out certain types of work. Table 1 compares the number of Person/Years of employment available in Pangnirtung's formal economy in 1981 and 1991.<sup>1</sup> In 1991, approximately half of Inuit who were able to work drew income from the formal economy -- about a 5% increase from 1981. Overall, Pangnirtung's Inuit population within working age remained at a steady 30% over the decade.

The public sector -- government agencies -- was the largest employer, providing about 60% of jobs in Pangnirtung. Inuit held 70% of these jobs; men occupied over two-thirds of public positions. However, in the private sector -- privately-owned businesses -- local Inuit held 85% of all jobs, and women made up over two-thirds of this working group. Furthermore, Inuit women tended to occupy higher-level administrative positions than did Inuit men. Seasonal employment opportunities such as in turbot

---

<sup>1</sup> A 'Person/Year' represents one year of full-time employment. This was not necessarily fulfilled by only one person -- for example, two individuals each working full-time for a six month period would equal one 'Person/Year.' Social Assistance records showed that the percentage of 'Unemployed' as equal to the percentage of 'Employed' indicated in Table 1.

TABLE 1: COMPARATIVE EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY: PANGNIRTUNG 1981:1991.<sup>1</sup>

EMPLOYER	PERSON / YEARS : 1981 <sup>2</sup>		PERSON / YEARS : 1991 <sup>2</sup>		% of TOTAL
	INUIT	NON-INUIT	INUIT	NON-INUIT	
HANLEY OF PANGNIRTUNG	27.0	N/A	38.0	3.0	18%
GOVERNMENT OF NWT	17.1	N/A	50.5	28.0	34%
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	15.9	N/A	9.0	8.0	8%
TOTAL: PUBLIC SECTOR	60.0	N/A	97.5	39.0	60%
TOTAL: PRIVATE SECTOR	42.1	N/A	75.3	14.5	40%
TOTAL PERSON / YEARS	102.1		172.8 <sup>3</sup>	53.5	100%
SEASONAL: SUMMER <sup>4</sup>	7.0	N/A	6.5	0.0	
SEASONAL: WINTER <sup>5</sup>	0.0	N/A	15.0	0.25	
TOTAL SEASONAL	27.3		21.5	0.25	

1. Source of 1981 data: "Inuit Employment Survey - Pangnirtung 1981/82", GNWT Economic Development and Tourism, Pangnirtung, NWT.

2. Approximate population: 1981 = 850; 1991 = 1,200 (40% increase). Composed of 95% Inuit, 5% Non-Inuit.

3. 72% Person/Year increase from 1981.

4. Seasonal Summer employment = Angmarlik Visitor Centre, Parks Canada, Fish Camps, Lodge, and Outfitting. Person/Years were calculated at 25% of total number of persons employed (ie. 3 months annual employment = 25% of a full Person/Year).

5. Seasonal Winter employment 1991 = Cumberland Sound Fisheries, fishermen (full and part time) and processors. Person/Years were calculated same as above.

TABLE 2: FORMAL TOURISM ACTIVITY CONTRIBUTIONS, WAGES & SALES: PANGNIRYUNG, 1991.<sup>1</sup>

EMPLOYER (& Term of Employment)	# OF WAGE EARNERS <sup>2</sup>	WAGE CONTRIBUTIONS	SALES TO TOURISTS
<b>ANGMARLIK CENTRE: (GNWT)</b>			
: General Manager (1 Year)	1	\$40,950	
: Assistant Manager (3 Months)	1	\$5,550	
: Hosts (STEP Program - 2 Months)	4	\$11,642	
: Contract (eg. Janitor)	1	N/A	
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<u>7</u>	<u>+\$58,142</u>	
<b>NATIONAL PARK: (Federal)</b>			
: Wardens			
- Seasonal Permanent (6 Months)	2	\$33,300	
- Seasonal Term (2 Months)	2	\$8,640	
: Visitor Services (3 Months)	1	\$10,000	
: Contracts (3)	3-8	\$24,000	
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<u>8-13</u>	<u>\$75,940</u>	
<b>PRIVATE:</b>			
: Auyittuq Lodge (3 Months) <sup>3</sup>	2	\$7,280	\$121,000
: Alivaktuk Outfitting (3 Months) <sup>4</sup>	2	\$7,980	+\$30,000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<u>4</u>	<u>\$15,260</u>	<u>+\$151,000</u>

1. 19-24 local Inuit were involved. These figures represent contributions directly due to increased tourist activity. Eg., full-time Parks staff were not included, only those hired specifically for the tourism season.

2. In order of importance, earnings were used for: 1) Living expenses; 2) Shared with family; 3) Hunting expenses and Savings, and; 4) Consumer goods.

3. In reality, 4 extra people were hired to work during the summer months. However, this was due as much to an increase in business by construction crews, as it was by tourists. Each of these groups accounts for about 50% of increased room-nights from June to August. "Sales to Tourists" figures are from 1990.

4. Half of these wages were re-imbursed by GNWT "Training-On-the-Job Program". Also, Alivaktuk Outfitting won a GNWT contract (\$64,000) to conduct a two-week Science Camp: this employed 28 local people in total, amounting to \$22,560 in wages alone.

TABLE 3: HOUSEHOLD ECONOMIC SURVEY SUMMARY: PANGHIRTUNG, 1991.<sup>1</sup>

	HOUSING CORP. (n=38 : 19%) <sup>2</sup>	FEDERAL (n=4 : 5%)	GNWT (n=9 : 39%)	HAP/PRIVATE (n=10 : 27%)
<b>SOURCE OF INCOME:<sup>3</sup></b>				
: Wages	53%	100%	100%	90%
: Social Assistance	37%	0	0	0
: Private Earnings <sup>4</sup>	10%	0	0	10%
<b>CASH INCOME / MONTH:<sup>5</sup></b>				
: minimum - maximum	\$1040 - \$1970	\$1735 - \$2670	\$2670 - \$4670	\$3300 - \$4400
<b>LIVING COST / MONTH<sup>6</sup></b>	\$872	\$985	\$1175	\$1814
<b>HUNTING COST / MONTH<sup>7</sup></b>	\$1785	\$1240	N/A	\$2192
:Weekend supply cost	\$391	\$446	\$130	\$414
:Camping supply cost	\$1348	\$1489	N/A	\$1657

1. 22% of households in the community were surveyed.

2. 'n' = number of households surveyed; '%' = percent of that type of household surveyed.

3. Households were asked which was their most important source of income (including hunting).

4. Private Earnings represent income from economic activity that is 'formal' (eg., business ownership) or 'informal' (eg., carving sales).

5. Households were asked to check-mark one category of cash income (eg. \$1000-1500 bi-weekly). The figures in this table are averages of the categories checked.

6. Averages based on household totals including rent, food, power, heating fuel, telephone, and cable TV. These do not include in-town transportation costs or consumer goods such as clothing, etc.

7. Averages based on totals including ammunition, fuel, and food supplies.

TABLE 4: SOCIAL ASSISTANCE CASES/MONTH, SEASONAL AVERAGES: PANGNIRTUNG, 1983-1991.<sup>1</sup>

YEAR (POPULATION <sup>2</sup> )	WINTER / (January - June)		TOURIST / SEASON (July - August)		FALL / (September - December)	
	Unemployed but Able	Not Enough Income	Unemployed but Able	Not Enough Income	Unemployed but Able	Not Enough Income
1983 (8950)	N/A	N/A	29	3	34	3
1984 (8976)	42	6	55	4	22	5
1985 (8990)	23	8	24	5	6	13
1986 (1,004)	16	13	15	7	12	6
1987 (1,042)	14	8	11	6	11	2
1988 (1,072)	25	28	13	11	12	4
1989 (1,088)	21	14	17	21	21	18
1990 (1,115)	23	23	31	22	22	24

1. Source: GNWT Department of Social Services, Minister's Reports, 1983-1990. A 'CASE' refers to one household.  
 2. 1986-1990 Pangnirtung populations obtained from NWT Bureau of Statistics, July 1991. 1983-1985 population figures are estimates calculated at a 2% rate of increase as from the 1980 NWT Data Sheet (population = 899).

TABLE 5: INUIT OWNED AND OPERATED LICENSED SMALL BUSINESSES: PANGNIRTUNG, 1991.<sup>1</sup>

TYPE OF BUSINESS	ESTABLISHMENTS	PERSON-YEARS
CONSTRUCTION	1	1
INTERPRETING SERVICES	1	1
TAXI	1	2.5
VEHICLE REPAIR	1	1.3
OUTFITTING / FISH CAMP	1	1

1. Does not include businesses with a sharehold-type of Inuit ownership (of at least 50%) -- eg., Auyuittoq Lodge, Uqqurmiut Artists Association, or Cumberland Sound Fisheries.

fishing in the winter, and in outfitting in the summer tended to favour men over women. Nevertheless, as Table 1 indicates, seasonal work added significantly to the overall employment picture in a way that benefitted primarily local Inuit.

Within the formal economy, approximately 6 Person/Years were directly tourism-related (See Table 2). These were primarily part-time seasonal jobs, but they nevertheless contributed approximately \$149,000 into the annual wage economy. About 10% of this was due to private sector involvement.

A general economic picture of households in Pangnirtung was difficult to draw. Surveys proved to be an unsuccessful means of obtaining complete or reliable information. Nevertheless, certain trends with regard to family income and expenses were evident from the 61 households that were surveyed (See Table 3). Inuit families lived primarily in Housing Corporation units.<sup>2</sup> Only 50% of these families drew their main income from wages. 40% of these households relied on Social Assistance and 10% were able to survive on private earnings (carving sales, for example). Overall, these families' income tended to cover their basic in-town living expenses, but did not provide enough to cover hunting costs. Hunting expenses alone averaged to \$20,000 per year per household involved.

The survey data provided a broad context of incomes and expenses in which to study tourism's place in the local economy. For example, tourist activity over the past ten years made little difference to the large percentage of families which depended on income from Social Assistance. Table 4 shows that approximately the same number of households in the "Unemployed But Able" plus "Not Enough Income" categories continued to draw Social Assistance in the summer, as in the rest of the year. This might also indicate that income earned directly from tourists was often not declared by families who applied for Social Assistance.

Table 5 shows the number of small businesses independently owned and operated by Inuit in Pangnirtung. In terms of employment (Person/Years), these businesses made up about 7% of the private sector economy. They represent only about 2% of the total formal economy of Pangnirtung. The following section discusses some of the difficulties that might account for this low percentage of Inuit involvement in private business.

#### 4.1.1. BARRIERS TO SMALL BUSINESS OWNERSHIP

Quite a few people we spoke with would have preferred to work for themselves rather than for someone else. However, few claimed to firmly grasp the practical meaning or the risks involved in independent business ownership. Non-Inuit managers

---

<sup>2</sup> The majority (but not all) of GNWT and Federal staff houses were occupied by Non-Inuit teachers, nurses, RCMP, Parks staff, etc. There were 280 residences in Pangnirtung: 73% Housing Corporation; 16% HAP/Privatey owned; 8% GNWT; 3% Federal.

who worked under an Inuit Board of Directors told us that because most adults were from a generation that moved into Pangnirtung from outpost camps, few understood the economics and operations of business. There were several factors -- including a fear of failure -- that tended to prevent people from taking the initiative to start a business. One of the biggest hurdles was their lack of financial and management training or skills. Because there was no local accounting firm, individuals could not depend on someone else to do their bookkeeping.

The absence of a local banking outlet presented another obstacle to business ownership. Almost all local Inuit and Non-Inuit business people we spoke with emphasized the need for a bank in Pangnirtung.<sup>3</sup> Potential business owners had no local institution where they could negotiate a loan, nor where they could take care of ongoing financial matters. Although government loan programs were available, people said these had a reputation for bureaucratic delays. Also, some local persons preferred to be free of this type of government tie. There was general agreement that the whole concept of banking that southerners grew up with, had not yet become a part of the Inuit experience and way of thinking. One Inuit individual explained:

If you are an Inuk, your children are your savings because they will take care of you when you are old. If you are white, a bank account will take care of you.

Unilingual individuals said that their inability to communicate in English was the major drawback to business ownership. Outfitters, for example, felt it was impossible to become independent tour operators:

I know I have enough experience working with Qallunaat to be on my own, but the only thing holding me back is that I cannot speak or write in English. I would not be able to do the things I have heard are required to be done for business, like writing things down.

One individual who had tried but failed to operate a fish camp, said:

I could not handle the business myself. Anybody who runs a business has to be able to speak and write English. My understanding of all the rules of business was just not good enough.

---

<sup>3</sup> Tourists also experienced money difficulties because there was no place in town where they could cash a personal cheque or get cash from their credit cards. In some instances, this prevented tourists from buying local art.



Local Inuit who had managed to build relatively successful small businesses confirmed the need to be able to speak and write in English. An ability to keep written records, for example, was essential to qualify for a government business loan.

To become an independent business owner also held a social risk for individuals in the community. Several people who had been involved in business said the community responded with envy, rather than with support. Local people tended to resist and resent the success of a local business person. When a new business 'opened its doors', local people were reluctant to become customers, and gossip about the venture was not uncommon. This continued to be a serious social barrier to success:

When you start your own business up here, there's another thing that is an obstacle: a lot of jealousy.

With every business or organization, there are always people who will try to put it down, to make it not succeed.

The AEDO had seen the same attitude from local people who for one reason or another were unable to build a good business reputation with government agencies.

One local business person claimed that this envy arose from an Inuit value in which resources were expected to be shared. In hunting, the success of one hunter did not necessarily mean the failure of another. But in business, the clients that belonged to one person were 'taken away' from another. This situation was not unique to Pangnirtung nor to Inuit. Rather, it was an attitude observed in any small community that had also struggled to balance the different interests of the individual with those of the group as a whole. People in Pangnirtung appeared to be aware of the negative effects of this attitude. Those who were afraid of its consequences for Pangnirtung's economy urged others to put their envy aside. A carver said:

If some people are selling more carvings than others and if some people are carrying more tourists than others, we don't have to envy them. We just have to make our own way. Everybody has to do that... That is the Inuit way: envy has no place in our culture.

When a lack of education or other social pressures prevented an individual from venturing out on their own, the sharehold system presented an alternative. In this arrangement, local people were able to participate as business owners knowing that bookkeeping and legal matters would be taken care of by trained managers. However, it seemed that very few local Inuit in Pangnirtung understood the concept of 'shareholder'. For example, although the Inuit Co-operative had been in Pangnirtung since 1968, the President argued that the general public failed to

learn the meaning of membership -- that for a member to profit, they must also support the Co-op:

I know that my father -- and others his age who have now passed on -- were really vying for the Co-op and supporting it. But the people who are here now don't seem to want to understand that they are members and should support it. We can try and try again to make them understand, but when they do not want to, we can only do so much. This non-support of members has been recent -- in the past decade or so... they are waiting for their 10% dividend.

Inuit shareholders in Auyuittuq Development Inc. also claimed that most people in Pangnirtung did not understand this type of business ownership. However, local Lodge shareholders did not agree on its benefits. Two of the four local ADI directors claimed that because major shares were held by non-local Qallunaat, most of the decisions were made without consulting the shareholders in Pangnirtung (See Dialogue 4). Inexperienced Inuit shareholders were hesitant to exercise their decision-making authority over more experienced and better educated Non-Inuit directors. Furthermore, one shareholder felt that because the ADI President and other major shareholders lived in Iqaluit, community needs in terms of tourism were not a priority.\*

ED&T officials suggested that part of the local business problem arose from the municipal government's failure to create a long-term economic agenda. For example, the Hamlet Council did not fully understand what the tourist dollar meant to the entire community. Hence, they failed to recognize and then to build upon the links between tourism activities and the overall economy in Pangnirtung. Rather, the Hamlet concerned itself with short-term, concrete matters such as road maintenance and garbage disposal.

To this end, several business people promoted the idea of a Chamber of Commerce in Pangnirtung. Individuals involved directly or indirectly in the tourist industry were seen to be going in separate directions; there was almost no co-ordination or support from the rest of the business community. A Chamber of Commerce would be able to set priorities -- for example, to re-direct tourist activities to inside rather than outside the community in order to provide a broader basis for local business development. Or it could negotiate with a bank to set up some sort of financial service in the community. It could also lobby for changes in government policy -- with regard to locally run home stay accommodation programs, for example (See Dialogue 4). In the words of one businessman: "One voice means nothing -- but together, a Chamber of Commerce might."

---

\* For instance, the creation of special tourist rates at the Lodge in order to attract more visitors to Pangnirtung.

#### 4.2. TOURISM AND THE 'INFORMAL' ECONOMY

The 'informal' economy includes cash income activity that is non-wage, and generally not reported for taxation or Social Assistance purposes. It was not possible to measure private income activity in the informal economy in terms of Person/Years: almost no local people involved in this type of activity kept written records of their earnings. Nevertheless, our observations and interviews showed that these activities were important to the economic well-being of a significant number of families in Pangnirtung. This is demonstrated in Table 6 which documents two sectors of local participation in informal economic activity. Table 7 illustrates the importance of this informal type of cash-earning activity for one local woman (one of the only persons who kept written records). Her wall hanging sales were a source of family income that would otherwise have been provided by Social Assistance.

Many Inuit families had a foot in both the formal and informal economy. Among couples under 40 years of age, it was common to see the woman earning wages outside the home, and the man working around the home (carving, for example) and out on the land. Women described this as a complementary arrangement, particularly since the collapse of the seal-fur industry. One woman explained:

You need money to go out on the land -- you need bullets and gas. A big part of our diet is the country food, and if someone is going to go out on the land, it might as well be the husband. I might be making the money, but he might be getting the food. I can't make ends meet at all by just what we buy at the (Northern Store). It works out really well.

Most people involved in informal economic activity said they used their earnings to supplement their in-town living expenses, but also to help support the family's traditional economy in obtaining country food. These types of cash-earning activity were wholly compatible with hunting activities because they did not tie a person down to any work schedule. Furthermore, direct sales -- of craft items, for example -- were an immediate source of cash: there was no waiting period for a pay-cheque. There were both Inuit and resident Non-Inuit who strongly believed that economic development should attempt to fit in more closely with the land-based economy. Some of these same individuals believed that unfortunately, ED&T was "dedicated to establishing structures identical to those in the south, despite the contradictions."

Our "Tourism Involvement" survey covered almost 70% (159 homes) of Housing Corporation and HAP units in Pangnirtung. Of these, 28% were involved to some degree in tourism-related income activity. As in the formal economy, tourism's potential to contribute to the informal economy would be strengthened if more

TABLE 6: INFORMAL ECONOMIC ACTIVITY CONTRIBUTIONS: PANGNIRTUNG, 1991.

ACTIVITY	PERSONS	APPROXIMATE VALUE / YEAR
CARVING: CO-OP PURCHASES	12. <sup>1</sup>	\$150,000
HOME-CRAFTS: UQQURMIUT PURCHASES	20. <sup>2</sup>	\$45,000

1. 11 men and 1 woman.

2. Primarily all women who knit, crochet, and sew piece-work for various souvenir-type items sold by the shop.

TABLE 7: HOME-CRAFT 'BUSINESS' WOMAN, WALL HANGING SALES: PANGNIRTUNG, 1988-1991.

	1988	1989	1990	1991
TOTAL SALES	\$138	\$2,355	\$2,365	\$3,950
PRICE / PIECE	\$35-38	\$20-130	\$25-190	\$20-220

TABLE 8: INFORMAL ARTS AND CRAFTS SALES DIRECT TO TOURISTS, SURVEY RESULTS: PANGNIRTUNG 1991.<sup>1</sup>

ACTIVITY	ACTIVE	INVOLVEMENT	MODERATE	INVOLVEMENT	MINIMAL	INVOLVEMENT
	# of Persons	Sales to Tourists	# of Persons	Sales to Tourists	# of Persons	Sales to Tourists
CARVING	3	\$3 - 15,000	5	\$1 - 3,000	6	\$100 - 1,000
PRINT-MAKING			2	\$1.5 - 5,000	1	\$600 - 1,000
HOME-CRAFTS			1	\$1 - 1,500	11	\$50 - 500

1. 70% of the community was surveyed. One individual may be involved in two or more activities. The surveys showed a total of 27 people living in 25 households involved in these activities. In order of importance, earnings were used for: 1) Living expenses; 2) Sharing with family; 3) Fuel, Equipment, and Hunting expenses.

activities were focused to inside the community. Men and women involved in arts and crafts, carving and outfitting suggested that economic efforts by local Inuit needed to be made more obvious and more accessible to tourists. Our visitor study showed that tourists demanded and were willing to pay for more in-town activities to round out their overall Arctic experience. Yet, our surveys showed that very few local people exploited these types of opportunities.'

#### 4.2.1. THE GAP BETWEEN TOURISM AND THE LOCAL ART INDUSTRY

Table 8 shows community involvement in various informal arts and crafts activities directly related to tourism. In total, direct sales to tourists ranged from about \$20,000 to over \$80,000 per season.' From the survey results, tourism contributed an average of \$800 - \$3,200 to each of 25 households involved in the informal arts and crafts industry.

Carvers who sold directly to tourists were not completely satisfied with the link between the arts and crafts industry in Pangnirtung and its developing tourism industry. Although 'advertising' through the Angmarlik Visitor Centre worked well for some carvers, they felt they had little control over sales. Tourists were directed to the carver of the hosts' choosing, as one artist explained:

The way the system is now, it seems to work out quite well for those carvers who work outside the house. But the Angmarlik hosts don't go into peoples' houses, maybe because they don't know who is making the arts and crafts inside the house. I would prefer that they find out who is making something, so these tourists can go watch them make it and then maybe buy it.

Only one carver we spoke with made regular visits to the Lodge to show his carvings to tourists. For him, this was a profitable means of selling his work. Although carvers had the choice to sell their work through the Co-op, most knew they could make sales faster and for more money by going directly to Qallunaat. Hence, tourism development increased carvers' opportunities to market their work. However, this had a negative effect on Co-op sales:

---

' Surveys showed a total of 8 people living in 7 households involved in various in-town tourist activities such as home-billets, story-telling, and country-food sales. Together these amounted to \$2,500-3,500 worth of sales in one season.

' Multiplied to represent 100% of the community, this would amount to about \$30,000 - \$100,000 in the 1991 tourist season.

There is a definite connection between the two. Carvers tend to sell their best carvings to the tourists, and their not-so-good carvings to the Co-op. This has started happening ever since the price of carvings dropped. That has been part of the problem.

Consequently, tourists who went only to the Co-op to buy a carving, left thinking that Pangnirtung was a 'carving-poor' community. The Co-op Manager was critical of the lack of co-ordination of local arts and crafts events, especially for visitors from the Cruise ship that made Pangnirtung one of its ports-of-call in August:

When the Cruise ship came in, I drove a lot of people around town to see different carvers. I couldn't understand why the Hamlet hadn't set up their hall with a couple of carvers doing work -- nothing! So I took it upon myself and drove truckloads of people to see carvers. These are the types of things they are not promoting.<sup>7</sup>

Unlike the carvers, crafts-women did not belong to any list at the Angmarlik Centre. They also complained about the poor link between tourism and the arts and crafts industry in Pangnirtung. For example, the woman represented in Table 7 sold her wall hangings mostly to resident Non-Inuit who made up her regular door-to-door marketing route. Her sales did not increase during the summer season, and even then, tourists were a minor sector of her market. One of the problems was that women had no regular outlet where they could show and sell their work. Their only alternative was to stop tourists on the road, or to visit the Lodge and the campground. However, the Auyittuq Lodge manager believed that because women tended to be shy, the Lodge was their last resort as a market place. Many tourists, on the other hand, were not prepared to buy an item 'off the street.'

Although women were able to sell a few crafts to the Co-op, its cash flow problems had not allowed the purchase of any large number of souvenir-type items. Uqqurmiut Inuit Artists Association offered to sell items on consignment, but women were very hesitant to give up a percentage of their sales to the shop. Like the carvers, women knew they could get more money, more quickly by selling directly to Qallunaat.

Most women agreed that tourism development had been good for Pangnirtung. However, when questioned further, few seemed to know much about the industry, nor did they appear to pay attention to

---

<sup>7</sup> Apparently \$9,000 worth of carvings were sold that day.

what might be its potential benefits.<sup>6</sup> They stated that in financial terms, the industry benefitted men more than women -- carvers and outfitters especially. In this sense, tourism's economic advantages were seen to be sparse and poorly distributed, as well as very seasonal. Overall, women's initial economic expectations from tourism development were not fulfilled; they believed there was much room for improvement in increasing local benefits. The Uqurmiut centre was seen to be a welcome addition to the community in this regard.

However, Uqurmiut's General Manager had difficulty understanding why so little had been done to close the gap between the local arts and crafts industry and tourism in Pangnirtung. In his opinion, GNWT ignored the fact that local arts and crafts contributed to tourism revenues. This, he believed, was inconsistent with the original community based tourism strategy:

If you look at the MMM study, the original concept was that the arts and crafts, the information centre and the museum be combined... But what happened? The arts and crafts got cut off! It doesn't really add up because the arts and crafts is the only thing that actually gets a dollar return that they can actually see. Every tourism centre in the south is turning itself into a big gift shop with a small attraction on the side. But up here they are moving in the other direction.

#### 4.2.2. OUTFITTERS: ISSUES OF CO-OPERATION VERSUS COMPETITION

Almost everything (has changed). There are more outfitters competing and a lot more rules to follow. But I always expected the government would step in and make a lot of rules. [A Local Outfitter]

Although outfitting, guiding and fish camp operations were generally licensed activities, these types of tourism income belonged for the most part to the informal economy. Only one outfitter had registered his outfitting and fish camp operations and had taken the step to administer his services as an independent small business (see Tables 2 & 5). Two other fish camps continued to operate without licences, and outfitters were not forced to declare their earnings. The fact that ED&T tolerated these types of economic practice indicated a degree of

---

<sup>6</sup> For example, women working at the Lodge did not view their job as directly tourism-related. Nor did they feel a part of, or that they benefitted from the tourist industry. Also, in recent research about drop-outs, none of the young women in the study chose tourism as a potential job opportunity (Personal Communication, Local Research Assistant to that study).

TABLE 9: DOCUMENTED OUTFITTER EARNINGS: PANGNIRTUNG, 1989-1991.

	1989	1990	1991	3/YEAR AVERAGE
ANGMARLIK CENTRE <sup>1</sup> (Trip Records)	\$21,310	\$24,925	\$15,080	\$20,440
PACKAGE TOURS <sup>2</sup> (Gross Receipts)	\$85,250	\$89,000	\$51,520	\$78,260
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$106,560</b>	<b>\$113,925</b>	<b>\$66,600</b>	<b>\$98,700</b>

1. Total sales as per number of trips: Angmarlik Visitor Centre records, 1989-1991. These records may be incomplete. Primarily independent travellers booked through the Centre.

2. Source: ED&T "Package Tour Analysis, 1991" Tour operators tended to pre-book their arrangements privately with individual outfitters, rather than going through the Angmarlik Centre.

TABLE 10: OUTFITTING, GUIDING, & FISHCAMPS, SURVEY RESULTS: PANGNIRTUNG, 1991.<sup>1</sup>

	ACTIVELY INVOLVED		MODERATELY INVOLVED		MINIMALLY INVOLVED	
	# of Persons	Tourism Earnings	# of Persons	Tourism Earnings	# of Persons	Tourism Earnings
OUTFITTING <sup>2</sup>	2	\$3,000 - 5,000	5	\$1,500 - 3,000	10	\$300 - 1,500
GUIDING					7	\$100 - 500
FISHCAMPS			2	N/A		

1. 70% of the community was surveyed. A total of 21 people said they were involved in these activities. In order of importance, earnings were used for: 1) Living Expenses; 2) Fuel and Equipment Expenses; 3) Hunting; 4) Shared with family; 5) Consumer Goods; 6) Savings.

2. Does not include Alivaktuk Outfitting (see Table 2). In relation to the outfitters participating in the informal economy, Alivaktuk's level of involvement would be categorized as 'intensive'.



acceptance on the government's part, that for the present, tourism's informal contribution was worthwhile. Table 9 shows average total sales of close to \$100,000/year due to outfitter activity.

Table 10 shows the degree to which twenty-one local individuals were involved in outfitting activities during the 1991 tourist season. In total, these informal earnings contributed a minimum of \$16,000 to a maximum of \$40,000 to the local economy. For the most part, outfitting was an extra source of cash for men who had no regular source of income other than Social Assistance. Fifteen of the outfitters interviewed fell into this category, although five were no longer involved for various reasons. Another six men participated in outfitting to supplement their main source of income through private earnings - carving, print-making, and the like. Eight others were involved in outfitting in addition to holding full-time wage employment.'

To older outfitters, the most striking change over the past ten years was the need for licensing and insurance (see Dialogue 3). Quite a few outfitters thought that licenses served only to make outfitting more expensive. Therefore, it had become a barrier for more, and in particular young men to become involved.

Local men involved in outfitting also had to struggle with the idea of competition. ED&T personnel claimed that outfitters had a poor grasp of the southern concept of competition, and of supply and demand. The Regional Superintendent explained:

The whole problem we've had -- in prices, for example - - is explaining competition. The person sitting in New York has twenty-five exotic tourism products to choose from in the same price range as Pangnirtung and you've got to compete against that. The average outfitter in Pangnirtung does not understand that concept because every visitor is seen as an endless pocket-book.

Outfitters who had a solid understanding of what tourists wanted and who were willing to make the initiative and to take risks, were considered by ED&T as 'model outfitters'. Inuit individuals who proved themselves to be knowledgeable in business found easier access to public funds because ED&T viewed them as a safe investment. However, a few local people saw this as outright favouritism. Others believed it was part of an ever-shrinking government budget:

I think ED&T should support more than one or two people. They should try to support as many as they can, but the money is not there any more. If a person really

---

' A few outfitters were very critical of men who had full-time jobs and 'took tourists away' from unemployed outfitters. Some felt that the Tourism Committee or the Outfitters Association should refuse to allow these men to hold a licence.

wants to get something going, then he can do it, but no-one is going to do it for him.

The current AEDO in Pangnirtung pointed out that an outfitter's success was also strongly linked to social and cultural situations:

If their families are secure, this puts less pressure on them to make cash contributions to their families. They do not have to feel guilty about leaving it in the bank... and coming up with 10% of the money to get a government loan.

Outfitters and other would-be business people in the North depended on government agencies for administrative support beyond what would normally be expected in the South. This was understandable in light of factors mentioned above: outfitters did not generally have the money, education or language skills to 'go it' alone. Nor did they culturally look at tourists as a resource for which they should compete.

Consequently, private tour operators who were working to build a business in the North singled out the government as their biggest competitor. Because local outfitters received services free of charge through Visitor Centres, private operators were prevented from entering these markets. Outfitters would refuse to pay the 10% commission fee as was done elsewhere in the industry. One northern-based tour operator concluded:

Pangnirtung is handed everything. People are too 'governmentalized' there; they have not learned how the tourist industry works or how it can be utilized by the private sector. Competition is not a foreign Inuit way of thinking: a good hunter must prove himself first. But this idea has not been translated into private business practice.

However, from ED&T's point of view, their responsibility was to directly support local outfitters as they learned to conduct successful business dealings with established tour operators in the North and in the South.

The Angmarlik Visitor Centre GM claimed that in general, outfitters lacked a working understanding of how tour companies operated (no appropriate Inuktitut word could be found for the concept of 'tour operator'). On the other hand, outfitters in Pangnirtung felt that southern tour operators and their guides lacked a working understanding of northern outfitters. Therefore, several problems arose between the two. For example, local outfitters claimed southern operators' price offers were too low to cover local expenses. At the same time, southern operators were not convinced that local outfitters were capable interpreters or guides and they were unwilling to pay a high price for transportation only. Also, southern operators were

limited to a budget that was pre-set by the advertised package price. This left them with little room for negotiation. One ED&T official suggested that in this instance, the government Department should be involved in bringing the southern operator and the northern outfitter together to negotiate the initial package price before it was advertised.

AEDOs helped outfitters to create a formula for a rate structure to Auyuittuq Park, Kekerten, and elsewhere (see Appendix B). From 1982 to 1991, the rates tripled. Most tourists felt forced to pay what they considered to be unacceptably high prices for an hour of transportation. They complained that prices remained the same whether they hired a new 'Lake Winnipeg' boat or an old 'Freighter Canoe'. Nor did it make a difference whether or not their outfitter provided them with food or interpretive services. Furthermore, tourists realized that most, if not all local outfitters owned boats first and foremost for hunting purposes. Transporting tourists was but a means to earn a bit of extra cash on the side. In this case, some tourists felt unfairly burdened with supporting the hunting economy.

Several resident Non-Inuit indicated a desire to take day-trips to the Park to hike, or across to the Koolik River to fish. However, they believed that a high-priced mind-set among outfitters -- encouraged by ED&T -- prevented local boat-owners from offering this type of tour at an affordable price.<sup>10</sup> In the opinion of BTA's Executive Director, the way in which rates were set at the Angmarlik Centre had placed restrictions on local individual operators.<sup>11</sup> In the end, both tourists and resident Non-Inuit believed that high outfitter rates hurt tourist satisfaction and long-term growth. A few local outfitters tended to agree and recently requested to set their own rates at lower, more competitive prices.<sup>12</sup>

From an ED&T point of view, the Angmarlik 'turn-taking' system would eventually change into a more competitive one -- but not overnight. But most outfitters were not convinced that it was necessary to become competitive. There remained a desire among outfitters to work together as a group and for the good of the community:

---

<sup>10</sup> One local outfitter did offer teachers a low-priced day-tour to the Park in Autumn 1991. At \$30 per person, the venture was a success for all 8 teachers and the outfitter.

<sup>11</sup> One outfitter told us he was afraid that if he did not follow the Angmarlik rates, he would be refused a licence. Another outfitter said he was the only one whose earnings required that he pay the GST. But he also felt pressured to agree to the Angmarlik set rates. Hence, he ended up earning 7% less per trip than other outfitters.

<sup>12</sup> Outfitters Association Meeting, October 1991.

Competition will not help us in the long run. Some will not succeed. Think about the issue that bad feelings will be created between the outfitters. Competition will not work in Pangnirtung.

Outfitters who had seen local envy 'put people down' suspected that competition would only worsen such attitudes.

Furthermore, many outfitters were not willing to devote full-time efforts to a short tourist season that lasted only six to eight weeks. For them, the Angmarlik Centre system allowed the freedom to wait for clients to come to them, and to accept or refuse clients as they wished. They were also concerned over what image competitiveness might create among visitors:

I always knew that we were competing, but I thought, if I went out on my own, what would happen? It looks like a bad picture. Pangnirtung has the most visitors of any community in Baffin. If we don't work together, then the picture of Pangnirtung won't be that great.

Interestingly, some visitors agreed. They welcomed the contrast this sharing system of outfitting created as opposed to the fierce competitiveness they were used to in other destinations:

A big surprise to us is that the prices are fixed. The first outfitter that comes to you, you needn't ask another one or two outfitters to compare the price like in Spain or Italy. Its good to see that they take turns -- that gives the tourist more confidence.

While most of the outfitters approved of this sharing system, several admitted there had been problems:

A couple of times I have been asked to go pick up someone at the Park, but when I got there, no-one was waiting. I found out later that the hikers had made their own arrangements to be picked up with the outfitter who took them there. When... they radioed the Parks office, the wardens did not know about the previous arrangements.

Some outfitters had also been known to 'steal' clients already pre-booked by another outfitter. In these cases, a few outfitters continued to practice what the group had decided was unacceptable behaviour. To date, the Outfitters Association had little success in solving this problem.

A couple of leaders in the community believed that outfitters had a better chance of success if they continued as a group effort, particularly as a legally recognized Association. Their reason was that as independent businessmen, the outfitters would neglect long-term planning -- ways to extend the tourist season, for example. Thus, they would in the end, profit less

from tourism. As a formal Association, outfitters also believed they would have more power to create and to enforce their own set of standards and rules.

A few outfitters had already become relatively independent: they advertised and booked their own clients directly through tour agencies in the South. Others thought seriously about becoming independent in the belief that this would give them more control over such things as departure schedules. There was potential also to increase their profits because they would no longer need to 'wait their turn'. The Angmarlik Visitor Centre GM stated:

Outfitters are starting to get the idea that they need to put the information out rather than wait for people to ask them. [...] More outfitters have learned to do it privately. Before, unilingual outfitters did not know how to run a business, but today, with (bilingual) role models, they can see that they can do better by going out on their own, rather than depending on the Angmarlik Centre.

Auyuittuq Parks staff and established tour operators concluded that whether the local outfitters worked independently or as a group was not the issue. What was important was how this affected the quality of tourist services. The Auyuittuq Park Superintendent explained:

Our position on the whole outfitting issue is that this is something the outfitters and the community have to sort out for themselves. If they want to have an outfitter association to enforce certain codes of conduct, and pricing, that's fine. If they want to go their own way, that's fine too. Our interest is in supporting something that provides visitors to the Park with adequate safety and service at reasonable prices.

#### 4.3. GOVERNMENT INVESTMENTS & INVOLVEMENT IN THE TOURISM ECONOMY

The grey area in tourism -- between the government and the private sector -- is very large. [BTA Executive Director, October 1991]

GNWT's financial investments in the tourism economy in the Baffin region and in Pangnirtung are shown in Table 11. Although much of the Pangnirtung data for 1988 and previous years was incomplete and therefore unreliable, it is clear that the pilot-project received a substantial share of regional investments. Over the decade, Pangnirtung received anywhere from \$50,000 to over \$700,000 per year for tourism development alone. In addition, students and other local people received a total of at least \$200,000 in wages from Federal or Territorial employment

TABLE 11: GOVERNMENT INVESTMENTS IN TOURISM, BAFFIN REGION AND PANGNIRTUNG: 1990-1981.

SEASON	BAFFIN			PANGNIRTUNG		
	Capital Projects	Operation & Management	TOTAL Investment	Total Investment	Percent of Baffin	Employment Programs <sup>1</sup>
1990 <sup>2</sup>	\$197,934	\$274,500	\$472,434	\$218,160	46%	\$6,930
1989 <sup>3</sup>	\$669,839	\$360,000	\$1,029,839	\$179,503	17%	\$10,425
1988 <sup>4</sup>	\$255,000	\$326,000	\$581,000	\$68,020	12%	\$16,275
1987 <sup>5</sup>	\$1,065,200	\$250,000	\$1,315,200	\$734,366	69%	N/A
1986	\$825,000	\$250,000	\$1,075,000	\$101,288	9%	\$14,350
1985	\$184,000	\$200,000	\$384,000	\$92,510	24%	\$30,636
1984	\$75,900	N/A	N/A	\$45,000	N/A	\$102,650
1983 <sup>6</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$203,000	N/A	N/A
1982	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$150,101	N/A	N/A
1981 <sup>7</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$200,000	N/A	N/A

- 1989 - GMYT STEP programme; 1990/1986/1985 - Federal SEED programme; 1984 - Federal PERI programme.
- Source: ED&T Report, "Regional Tourism Industry, Baffin 1990."
- Source: ED&T Report, "Tourism & Parks Division, Baffin 1989."
- Sources for 1988-1984: ED&T Report, "Tourism & Parks Division, Baffin 1987"; PTC Minutes and Correspondence.
- Angmarlik Visitor Centre = \$672,200; Kekerten Historic Park = \$18,000. (Personal communication, ED&T Regional Supervisor of Tourism Development)
- Sources for 1983-1982: PTC Minutes and Correspondence. (Pangnirtung figures are almost certainly incomplete.)
- Estimated cost of NMK tourism study (Personal communication, ED&T Regional Superintendent).

TABLE 12: ESTIMATED ANNUAL TOURISM INVESTMENTS AND RETURNS: PANGNIRTUNG, 1990/1991.

	RETURNS IN WAGES	RETURNS IN SALES	GMYT INVESTMENT <sup>1</sup>
FORMAL ECONOMY <sup>2</sup> : Public	\$134,000		
: Private	\$15,000	\$151,000	
INFORMAL ECONOMY <sup>3</sup>		\$110,000	
TOTAL	\$149,000	\$251,000	\$220,000

- Source: ED&T Report, "Regional Tourism Industry, Baffin 1990."
- Source of wage figures: Survey results, 1991. Source of sales figure: File documents, 1990.
- Source: Survey results, 1991. The figure shown is an average between the minimum and maximum earnings as indicated by 70% of the community surveyed. This average was then projected to represent 100% of the community.

programs. These funds were directed at work on specific tourism projects, some of which later proved to be unsuccessful.<sup>13</sup> Rough estimates of all formal and informal returns (Tables 2, 8, 10 & 11) for 1990/1991, indicate that tourism's annual contribution to Pangnirtung's economy exceeded GNWT's annual tourism investments (see Table 12).

Ideally, the public sector was to own the core of the tourism structure within Baffin communities -- the Angmarlik Visitors' Centre and Kekerten Historic Park, for example. The private sector was to own the necessary tourist products and services that surrounded that core -- package tour operations, transportation, and accommodation. In reality, however, the government walked a fine line between fulfilling their responsibilities as a public agency, and over-extending their protective arm over private developments in Pangnirtung (see Dialogue 4).

Non-Inuit business people tended to view ED&T's policies and practices as promoting local dependency rather than self-sufficiency. One private sector manager believed the pilot-project would never be over because...

...the government has put so much money into this town, its a way of life. If you need a new boat, you just go to the government -- the money tree.

ED&T officials argued that their investments provided a foundation for people in Pangnirtung to build upon in the future. However, to an extent they agreed that, meanwhile...

...the community will remain dependent on government for some time until there is sufficient business, economic activity in tourism to be self-sufficient. In between, someone has to keep that asset operating.

That "someone," is government.

Pangnirtung's initial pilot-project snow-balled into subsequent projects. Consultants and resource people came in, studied the development situation, and offered more recommendations. In a sense, ED&T viewed this as one measure of success: the better the infrastructure, the greater the opportunities for growth. However, this also made 'walking away' from the pilot-project difficult, if not illogical. Nevertheless, there was some indication that ED&T was already beginning to 'back-off'. The Regional Supervisor of Parks and Visitor Services stated:

I think Pangnirtung will see a lot less of development than they've seen in the past, and I don't necessarily think that's bad. We take it to a high and then divorce

---

<sup>13</sup> The Kingardjuak Tourist (Traditional) Summer Camp and Hiking Trail (\$7,850) and the Aulatisivikjuaq Glacier Overnight Camp and Hiking Trail (\$32,000) are two examples of failed projects.

ourselves for awhile, then come back to it a time later and see what happens. Maybe that is part of getting the community to gradually take on some things, as opposed to building up a sort of dependency thing.

Throughout the tourism pilot-project process, the ownership roles between the public and private sector became blurred. A situation developed, for example, where GNWT employees functioned as tour operators (see Sections 4.2.2 and 5.1). This meant that a government agency occupied a position that would ordinarily be held by the private sector. In this sense, the government became a competitor to existing local and regional private tour operations. Also, they were competing against their own 'community based' goals to encourage growth in private sector activity at the local and regional levels. The AEDO remarked:

(There is) too much industry -- both south and north -- reliance on GNWT to provide things. [...] Individuals feel that if we are here to promote tourism, then they should be able to make tourism-related long distance calls on our telephone, etc. That limits their involvement in doing it for themselves.

BTA's stance was that Visitor Centres should be used as information sources only and not as tour agencies and retail outlets. BTA believed that each community with a strong tourism base needed a 'Receptive Tour Operator': a local business person who knew how to co-ordinate southern tour operators and their package-tours, local outfitters and guides, and tourists.

The situation involving the Angmarlik Centre general management position described above illustrates the complex relationship between the government and private sector interests. In fact, ED&T recently (1991) seriously considered contracting the Angmarlik Visitor Centre over to private management. Over the previous ten years, both the PTC and ED&T were unable to secure the tourism management position with any sense of permanence. When the Angmarlik Centre opened in 1988, the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre and the GNWT Department of Culture and Communications were to contribute funds for artifact management in the museum. However, this commitment was short lived. Later, because ED&T in Iqaluit had successfully managed to limp along by offering the job as a 'casual position,' the regional Department was unable to demonstrate to their Yellowknife superiors, the need for a permanent position. Maintaining the position as 'casual' for over three years brought pressures from the public service union. More importantly, it made the individuals who occupied the position feel insecure -- never sure if they would have a job four months down the road.

In an attempt to solve this problem, ED&T put the Centre management position up for private tender in a one year contract. However, this presented the risk of an outside non-Inuit bid winning the tender. At the same time, several local leaders and people involved in the tourist industry made a strong statement against anyone other than a local Inuk filling that position. Their fear was that tourism would fall into "Qallunaaq hands."



For some, putting the position up for tender indicated a lack of commitment on the part of ED&T:

I think (ED&T's) strategy is to save money. If they had a full-time employee, they would have to get all the benefits -- housing, vacation pay, etc. But with a contract, ED&T doesn't have to give any benefits at all.

Others believed that should a local person be ready to fulfil the contract, this could be a positive avenue to more local control within the tourist industry. However, the time was not right: there was no local Inuit individual apparent who could immediately fill all contract requirements. Finally, in order to protect the position, the regional ED&T office decided to cancel the contract. They began once more to lobby the Territorial Deputy Minister's office for permanent status.<sup>14</sup>

These types of situations prompted Non-Inuit members of the private sector in Pangnirtung to view tourism as an over-protected, government-run industry. Both the Uqurmiut Artists Association and the Pangnirtung Inuit Co-op criticized ED&T for providing almost no support to tourism-related activity through already existing businesses in Pangnirtung. On the other hand, private sector establishments such as Auyuittuq Lodge also benefitted from government's policy of market protection. Apparently, Auyuittuq Lodge struggled to keep room rates in line with customer demand, deep capital debts, and the high expense of operating a hotel business in the North.<sup>15</sup> For these, and other reasons, the Lodge-owners lobbied fiercely -- and successfully -- against alternative forms of accommodation for tourists in Pangnirtung. To date, no-one had been able to clearly demonstrate that the Lodge could not fulfil all accommodation requirements in the community. Consequently, ED&T declined to politically support or financially invest in any form of competition to the present accommodation services in Pangnirtung (see Dialogue 4).

---

<sup>14</sup> At the time of writing, the Angmarlik Visitor Centre General Manager position remained in a state of uncertainty.

<sup>15</sup> Monthly utility costs at Auyuittuq Lodge were much higher than in the South. For example, electricity costs \$0.33 kw/hr, about ten times more than in Toronto.

## DIALOGUE 4 : THE ACCOMMODATION DEBATE

For several years, different interest groups disagreed about the need for alternative accommodation to the existing Lodge in Pangnirtung. The debate below illustrates a 'classic' problem about where the line between private and public rights and responsibilities should be drawn. The three major groups involved have been: 1) Non-local, well established business-people who wanted to expand their interests; 2) local Inuit who wanted a way to generate more family income, and; 3) government departments who wanted to protect markets and balance competition, while encouraging small-business growth in a region with few resources.

TOURIST: I think there really is a need to provide an intermediate type of accommodation. There are a lot of people who just don't have \$200/day. Costs will inhibit tourism here. Also, we are not here to stay in a hotel like anywhere else in the world. It would be nice to stay with a family -- a nice complement to the sport aspect of the trip.

LOCAL WOMAN: We Inuit women don't mind having people staying at our place. That Lodge is too expensive... When we see people at the campsite when the weather is bad, sometimes we look at these people out there and wish we could have them in our house, but we can't do anything.

ADI PRESIDENT: I am opposed to this idea on the grounds of market disruption. I do not hear visitors demanding that First Air cut their flight fares in half, so why do they demand that accommodation prices be lowered? This market for only one or two bed-nights is not worth the investment required to supply an alternative accommodation for the hiker group. It might be worth it if this market was twenty times the size, but then these hikers would stop coming because the area would no longer be wild and undeveloped -- it would be too travelled. So they cannot have their cake and eat it too.

TOURIST: Surely that can be worked out. Charge those people who want to run a B&B a certain higher rent for doing so. Perhaps restrict the number of B&B's so as to control competition with the hotel. Then get after your politicians to change the law! Law is something to be changed when needed.

QALLUNAAQ BUSINESS-OWNER: I feel that the whole thing about tourism -- the B&B -- is a legitimate need. It is not a selfish need. Its not going to be a million-dollar maker, but it certainly will help

out. Left in the hands of bureaucrats, (tourism) is going to fail. But I know GNWT will never turn around and say, 'its fine for everyone in Pangnirtung to have a B&B who wants it'. Not until the people in Pangnirtung can say, 'we're going to do it... because its right, its legitimate, its good for us and our children'.

LOCAL WOMAN: Not just for people up here, but there is still a lot of people all over the world who are ignorant... about the culture and values of the Inuit people. This (tourism B&B idea) would help.

LOCAL OUTFITTER: Tourists (are) way out in the campground where they look at us from very far and make judgements from there. If we want them to say good things about us when they get home, we have to let them get involved with the community.

LOCAL WOMAN: The Tourism Committee (should) get active again and be open to be approached by people with ideas, so that whatever gets started up, is not by just one person and then another and so on. They (could) organize anyone interested in B&Bs... and then set an agreed rate so it would be the same with everybody.

LODGE MANAGER: I cannot emphasize strongly enough the negative implications of the B&B idea in Pangnirtung. If the Lodge could get reduced power and fuel bills and did not have to pay Workers' Compensation, then they could charge a lot less for a night as well. The NWT Housing Corporation must come out strongly against the B&B concept -- it's policy should be to enforce that stand. That is, tenants would risk losing their house or turning over their earnings if they billet tourists.

ADI PRESIDENT: To run a B&B out of a Housing Corporation low-rental unit is the government

subsidizing competition to the existing accommodation supply. I believe it would be OK for people in HAP houses to run a B&B after their five years are up, but they must meet the same safety and licensing standards as the Lodge. Only then will tourists be ensured consistent and committed service that will be a credit to the industry.

**ED&T TOURISM DEVELOPMENT SUPERVISOR:** The problem with this part of the world is that the majority of homes that could be used for tourist-homes, are paid for by the government -- the Housing Corporation. So, the private sector invests a pile of money into the hotel and justifiably says that ...you cannot have government competing against the private sector when it comes to accommodation. And you have these guys going well above my level, and saying to the Minister that this cannot happen and the Minister agrees... We have attempted to explain to the powers that be that 90% of the housing in the Baffin region is publicly owned housing, and that's not going to change for a long, long time.

**WOMEN'S AUXILIARY:** One problem we had was that the owner of the Lodge wanted to take Women's Auxiliary to court because there were not enough tourists in his hotel, and they were going to the Parish Hall. He wrote a letter to the Women's Auxiliary and we gave it to the Bishops... Most Inuit, if we don't know how to speak English, we can't stand up to the (Lodge owners) and say what we want.

**ADI SHAREHOLDER #1:** I agree with the ED&T decision that the Angmarlik staff should not mention the Parish Hall to tourists. If everything opens up, then what is the point of the Lodge in town? The Parish Hall should make up its mind -- are they in the business of accommodation or religion?

**ADI SHAREHOLDER #2:** The President did not mention anything to the other local shareholders about his letters to the Women's Auxiliary and ED&T, although the letters were written on behalf of ADI.

**WOMEN'S AUXILIARY:** I hated [the Lodge president] for what he tried to do. I know how much it costs for a tourist to stay at the Lodge, yet the workers' pay is very little.

**ADI SHAREHOLDER #2:** I put some of my own clients into the Parish Hall. I totally disagree with the President's theory that if a tourist can afford the flight, they can also afford the accommodation

prices at the Lodge. I know people who have saved for a year or two to come to Pangnirtung.

**AEDO:** Of course there needs to be an alternative to the Lodge -- most everybody would agree with that. But I cannot actively work with someone to promote that type of thing, because I know we are then working against official policy. We have to stay away. So nothing happens and five years go by with people still saying, 'we need a bed and breakfast.'

**LOCAL WOMAN:** This B&B (idea) has been going on for years. It hasn't been called 'B&B' geared toward tourism, but it has always been done. When organizations have meetings here, a per diem is given out to the people that these guests are staying with. Social Services does it -- when I go to have my baby in Iqaluit, I don't stay in a hotel. I stayed with my sister, who got paid a per diem. So the government themselves practice this.

**QALLUNAAQ BUSINESS MANAGER:** The problem with tourism in town is that (the government) is going to back (the Lodge President) and keep him sitting on the pedestal. And if someone goes to get an accommodation licence, the war is on.

**ED&T REGIONAL SUPERINTENDENT:** Facilities took on a BIG debt in order to finance (renovations), that demanded certain occupancy rates in order for them to meet their payments... In the mid-80s things looked rosy, then -- BANG! 1988 the recession starts... So the people with the big hotels and the big debts need to charge \$170-200 per night to pay off their debts (on) an initiative they felt the government encouraged them into. In the meantime, you've got (local) people who are trying to increase their otherwise small income through a very simple means, tourists who are rebelling at hotel rates and creating a demand for these B&Bs, and legitimate complaints on the part of owners. If the government widely endorses (B&Bs) as a great idea, we've all of a sudden inherited \$3 million in bad debts.

**LOCAL WOMAN:** I think a B&B would be beneficial in so many ways. It probably would encourage more visitors up here... It could benefit both men and women -- for example an outfitter and his wife... A B&B plus tour guiding business would do them good.

5.

## TOURISM MANAGEMENT, TRAINING, AND AWARENESS

Many people... felt the current lack of awareness and skills was one of the major problems in tourism development, and felt there should have been a stronger emphasis on human resource development earlier on in the program. [Bob Kuiper, 1987]<sup>1</sup>

I think (tourism) is going the way it was planned, but I don't see enough local people benefitting. The government has been too slow with training programs and to giving business opportunities to local people. That is where they are lacking right now. [Former Tourism Committee Chairperson, 1991]

From the beginning of the pilot-project, the Tourism Committee recognized the need for community awareness, for training programs offered locally, and for strong management. Several studies and conferences in the mid-1980s stressed the link between 'human resource development' at the local level and the goals of community based tourism.<sup>2</sup> In 1991, 'operation and management' skills continued to be a top priority. This was true as it affected both the quality of tourist services, and local control over the industry and its development in Pangnirtung.

Throughout the last half of the 1980s, Arctic College, ED&T, and the Tourism Industry Association (represented by BTA in the Baffin region), worked together to improve guiding, outfitting, tourism management, hospitality and awareness. Training was seen as the key to a stronger tourism economy in the Eastern Arctic. The responsibility for training was to rely as much upon private

---

<sup>1</sup> DOCUMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF THE PANGNIRTUNG PILOT STUDY AND TOURISM PLAN. (Final Report, First Draft; Based on data collected in 1985.) Prepared by Bob Kuiper, Vancouver: School of Community and Regional Planning, University of British Columbia. 1987.

<sup>2</sup> See Footnote 1.; Also, COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: ARCTIC EXPERIENCES. Baffin Regional Economic Development Conference, sponsored by GNWT Economic Development & Tourism and Canadian Arctic Resources Committee [CARC], Iqaluit, September 1986.

business resources as upon government; new Federal and Territorial policies set limits on training funds.'

ED&T officials we interviewed claimed there was still not enough understanding throughout the region about how the tourist industry operated. They admitted that training and education of local people had been inadequate to properly run the tourist industry in Pangnirtung. There were several reasons for this shortcoming. First, the government chose to invest in capital development, followed later with investments in operation and management:

In the early '80s it was very capital intensive. It was deciding the chicken and egg thing -- which comes first? Capital money and capital projects were easier to get at the time, so we chose the easy way out. We'd start with the capital plans and then we'd work on the other resources, including training and marketing.

Second, the scattered geography of Baffin communities together with increased regional demands meant fewer training programs for Pangnirtung. Third, a re-organization of training programs at the Territorial level distributed courses more widely across the NWT, and meant Baffin had less courses in the end. As a result, local people had seen employment opportunities go to...

...tour guides from the south who do not have any idea what the people or landscape is all about. That is the wrong way of developing tourism. GNWT and our leaders should really emphasize 'put the money where the people are.'

This chapter discusses the problems and issues related to tourism management, training, and awareness as each applies to various local groups and individuals.

### 5.1. DIFFICULTIES IN LOCAL MANAGEMENT

A lot of times I am sort of stuck in the middle of everything. I am partly responsible for it -- there are so many variables that I cannot control. It becomes quite difficult to pull all the strings together at the same time. [Previous GM, Angmarlik Visitor Centre]

Throughout the development process, the PTC showed a particular concern to find a local Manager with strong management and financial training and skills. Here, human resources presented their own unique set of problems. First, there was a relatively high rate of turnover in the position. In the early

---

' BTA Tourism Bulletin. No.13, January 13, 1990:1.

years when the position was administered by the PTC, Tourism Managers changed at least every year (and sometimes more often). From 1983 to 1986, three individuals were dismissed due to mismanagement of funds or other legal troubles. Why others left the job is unclear. PTC Minutes and correspondence suggested that some individuals found a desk job frustrating, and soon became fed up with responsibilities they felt were too heavy for one person to handle.

More recently, management and operation of tourism had been placed squarely in the hands of the local General Manager of the Angmarlik Visitor Centre. Since 1988 when GNWT took responsibility, five individuals were placed in the GM position. One ED&T official considered this turnover low on GNWT standards. However, it meant a new start each tourist season and in the AEDO's words, a rather "ineffective coordination of services". From a private business manager's point of view, the government was too quick to 'throw away' human resources: they did not allow the time and training needed to build upon the strengths the local individual might possess.

By the time the Angmarlik Visitor Centre opened its doors, the PTC expressed strong concern that they find a GM who would stay at the job for a longer period of time. However, because the Visitor Centre was owned by GNWT and the GM was now a GNWT employee, the various parties involved tended to confuse the Manager's job description. Several local people observed that the GM position had become more complicated since the position was taken over by GNWT.<sup>4</sup>

Defining the ideal job for the Angmarlik General Manager was an ongoing part of the tourism pilot-project in Pangnirtung. This presented problems for the individuals who occupied the position, as explained by one GM:

There are so many people totally confused about what I really am. I think I'm more confused than they are. Its hard to get all these different people above me to sit down at a table and work together. Every time I'm with a different person, its a different job description... Its hard having so many bosses, different people telling me what to do -- even local people and tourists telling me what to do... Sometimes I loose my confidence of what I really am.

The Angmarlik GM acted as a direct go-between among many interest groups: the Tourism Committee; the Elders whose meeting room was in the Centre; the Lodge; local outfitters; southern tour

---

<sup>4</sup> However, two previous GMs stated a preference to work for the government because of the benefits. Studies about other Arctic communities concluded that Inuit were hesitant to work for the government in fear of being seen to have 'sold out'. The GMs replied that this had been, but was no longer the case.

operators; tourists, and; government officials. Some local groups expected the GM to take on their responsibilities. Outfitters who depended on the Centre for business often thought of the GM as their Association's secretary manager. In recent years, the PTC expected the GM to arrange for meetings, take minutes, and keep the Committee informed of all correspondence. At times, the GM was blamed for the inactivity of the PTC.

The GM often became trapped between social responsibilities as a resident of Pangnirtung, and responsibilities to the tourism industry that extended beyond Pangnirtung. For example:

Tour operators in the south try to budget things in a southern way... An outfitter will give me his budget for a whole package tour, but the problem is that the tour operators down south will not agree to that price. This leaves a lot of negotiating for me between both sides. In one incident, the outfitter and the operator kept saying 'no' to the prices and we ended up losing 24 tourists... Many times I feel powerless to the outfitters because I can't get enough tourists to them, and the same thing with tour operators to bring tourists up here.

The ED&T Regional Supervisor of Visitor Services understood these conflicts:

Its tough because you are caught right in the middle between what the hotel owner wants, what the tour operator wants, and what you know is right! You have to make judgement calls all the time -- whether its a disgruntled tourist, or an upset outfitter -- you have to try to resolve it. Basically your job is to try and make people happy... that's all I've ever asked from any of (the General Managers).

In reality, ED&T was unable to find the perfect person for the job. Consequently, the Regional Supervisor over the Angmarlik position claimed to have adopted a 'training' approach. Although no records of formal management training programs were available, PTC Minutes documented that the GMs attended a few seminars and workshops. ED&T officials recalled sponsoring the GMs at training programs whenever possible.<sup>1</sup> The hope was that eventually an individual would learn the skills to become the ideal General Manager. However, the high turn-over rate worked against this goal.

The most common weakness shared by each of the GMs was in the area of business management and organizational/supervisory

---

<sup>1</sup> A letter from the EDT Regional Superintendent to the Angmarlik GM in June 1988 claimed: "This Department has invested a great deal of time into your training and development."

abilities. The problem was made more complex by the fact that this was a 'high profile position': it was open to criticism by both local people and by visitors. A few local outfitters did not believe the GMs had been properly trained to handle their broad range of responsibilities. There was almost a sense that they were set-up for failure. The Auyuittuq Lodge manager added:

The GM has not learned to delegate and he cannot handle it all. When he did delegate, he didn't know how to follow-up. Although he has the right personality for the job, he is not the administrator that is needed for that job.'

The fact that the Regional Supervisor was stationed in Iqaluit and seldom visited the community caused GMs to feel defeated by their lack of final authority to make decisions and to operate in a way they saw fit. The former GM described:

My supervisor will tell me what to do, but I won't agree because I'm here, I've seen it happening, I've seen how it works... How can they run things when they are never here at all? They're not looking at what I am doing. If they could come in here and see what was really going on, it would make it a lot easier. Also, if I can do what I think is best, it would make it a lot easier for both the locals and the tourists.

There were various ways in which GMs dealt with the pressures they felt coming at them from all sides. Several quit the job out of frustration. Others hung on for awhile by re-defining their role in a way that suited them: "I just let it go, forget it, and do what I am supposed to do: greet visitors, give them information and service."

From a local cultural point of view, training was not the only issue when it came to good management. Like hunters before them, an Inuk manager must prove himself over time before he is accepted as a leader or authority within the community. Our interviews with Elders indicated a strong tie between age and performance. With respect to the Angmarlik Visitor Centre General Manager position, an Elder said:

It is a big mistake to have young people as the General Manager -- the boss -- because young people should not be the boss in any place. They don't know enough.

---

'The 'right personality' proved to be an important quality with regard to the GMs constant contact with visitors. For example, a letter from the Minister of ED&T in October 1990 praised the Angmarlik GM for his "excellent hospitality."



The majority of Elders said the GM should be a 'more mature person,' someone whom they considered an 'adult'. They based their opinions on their experiences with previous staff members who they found to be untrustworthy or uncaring. As well, they claimed that a young person did not have the communication skills to properly and respectfully serve the Elders.

Elders recognized that a young person had the knowledge needed to do the paper-work and to communicate in English with tourists. However, they felt that young people tended not to have their 'mind set on the job', nor did they know enough to make decisions in the interest of the community. If a young person were to hold the Angmarlik GM position, Elders recommended that a community body -- the Tourism Committee, for example -- should work closely with that individual to direct decisions and to supervise their work. A few Elders suggested that an older person -- 'a real Inuk' -- be hired for the GM position. (One or two younger secretaries could do the paper-work and act as interpreter.) An older individual would have first-hand knowledge of the local tourist destinations and of the Cumberland Sound area in general. Therefore, they would be better able to serve tourists asking about particular activities and locations.

In other management positions in Pangnirtung -- at the Lodge for example -- most private businesses hired Non-Inuit individuals. According to the Auyittuq Development Inc. President, this occurred for two reasons: 1) the skills to fill the management role were not yet available locally, and; 2) Inuit in management positions were placed under considerable social pressure to grant favours to friends and relatives. People in Pangnirtung who might have been capable of holding a management position, hesitated to take the job because other local people tried to take advantage of them. Some said this situation extended from the Inuit tradition of sharing. This meant that local managers faced another sort of social and cultural pressure: fellow Inuit held a higher set of expectations from a fellow Inuk 'insider', than from a Qallunaaq 'outsider'.

## 5.2. TRAINING: OUTFITTERS, WOMEN, AND STUDENT HOSTS

Tourism in the Northwest Territories was relatively new compared to the rest of Canada and other countries. Several local individuals recognized that compared to the south of Canada, the USA, and Europe, the quality of tourist services in the NWT was poor. Training about tourism generally, and tourist services specifically, was seen to be vital in order to compete with other destinations. However, over the previous ten years, only five out of thirty outfitters interviewed said they had received any type

of guide training.<sup>7</sup> Of these, only three were trained to interpret Kekerten Historic Park.

One of the problems was that too few training courses were held locally. This was due, in part, to inconsistent funding as a result of government budget cuts. Also, most outfitters thought they did not need training. Or, many would not attend training courses unless they were offered within their home community. Furthermore, northerners had come to expect all-expense-paid training, an increasingly costly program in times of government budget restraints. Added to the problem was a shortage of certified Inuktitut-speaking instructors. This issue was raised back in 1987 at the BTA Annual General Meeting when the PTC Chairperson expressed concern that training programs were too much "in the southern style." Since that time, Pangnirtung has produced the first and only Inuk instructor of guide training and St. John Ambulance First Aid in the NWT (see Chapter 2.1).

The need for reliable outfitter services could be measured by tourists' comments on outfitters' performance. Unfortunately, one of the most common complaints from visitors was about outfitters who, for example, did not pick up hikers at the appointed time, or misjudged the tide schedule. In these instances, visitors felt that local Inuit outfitters -- who were born and raised in this environment -- could be trusted as experts in tidal schedules. When problems occurred, visitors felt they had been taken advantage of, especially in light of the high cost of hiring an outfitter. Almost every unilingual outfitter blamed these types of problems on their inability to speak English. One outfitter stated:

There can be many factors affecting the decisions an outfitter makes. So the language difference can start hostilities between the two. [...] There should be a rule where outfitters who do not speak English be required to bring translators. The Qallunaat spend a lot of money to come here and if there are problems, they should be able to discuss it.

Communication was especially important in situations where tourists tried to pressure their outfitter to travel in what the outfitter considered unsafe weather conditions. Those who were bi-lingual believed that their ability to speak English led to better quality service and greater satisfaction among tourists.

Older outfitters felt there should be a training course available about the local waters and weather. But some believed that their expertise in Inuit ways and the Arctic environment should exclude them from outfitter training:

---

<sup>7</sup> EDT's 1990 PACKAGE FOUR ANALYSIS documents ten outfitters in Pangnirtung with Level I Basic training.

I don't feel I need training because I am a real Inuk. I know about hunting and I would know what to do if someone got hurt. I've handled Qallunaat for a number of years now, and they have always been satisfied with my services, so why change something that works?

However, the Inuk instructor did not agree:

We have to take advantage of the time we have with our clients... and there are very little things you can do to increase business up here. So I don't agree with those who say they don't need guide training just because they know how to hunt. Boating is not all there is to it. To use a similar example, if I went hunting seal at the floe-edge and saw a seal, I'd shoot at it because that is why I am there. But if I see a walrus, I'll shoot at it too even though I am only hunting seals. It's the same with Qallunaat up here. They come up here to see a specific thing, but there are many other things they can see and experience.

A couple of other outfitters agreed that both training and licensing were essential to becoming "professional" and to "catch up with the rest of the world."

In addition to safety and reliability, the Angmarlik Visitor Centre GM claimed there was a special need for interpretive training. Many outfitters continued to believe that tourists expected transportation from point 'A' to point 'B' and nothing else. But apparently more tourists would have gone to Kekerten had the Angmarlik staff been able to book an outfitter trained in interpretation of the Historic Park. The GM believed that interpretive training was important to word-of-mouth advertising: tourists passed on both what they saw and what they were told about cultural artifacts, historic sites, and the land.

Women in the community were critical of the over-emphasis on outfitter and guide courses, as opposed to other types of tourism training. (This is consistent with findings discussed in Chapter 4.) Several women stated that tourism workshops had been exclusively for men, dealing with activities in which only men could participate:

Why aren't there any women taking part in guide training? The trouble is that the curricula developed in every college is so stereotyped. Its only geared to men and you have to have the equipment. I mean, there are other ways of guiding that's not being done generally -- its only one type of guide training.

Many women were in fact surprised to be asked if they had ever attended a tourism workshop. On second thought, however, several expressed an interest should they be 'invited':

I never heard any women invited to workshops. I was thinking why we ladies could never go to tourism workshops. It's always men; just because they have their outfitters licence, that's why. I was thinking that for myself, when I am at the (fish)camp, interpreting for my husband all the time, I thought maybe I should go to a tourism workshop sometime, to get more ideas.

Outfitters and other men in the community agreed that women should have equal chances to become involved in tourism.

One of the few training opportunities that existed locally for women was through Auyuittuq Lodge. The manager had applied for funding to conduct hotel management training through Adult Education. Several local young women participated for up to one or two year periods. Problems arose, however, when local women left the job for personal or family reasons. It was most frustrating when these young women used their training they received to take a government job with a better salary and benefits. One business person described this situation as typical: "the private sector trains people, the government hires them."

One other tourism training opportunity that was open to both young women and men -- as student hosts at the Angmarlik Visitor Centre -- was viewed as entirely inadequate. A few outfitters agreed that student hosts needed better training:

They definitely need to have education first -- like hospitality, that is the first thing to focus on because they are hosting. Then give them teaching on interpretation, like here in the Museum, and to respond to clients' questions.

The Lodge manager noted that a lack of student host training resulted in poor communication between Auyuittuq Lodge and the Angmarlik Visitor Centre. Visitors to Pangnirtung also complained that Angmarlik hosts were unable to offer the necessary information about carvers, crafts-people, where to buy country-food, or where to go to observe birds and other wildlife. Part of the problem was that there was an almost complete turn-over in tourism hosts and hostesses from one season to the next.

During an interview with the most recent group of student tourism hosts, each agreed they felt inadequately trained to perform their duties. After only one day of training, these young people were expected to tour visitors through the museum and to be expert sources of community and area information. Although in previous years a Canadian Parks Services staff-member had conducted a Hospitality course for the student hosts at the Angmarlik Centre, this did not materialize in 1991. This was due in part to Tourism Committee neglect. Poor administration of the Student Employment [STEP] application process caused funding

delays and pushed the student hiring date into a time when tourists were already arriving in Pangnirtung.<sup>9</sup> The General Manager in 1991 agreed that shortage of time had been a major factor:

I asked my supervisor if I could have a week to train these summer students. He said, 'no there is not enough time -- maybe after everything is done'. I said, 'well why train them when everything is done?' I even went to Parks Canada to get some trainers, and they said, 'write us a long letter first and we'll see.'

The Assistant Manager added:

It would be a lot easier if we trained the students before Qallunaat came. We were in a hurry to hire the community hosts and to show them everything as fast as we could, because (tourists) were starting to come that week. So we just told them the basics.

Although the 1991 Assistant Manager had three years of experience, she nevertheless was convinced that her training did not prepare her to fulfil the job requirements. She felt she lacked a necessary understanding of the tourist industry. In particular, she had little confidence in her cultural and historical knowledge to properly conduct a museum tour. The other student hosts agreed that the interpretation aspect of their job presented great difficulties. Several student hosts had come to the end of their summer confused as to whom the museum was about.<sup>9</sup> In other aspects of their job, the lack of training was made worse by poor supervision:

We didn't do anything at all! It seems like we were just by ourselves -- on our own -- nobody telling us what to do. It was hard for us because we would ask, 'what are we going to do now?' We had to look for something to do, but then how do you do it? Or what information are you going to get? Our manager never said anything. I don't think he's ever been trained

---

<sup>9</sup> A lack of communication between the PTC, the Angmarlik GM, and the Hamlet office resulted in the first STEP application falling through the cracks; a second application had to be quickly re-submitted in time to hire summer hosts. (PTC Correspondence, 1991)

<sup>9</sup> The hosts were confused about whether the museum was about the Inuit of Pangnirtung, or Inuit in general. Their parents had told them that drum-dancing had not been a tradition in the Cumberland Sound area. Yet the students watched the GM demonstrate to tourists how and why drum-dancing was performed.

about what to do at Angmarlik Centre or how to teach the hosts working for the summer.

From the Manager's perspective, the double responsibility to train and supervise was difficult to handle:

It was hard because I had to make sure they had enough knowledge and information to give out. Everyone was in a different shift and the only time we could train them was when we could all get together. I couldn't get everyone in the office on the same day. I told them that the only way to learn was if they came here voluntarily, which they didn't want to do.

The Lodge manager suspected that students who applied for summer hosting were not really interested in the job nor in tourism. Rather, they applied because that was the best paying job they could get for the summer.

Several sources felt that the young age of the students was at the root of many of the problems with the hosting program. Youthfulness in itself limited what a person was allowed to learn in the Inuit tradition of education. Therefore, when teenage students claimed to know nothing about the museum or the old days, part of the problem was that they could not know. A previous Tourism GM explained:

For people in my (older) age group and people in their (the student hosts') age group, things are very different. When I was their age and I asked some of the older people questions, they wouldn't always answer. But now when I ask the same questions, they open up a lot more because they consider me a little older now.

One Elder commented that tourists could not begin to understand what Inuit life was like because the staff at the Angmarlik was too young to know the stories. Other adults claimed that the students were not mature enough to act as spokespersons for the community. Nor did they possess the knowledge necessary to give complete information to visitors seeking answers. This could create a poor first impression of Pangnirtung as a tourist destination. A private business manager said:

They should be mature students. The Angmarlik Centre is where most people get their first impression. Tourists shouldn't have to ask questions: these hosts should be fountains of information. Instead they get, 'well, I don't know'. That's the biggest failing the Angmarlik Centre has -- but that's not the hosts' fault... they've not been trained, or taught.

### 5.3. TOURISM AWARENESS IN THE COMMUNITY

One of the major criticisms about the recent Tourism Committee was its failure to communicate to the rest of the community. Residents felt 'in the dark' about what was happening within the industry and about who was visiting Pangnirtung and why. Because tourism was a relatively new type of economic activity in the community, awareness was important to promoting it as a significant part of Pangnirtung's economy. The recent lack of communication had its consequences; a Co-op Board member explained:

The Tourism Committee's non-communication with the community really affected the Co-op also. In the past, tourism people used to tell the Co-op when groups of people were coming into town, and to be prepared for them. (Lately) there was absolutely no word at all from the Angmarlik Centre to the Co-op. The Tourism Committee members and people in general blamed the manager, but there is a lot of work that manager has to do. But because the Tourism Committee was not behind him, he was left with a lot of work that the PTC could have handled.

People expressed a hope that plans for a new Tourism Committee, in close association with the Hamlet Council, would work toward a stronger relationship between the industry and the rest of the community. A Hamlet Council member who had taken a leadership role in forming the new Tourism Committee stated:

We are going to try to be very open this year. It was too closed last year and no-one knew what was going on. We want to make it very clear to the community that we are approachable and we want to be approached by the community. That's the only way to work -- the whole community working together, no secretive little group that tries to work for the community.

One of the reasons why community awareness was important was because it helped to maintain a positive attitude towards the flow of visitors to Pangnirtung each summer.<sup>10</sup> Keeping the community informed of visitors' comments, and listening to feedback from residents, could help to monitor the 'host-guest' relationship and prevent it from going sour. For example, many

---

<sup>10</sup> BTA advertised hospitality/tourism awareness courses designed to make all persons increasingly aware of what tourism is, what it means to the community and how to take care of visitors. These courses were based on the view that without this knowledge, a tourism industry had little chance of succeeding. "Northernmost Host Program." BTA Notice, November 15, 1988.

visitors expressed a strong distaste for the large amount of garbage lying around the town. This presented a stark contrast to the beauty of Pangnirtung's surrounding natural environment. Visitors saw this as a lack of local Inuit pride in their community. This type of perception caused some local people to view their 'host' relationship with tourist 'guests' as a very sensitive one:

Qallunaat are very fast in writing letters to newspapers... There should always be this communication between the Inuit and the tourists... The Tourism Committee should always keep an eye over them, because there have been some people to see seals and whales, and as a result of those trips, I have seen bad articles about Inuit.

I want to learn more about what tourists hear about us before they come up here... What they hear in books and magazines is probably not true because they were written by Qallunaat who don't know very much about us.

Fortunately, up to this point in Pangnirtung's tourism development, visitors were pleased by the warm welcome they received upon their arrival. This friendliness helped to confirm tourists' decision to visit the North in the first place.

This welcoming attitude toward visitors grew out of a long history of contact between Cumberland Sound Inuit and Qallunaat. Compared to any other Baffin community, people in Pangnirtung had a legacy of at least fifty extra years of contact with the outside world. This included extensive participation in commercial activity during the 19th century whaling era in Cumberland Sound. It continued into the 20th century when the Hudson Bay Company and St. Luke's Mission Hospital were established in the settlement of Pangnirtung. In the opinion of ED&T officials, this resulted in a group of people who were more comfortable than people in other communities, to interact with southerners. Elders confirmed this view:

In the Pangnirtung area, the Inuit really welcomed the Qallunaat. There was never any bad feelings and there has always been a very good working relationship between the Inuit and the Qallunaat. However, in other parts of the Baffin and the North, I have heard that this was not the case, that there were bad feelings towards the Qallunaat. But never around here.

The interviews with women in the community also conveyed a relatively positive feeling toward tourists. Over the past ten years women's views of tourists changed from one of annoyance to one of acceptance:



When sealing was still profitable, the women used to work outside the house... While they were cleaning skins, tourists started coming by and my Mom hated it because they were taking pictures. I think it made her feel smaller than (the tourists) were, because she was dirty. She felt that the tourists were intruding. There used to be someone on the radio saying that tourism would benefit us all, and Mom used to say -- 'I wonder how?' [...] At the time I did not understand how tourists could bring money into the community. I just thought they were nosey people, because that's the impression that Mom gave. The tourists didn't even ask to take pictures, they were just clicking away. [...] (But now) it seems as if we don't want to hide from the tourists any more, but want to show it off. It is valuable; in this sense tourism has given us more, even if it is not economic.

In 1991, most women had a more generous attitude toward tourists: several women expressed sympathy for hikers in the campground during bad weather (see Dialogue 4). Also, they noticed that over the years tourists had become more considerate -- about photo-taking, for instance.

Awareness among the youth of Pangnirtung was vital to the future of its tourist industry. Some adults believed that young people in Pangnirtung would learn and know about tourism simply by having grown up with it around them. Others disagreed:

I think the Grade Ten, Eleven and Twelve students need education about tourism. Tourism in the Territories is new compared to elsewhere in Canada or the world. It has just started in the Territories, so we need education in the schools.

However, few teenagers seemed to recognize tourism as an economic opportunity for themselves. Our research indicated that local youth had a very poor knowledge of either the industry or its development (see Dialogue 5). For example, even the students who worked at the Angmarlik Visitor Centre as summer hosts had little to no idea of what the Tourism Committee was about. Nor did they know about the history of tourism development in Pangnirtung. This was in spite of past efforts by the local Education Council and the Tourism Committee to teach students about tourism:

When I was in the Tourism Committee, I went to the local school to try to emphasize that there are career opportunities in the tourism industry. I've said this

many times in Yellowknife to the government that tourism is a career opportunity for our people.<sup>11</sup>

When the community decided to go forward with tourism development ten years ago, their reasoning was based largely on the hope for a better economic future for younger generations. However, for many young people in 1991, tourism was still a foreign concept.

Parents realized that their children needed to be presented with opportunities for the future; most believed that education was the key to those opportunities. Unfortunately, formal education in Inuit communities had little success in producing graduates that went on to professional or occupational training. Nor had it been successful in teaching and reinforcing young peoples' Inuit identity. A few of the Elders reasoned that young people were 'in the middle' -- they were learning too little about either the Qallunaat way or the Inuit way to succeed as one or the other.

Outfitters saw a very practical and lifesaving need for a blend of Inuktitut and Qallunaqtut education in the guiding and outfitting training courses:

Training was put on us by the Qallunaat. I like the idea behind outfitter training, but more training is needed in the Inuit way, not just the Qallunaat way of outfitting or boating. For us who live in the Arctic, not knowing our land is dangerous. Accidents can happen very suddenly. Even though Qallunaat only usually come in the summer, we have to look at the future. Qallunaat are starting to come up here in the winter. The Inuit knowledge of our land is not included, but it really should be because young people who are growing up today don't get a chance to learn about that as we did.

Teachers and parents agreed that education was partly a cultural problem. Inuit young people entered a less active, more structured learning situation in school. This was very different from home or on the land where children initiated learning by watching and doing. Many local Inuit believed that Inuktitut knowledge learned outside the school should be given as much credit as Qallunaqtut education inside the school. For these reasons, apprenticeship programs that had begun in at least one of the locally owned fishcamps might point a way for the future. Tongait Fishcamp made use of a GNWT "Training-On-The-Job" program to hire young employees (50% of wages were reimbursed). This might be one type of hands-on tourism awareness and training that could be expanded upon and encouraged.

---

<sup>11</sup> PTC Minutes, October 1987: The Education Council requested the PTC members to go to the school in the future to talk about tourism to the students.

## DIALOGUE 5: TOURISM AWARENESS AMONG LOCAL YOUTH

In December 1991, we carried out a tourism research project together with a group of Grade Eleven students enrolled in the 'Career and Life Management Course' at Attagoyuk School. We taught lessons on the 'tourist industry' and 'tourism development.' The former Tourism Committee chairperson gave a talk about the history of tourism development over the past ten years in Pangnirtung and its potential for young people in the community. The following dialogue speaks about the lack of, but need for, tourism awareness among young people in the community.

TEACHER: I don't think a lot of the students have thought about tourism. I think (your project) was more of an informative session for them, then one where... they have prior knowledge about that -- from school, or on the news. But with tourism, they have not. So they don't have any background information to add to the teaching, or to ask (questions). As far as tourism is concerned, it's still a very new and foreign concept.

LOCAL CO-RESEARCHER: It could be very difficult for them to see a future in tourism -- making a whole lot -- to actually see that as happening -- outfitting and crafts.

TEACHER: Yes, there is a vision there that is required, and requiring that from a teenager is quite a vision -- even in a situation where there is a lot of tourism happening all around you. Part of the fact is that they are teenagers and maybe not taking this issue as seriously as we are, but, I still think it's an educational process and they have to be informed. This is the first time they have been informed about tourism.

LOCAL CO-RESEARCHER: Another thing that I've noticed about our teenagers here, is that... they've seen their fathers and mothers serving the Qallunaat all the time. And with this tourism thing, the comments I've gotten from a couple of young friends I have, is that they just don't want to serve the Qallunaat. They want to be the boss somewhere rather than just being a servant.

TEACHER: Yes, and that's where education is the key. I think the students would learn in a far different and in a far culturally sensitive and relevant way by having an Inuit teacher who speaks

Inuktitut, but is also fluent in English, and is able to bridge that gap.

...

RESEARCHER: Recall the former Tourism Committee Chairman's talk? He was very direct to you that the reason they started tourism in Pangnirtung ten years ago, was for YOU! It was to be another opportunity for young people to live and work in Pang, because many people do not want to leave Pang. What did you think of that talk?

STUDENTS: (No response.)

RESEARCHER: How does it make it feel when older people in the community make plans for the young people and their future?

STUDENTS: (No response.)

RESEARCHER: Do you think that tourism is something that you see as potential for a career or a business -- outfitting or a craft store, etc. -- after you are finished high school?

STUDENT: If I was interested in it.

RESEARCHER: Is anyone in this room interested in becoming involved in tourism?

STUDENTS: (No response.)

RESEARCHER: Why are you in high school?

STUDENT: Because... to get better jobs!

RESEARCHER: What kind of job? What is a 'better job'?

STUDENT: To become what we want to be.

RESEARCHER: What is that?

STUDENT: To get higher paying jobs!

RESEARCHER: Do you think a high school diploma will help you get that?

STUDENT: It should.

STUDENT: No. Everybody is going to be getting their Grade Twelve and jobs will be filled and you will have to get a higher education level to get higher jobs.

TEACHER: Until they can see that there is some concrete reason within the community to get an education, the attitude towards it will not be as serious or as motivated as one would like.

...

RESEARCHER: Does your town really change in summer with all the tourists here? Does it bother you that there are so many more Qallunaat here then?

STUDENT: (whisper) Damn tourists!

RESEARCHER: Why?

STUDENT: Because they come! (laughter)

RESEARCHER: That is a problem in other places; after awhile people become sick and tired of tourists taking over their town. So that is something that you have to think about in the future if you become involved in tourism -- to keep a good community attitude towards tourists, or to control them in some way.

STUDENT: Are there more tourists coming each year?

RESEARCHER: Yes, but in the last two years, tourism has decreased all over Canada because of the recession, etc. But Pangnirtung has done OK.

STUDENT: But most tourists come only in the summer.

RESEARCHER: Yes, that is a problem, but it is one thing that the Hamlet council and the Tourism Committee are working at.

LOCAL CO-RESEARCHER: It has started already. There are now tourists going to the floe edge in the spring; that never happened before. Also, the halibut fishery is actually drawing tourists too. A couple of outfitters are planning to take tourists out to watch the halibut fishing.

...

TEACHER: I think they should know that tourism is quite possibly going to be a future opportunity for jobs and development here. So they should be aware of it now when they are in their high-school years. But, I don't think they looked at it personally and said, 'well maybe in a couple of years this could be an opportunity that could exist for me.' I don't think they looked at it in a personal sense - - maybe their outlook was in an overall community sense.

6.

## CULTURE AS A TOURIST ATTRACTION

(T)he Cumberland Sound Inuit make no historical connection between themselves and those who lived in the sound before the arrival of the white man... (T)he view of history shared by the Cumberland Sound Inuit extends no further back in time than the Whaling period. [Marc Stevenson]<sup>1</sup>

I agree with this statement in one way, but disagree with it in another way. Myself, I... do not remember the time before the Qallunaat came. On the other hand, I know what went on before the Qallunaat came, through stories. So there are two ways that this could be taken. [An Elder from Pangnirtung]

### 6.1. CULTURE-TOURISM AND THE WHALING ERA IN CUMBERLAND SOUND

Tourism-related historical and archaeological studies of the Pangnirtung area emphasized that part of the Cumberland Sound Inuit past that dated back to the Whaling Period (mid-1850s to 1920s).<sup>2</sup> The story presented to tourists was one of a whaling people in general, and of their participation in commercial whaling in particular. However, during the course of our research a few local individuals expressed a dislike for this emphasis on the Whaling Era: some said, for example, that the museum was more about Qallunaat than about Inuit. We decided to follow-up on these comments by asking the Elders to respond to Stevenson's statements quoted above. Our intent was to get a better idea of how local historians wanted to present their culture to outsiders.

Because the present-day Elders could remember only as far back as the Whaling Period, those are the stories they told. This

---

<sup>1</sup> KEKERTEN: PRELIMINARY ARCHAEOLOGY OF AN ARCTIC WHALING STATION. by Marc Stevenson. Yellowknife: Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre. Department of Justice and Public Services, GNWT, 1984.

<sup>2</sup> See Footnote 1.; also, A HERITAGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PANGNIRTUNG, BAYPIN ISLAND, NWT: VOL.1. by Stevenson & Associates, Edmonton: Prepared for Pangnirtung Hamlet Council and Economic Development & Tourism, GNWT, 1990.

did not seem to mean however, that this was where their history stopped. Nor did it mean that this was how they wanted to present their culture to others. Rather, it indicated a vital distinction between what was termed 'history' as opposed to 'living memory.' Living memory had the added value of truth learned from experience: Elders hesitated to talk about what they did not know first-hand. However, most responded rather strongly against Stevenson's conclusion that their view of Inuit culture and history "extends no further back than the Whaling period." To the Elders, this statement implied that Inuit history began when Qallunaat came North.

Few Non-Inuit actually lived in the North during the Whaling period. Furthermore, these Non-Inuit depended upon the Inuit for physical survival. Therefore, Elders said they were unable to exercise any serious threat to Inuit cultural survival:

There were so few Qallunaat here at any one time that I do not see how Inuit could have lost their culture or that they were ever in danger of losing their culture.

Elders agreed that only when their camps were evacuated into the larger settlement now known as Pangnirtung, did Qallunaat influences become more obvious, constant, and threatening.

The Elders view of Cumberland Sound Inuit culture-history was important with regard to the content and design of the Angmarlik Centre museum. Most Elders felt the museum showed too small a portion of the pre-Whaling Period Inuit culture:

The museum does not represent the pre-Whaling era and there is too much metal in there -- not enough bone, skins, and wood.

There are too many whaling artifacts here. I feel there are not enough artifacts from generations before me.

In part this was because many of the old artifacts could no longer be found (one Elder suggested that archaeologists had taken them all away). Also, no living Elder was able to reproduce many of the old tools. Several Elders suggested that artifacts would have more meaning if they were presented as both useful and relevant:

There should be more things that were used before which are still used today, even though they have changed. They should be more applied to what can still be used today.

Those artifacts would be more believable if there were a few lines explaining each piece and a little story that goes along with that. It would give a lot more credibility to know that they were actually used, not just old things that were discarded.

Elders believed that tourists left the museum with a poor understanding of the Inuit past because: 1) there was almost no written explanation alongside the artifacts, and; 2) the museum presented mostly the Whaling period of Inuit history. One Elder stated:

Its a total falsehood. I do not believe that if a tourist comes here in one day, looks around and reads something in one day, and then leaves, that there is any way they can understand Inuit culture.

On the other hand, one or two Elders appreciated the idea that the Angmarlik museum was not only about the Inuit of Cumberland Sound:

The way I understand it, the museum is about whaling: that's the whole point of the museum. So I like the way there are all these old whaling instruments -- the big harpoon and the bullets. Its a whaling museum.

It is important to have whaling in the museum -- to have a lot of whaling artifacts in there because it was an important thing that happened to our culture. Even though there are a lot of Qallunaag things, they should be there because they were used quite a lot. But to look at that museum today, it looks like there were a lot of Qallunaat there; but only one or two or three would be around.

The former PTC Chairperson explained why the Tourism Committee agreed to emphasize the whaling culture as a tourist attraction:

My strongest feeling at that time was to show my kids and the young people what the whaling was about... before the Elders left us, and we lost all that valuable information. We don't write very much and we don't talk a lot like Qallunaat... It was extremely important to start some place where people know the most. To start with the legends before the whalers, we felt we couldn't get the whole story. When we talked to the Elders, we tried to go back as far as possible, but much of that is lost. We were almost too late to get the whaling story back.

Adults from a younger generation noted the cultural benefits that tourism development has brought to them and their children:

My kids would never have seen the Angmarlik Centre -- how it was in the whaling days -- if it wasn't for tourism. So much of that would not have been preserved. In a way, it makes you more proud to be who you are and

to see that there are tourists who will come and see that part of you.

People were not expecting to regain their culture -- both from the museum and also because outfitters need to know the history of the land and of Kekerten. Carvers also are giving written stories or legends about their carvings, which puts a larger value on the carvings. This all helps to create motivation to come to the North.

Elders agreed that the museum and its artifacts and pictures could provide a way for young people to see, ask and learn about their past. However, apparently very few young people actually got to the asking stage. The only time Elders assisted a group of youth was when they were specifically requested to do so by the school. Elders believed that young people had little interest in 'old Inuit things' because they were too involved with 'new Qallunaat things'.

## 6.2. THE PRESENTATION OF CULTURE

Elders stressed the importance of communication between the Inuit and the Non-Inuit:

The museum is important for Qallunaat because it is important that Qallunaat and Inuit learn to communicate and to understand each other. Therefore, it is important that the Inuit welcome the Qallunaat tourists.

To this end, a few Elders were not sure why they were 'forced' to retire from their meeting room in summer. This prevented them from interacting with tourists in a more formalized way.

Visitors to Pangnirtung were as interested in the social and cultural life of Inuit today, as of Inuit in the past. Tourists were impressed by a feeling of 'real community' where facilities like the Angmarlik Visitor Centre served both visitors and local people. Tourists found the Angmarlik Centre attractive partly because it obviously met community needs: the Elders' room, the Library, and the local educational potential of the Museum, for example. However, tourists also warned of the dangers of tourism: in other third- and fourth-world destinations, local people had become a cultural 'show' for tourists to 'buy' (see Dialogue 6).

Our interviews with the Elders were valuable because they focused attention on the cultural effects of tourism development. Often pressing economic and political issues over-shadowed the more subtle cultural issues. But these could also affect the quality of tourism development, particularly in the eyes of the host community.



ED&T officials insisted that GNWT's tourism investments in Pangnirtung and the rest of the region, could not be measured by capital dollars alone. Rather, returns on investment should be measured in terms of 'quality of life'. Kekerten Historic Park, for example, might not be a profitable project in financial terms, but it returned rich cultural resources to the Inuit of Cumberland Sound now settled in Pangnirtung.

The ways in which those cultural resources were defined and valued, however, might differ between local Inuit, professional consultants, and government agencies. Academics have explored the question of 'invented' tradition and history. They have shown how 'stories' of tradition and history were told or written in different ways, depending on the particular point of view or particular purpose. Over the past ten years of tourism development in Pangnirtung, the history that was told and the culture that was presented, focused on the 19th Century commercial Whaling Era. The purpose of this particular presentation was to promote culture-tourism. Newspaper travel features illustrated this point (see Appendix C).

The reason we raised this point is to draw attention to the way in which Cumberland Sound Inuit culture is presented to outsiders. This message must be acceptable to the community of people who are identified with that story. The work that was done at Kekerten and at the Angmarlik Visitor Centre was important to Elders and tourists alike. The Elders recalled with pride the life and changes they experienced while living and working at the Whaling Stations. But, they were also proud of their heritage in a pre-historic whaling culture that hunted beluga and bowhead out of kayaks and with harpoons. Finally, the way their culture was presented had also to be agreeable to the younger generations of Inuit in Pangnirtung. They were the ones who had to be willing to take over the tourist industry in the near and more distant future.

## DIALOGUE 6: HOST AND GUEST -- A CULTURAL EXCHANGE

An unexpected outcome of the 'Visitor Voices' sessions was that the evening itself became a cultural event. A few local people -- the 'hosts' -- attended each session. This allowed tourists -- Canadian, American, and European 'guests' -- a sought-after opportunity to ask questions about Inuit culture and society. Following is a dialogue of selected conversations that range in topic from Inuit 'on show,' to Greenpeace, to the role of Elders.

RESEARCHER: Why did you come to Pangnirtung?

CANADIAN: I came mostly to meet the Inuit. My work is with people from different parts of the world, with newly arrived immigrants and I love meeting new people. So I really wanted to come and meet the Inuit.

RESEARCHER: What stands out in your mind with respect to your first visit to a northern community?

GERMAN: For me, it is the sense of community that gives me a strong impression. There is no competition for the outfitters. They seem to have a just system that is working. This is quite new to me, its not 'survival of the fittest'. They look out for each other and this is something that is not working now in Germany.

CANADIAN: I was surprised by the approachability of the people. In northern Indian communities, the reception is quite different -- I felt very much like an outsider and an intruder. But here I felt welcome.

HOST: We try to treat all people here as we would like to be treated ourselves. To be enthusiastic, to clear communication. I often wonder when people leave here, if they will use what they learned about our culture, and take that home with them?

CANADIAN: The sign outside says the Elders' room is closed for the summer. Why would the Elders room be cancelled exactly when the tourists are here?

HOST: Because that is the only chance they have to go camping, to get out on the land with their families. They meet here all winter, but will make appointments in the summer to meet with visitors if they want story-telling.

AMERICAN: What makes one an Elder?

HOST: For an Elder, it is when they feel they are an Elder and they take up the roles of an Elder. Their roles are as story-tellers and passing on their history. They keep and teach the tradition of living on the land and living with the land. But the way of living in the community has changed. An Elder is someone who must prove to the people that they are trustful, honest and helping the people.

AMERICAN: One of the things a white or southern visitor might want to do in coming up to a community like this, is to evaluate their own life by differentiating their system with what is here, the organization here. Even being raised in Alaska, I still don't know what an Elder is or what they do. Casual visitors here need to be hit in the head about Elders and what is different from a Western premise.

HOST: Indirectly, Elders have a strong role in guiding the people, although you won't see them in councils. But councillors who make the decisions, always at one time or another consult with the Elders to know what is right for the community. For example, if I had to make a decision about tourism -- to take some tourists out to a hunting ground, an unwritten law is that I will not do it without the consent of the Elders first. I will find out if it will be OK to take someone to the whale estuary or somewhere else.

AMERICAN: I think that to represent Inuit culture to other people, those points are really important and people need to be hit over the head with it because, its different from elections. Its strange as a visitor to walk in here. I wanted to respect this room and didn't think I should come in here or to maybe sit in an Elder's chair. Then I saw other people and so I came in here. There is an atmosphere of mystery about this room.

GERMAN: I am convinced that when I go home some people will ask about my sealskin mitts, because there they have the Greenpeace image. Where does Greenpeace make its campaign and how has this affected the Inuit?

HOST: Greenpeace depicted a very different picture without coming up and finding out how we live. Rather, they zeroed in on a small group of Newfoundlanders who clubbed baby seals. We've never killed them that way.

GERMAN: I think that is extremely important information, especially for European visitors, because all we see are the Greenpeace pictures.

PARISIAN: Somehow here I was not expecting it to be so organized, so white. Something really struck me when we visited the weave shop, the person we had contact with was white and there was no contact between the locals and us. We just see ladies weaving, then we see the high prices of the weavings, and we don't know what is going on. As a tourist, you get a very strange impression, that they are there 'on stage'. It seems like whites are trying to organize the locals. We have the impression that the Inuit do not have their life in their own hands.

HOST: I'd like to comment on that. I think you are saying that you were expecting native people to be involved with the tourism or organizing it. But you found out that everything is organized 'Qallunaqtitut'. Nowadays, we Inuit are in-between, we are stuck in one place, this big settlement. We are losing our culture and our traditional way of life. We are approaching a new way of life, which is the white-man's. We have no choice because we depend on the money. If I have no money, I can't live out there (on the land). I have to be working here or on welfare. But maybe in twenty or thirty years time, I am hoping to get my traditional way of life back. But everything will be bi-lingual. I'd like to see my culture more in front of the others to show them what we are.

PARISIAN: What I mean is that you are obliged to integrate into the white society, that you are not in charge of your own structures.

CANADIAN: I think what he is saying is that in a few years the Inuit will have their control back.

CANADIAN: The challenge for you (Inuit) is to figure out what people can do in native communities to be self-sufficient and to still retain your culture. Its a very difficult and complicated issue, isn't it?

PARISIAN: Its not that I want you to stay the way you were. What I mean is that these tourists are passing by and I have the impression that there is a show of the culture because there are tourists and not because there is a community. What struck me is that at the same time, I have the impression that there are people who are not from your community doing the job for you, showing you to us (the tourists), which is annoying.

HOST: Your first impression of Pangnirtung is quite deceptive, because you just see the outside, just the houses and a few of the people. I think you'd be quite surprised at the local people who work in the offices and act like real southerners, white people -- doing research, for example. And then the weekend comes and he goes out hunting and he is a completely different guy -- a real Inuk.

CANADIAN: But we don't have the leisure time to stay for a long time and just blend in and learn about the culture. We spend a good deal of money to come here and it takes a lot of time to earn enough to come up here. I know that we are rude and we are fast, but we are the tourists, and we are not the worst either.

CANADIAN: I think what we are saying from a tourist perspective is that everybody wants to get a clearer picture of the traditional way of life, how it is evolving among the Inuit people. We would like to see more developed portrayals of the old way and how you are evolving and in control, apart from viewing that vast beautiful landscape.

...

CANADIAN: What would you like to give us as tourists, to our society?

HOST: Just understanding that we are Inuit, the people. We're nothing special. Some people think that we are something special just because we are Inuit and can live on the land, but we are just human like you. We just live in some place else, that's all.

7.

## LOOKING AHEAD:

### OUTCOMES, POSSIBILITIES, AND QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

This concluding chapter re-states as clearly as possible the major points that have been made in this review of community based tourism development. The overall outcomes brought forward suggestions for improvement and possibilities for future development. Some of the conclusions also raised questions that should be seriously considered by the groups involved or affected. The challenge is for these groups to make their own recommendations for action as they look ahead to the future of tourism development in Pangnirtung and the Baffin Region.

Chapter and Section numbers indicate where one can find the information upon which the following conclusions have been based (eg., '[2.1]' directs the reader to Chapter 2, Section 1).

#### 7.1. POLITICAL OUTCOMES

THE GOALS OF COMMUNITY CONTROL -- AS OUTLINED IN THE 1983 DOCUMENT COMMUNITY BASED TOURISM: A STRATEGY FOR THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES TOURISM INDUSTRY -- ARE NOT YET FULFILLED.

The Pangnirtung Tourism Committee exercised an advisory role, as opposed to a role of prime initiator and decision-maker.

In part this was due to three local factors:

- Poor co-ordination and communication between the groups who had representatives on the Tourism Committee [3.2; 3.4; 4.1.1; 4.2.2].

- A lack of initiative on the part of local Committee members and other community leaders and residents, to 'take control' [3.4].

- Weak PTC leadership and poor performance of the PTC membership in the late 1980s [3.2].

The almost total collapse of the PTC need not be seen as failure. Rather it could be viewed as part of a difficult transition from a concentration on structural development, to new responsibilities in the operation and management of the tourist industry [2.2; 3.2].

Economic Development & Tourism did not intend to grant ultimate control over tourism development to the community.

While community based tourism was a definite shift in development policy, it was less of a shift in development practice [3.1]. This was primarily due to an emphasis on capital development at the cost of human resource development, which eventually resulted in local people unequipped to take control.

This was indicated in several areas:

- ED&T continued to initiate and implement tourism projects when the PTC was no longer functioning [3.3].

- To protect their large capital investments, ED&T felt responsible to maintain control and to prevent the pilot-project from failing [4.2.2; 4.3].

- ED&T was the regulatory body over outfitters. In policy this was desirable. In practice, outfitters believed that more local control was needed over inspection and licensing to ensure better quality service [Dialogue 3].

- ED&T controlled the key tourism management position in the community -- the Angmarlik Visitor Centre GM [3.4; 5.1].

- ED&T controlled the development funds; hence, in practice they were the final decision-makers for tourism development in Pangnirtung [3.4].

A lack of initiative at the local level to 'take control', together with ED&T's regional mandate to serve thirteen communities, caught the government between accusations of either 'neglect' or 'domination' [3.3].

Although the 'community' did not achieve control over tourism development over the first decade of the pilot-project, the community based policy was a step in the right direction. It provided the community with an opportunity for meaningful involvement, and increased local confidence in dealing with development issues. This was demonstrated by a concerned recognition among the Outfitters' Association and the Hamlet Council that the failure of the PTC threatened local control over tourism [3.2; 5.3]. In this sense, community based tourism development had potential toward fulfilling goals of political self-determination [3.4].

POSSIBILITY: One of the most frequently mentioned suggestions for the revival of the PTC, is to re-organize it as an industry-type association. Members directly involved in tourism might possess more motivation to work actively toward improving the industry, expanding the season, and controlling future development. For example, local outfitters could lobby for greater control over inspection and licensing in order to promote consistent, high-quality service.

QUESTION FOR CONSIDERATION: If the local Tourism Committee is inactive, and if no other group in the community requests or lobbies for new projects and plans, should the government go ahead and push their own agenda in the name of development? That is, when is the community ready to know what is good for itself, and to initiate its own plans?

## 7.2. ECONOMIC BENEFITS

TOURISM IS A SIGNIFICANT PART OF PANGNIRTUNG'S LOCAL ECONOMY, PARTICULARLY IN THE INFORMAL SECTOR. FOR THE MOST PART, COMMUNITY BASED TOURISM IS AN APPROPRIATE FORM OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

Tourist visitation provided an opportunity for local individuals to supplement their family income.

This could be seen in three main areas:

- In the formal wage economy, 6 Person/Years were due to direct tourism activity [4.1; Table 2].
- Outfitting contributed approximately \$100,000/season to both the formal and informal economies [4.2.2; Tables 9 & 10].
- Carvers and other home-craft artists earned \$20,000 to \$80,000/season in direct sales to tourists [4.2.1; Table 8].

Local people had difficulty entering the formal tourism economy as small-business owners or shareholders.

Three reasons accounted for this difficulty:

- A lack of education, experience, and local financial institutions were barriers to private sector involvement [4.1.1].
- The links between existing businesses and the tourist industry were weak [4.1.1; 4.2.1; 4.3].
- The Hamlet Council had a poor understanding of tourism's significance to Pangnirtung's overall economy, and so did not recognize or promote its long-term potential [4.1.1].

Government involvement and investment limited formal private sector growth in the local and regional tourism economy.

For example:

- The set rate-structure at the Angmarlik Visitor Centre limited outfitters' potential to create a variety of services to both tourists and local Non-Inuit. High rates formulated according to 'supply' did not balance with 'demand'. It was thought this could hurt long-term tourist growth [4.2.2].

- ED&T carefully protected their own investments, local participation, and established tourist facilities. While this is not an uncommon government mandate, some people claimed that it tended to increase dependency, rather than promote local economic self-sufficiency [4.2.2; 4.3; Dialogue 4].

However, ED&T indirectly supported local economic benefits achieved in the informal economy [4.2.2]. Overall, tourism's development was appropriate in that it allowed Inuit individuals to earn extra (undeclared) income from tourists, while still pursuing a land-based economy [4.2].

Unfortunately, tourism developed as primarily a male-oriented activity. Women received few economic benefits from tourism in comparison.

This was largely explained by the following factors:

- Residents initially wanted tourist activities to be directed outside the community. This meant that there were few in-town opportunities for women to pursue [2.1; 4.1.1; 4.2].

- Women's representatives on the PTC had a poor understanding of what they could reap from tourism, and hence, made few demands [3.4; 5.2].

- The gap between the arts and crafts industry and tourism prevented women from becoming more involved in direct sales to tourists [4.2.1]. Political pressure to prevent tourists from staying in Housing Corporation homes also closed a door to increased involvement by local women [Dialogue 4].

POSSIBILITY: Women, outfitters, business-owners and tourists themselves made strong recommendations for more in-town tourist activities and services. This could increase and distribute tourism revenues among local residents. The opportunity to provide 'home-stay' type accommodation is seen as one valid means to reach this goal. Other suggestions include: a small souvenir shop, a bakery, a country-food restaurant, town-tours, accessible outlets for the sales of local arts and crafts, and planned story-telling and musical activities.

QUESTION FOR CONSIDERATION: Does the Pangnirtung Hamlet Council recognize the importance of tourism to their community's overall economy as indicated in this study? Do they want to exercise more local control over tourism? If so, how will they co-ordinate the different activities in order to build a stronger tourism economy in the long-term?

### 7.3. MANAGEMENT CONCERNS

THE GOAL OF STRONG LOCAL MANAGEMENT IN PANGNIRTUNG'S TOURIST INDUSTRY IS NOT YET ACHIEVED. THE GENERAL MANAGER'S POSITION AT THE ANGMARLIK VISITOR CENTRE IS A PROBLEM FROM LOCAL, GOVERNMENT, AND INDUSTRY POINTS OF VIEW.

General Managers lacked the education and experience needed to manage and supervise the various groups involved in the tourist industry.

Several factors were involved:

- A high turn-over rate worked against any long-term training program that might equip an individual for the job. On the other hand, too little training was part of the reason individuals quit the job, which helped to create the high turn-over [5.1].

- GNWT ED&T lacked commitment to the position as permanent or to consistent, long-term training [4.3; 5.1].

- The PTC failed to direct and support the GMs, especially since 1988 when GNWT took over the position [5.1].

The General Manager job description included a wide range of responsibilities, often more than one individual could handle.

For example:

- Demands from a variety of local, industry, and government groups helped to create a confusing job description that left the GMs unsure of their authority [5.1].

- As the BTA pointed out, the GM was taking on more responsibilities than should have been allowed; in many ways the GM acted as a private sector tour operator [4.3].

The General Manager position had a high-profile in the community. From a local point of view, the previous GMs were not mature enough to act as spokespersons for the community, nor to handle the social responsibilities the job entailed. This was most evident in Elders' opinions that the Angmarlik GM needed to be an individual who had proven leadership skills, who had strong cultural knowledge, and who could care for Elders who used the Centre [5.1].

POSSIBILITY: There is a demand for much greater local-level participation in the hiring process, and in the definition and direction of the Angmarlik Visitor Centre General Manager position. In particular, local people recommend that the Elders be given a voice in deciding who is hired. Also, the PTC needs to provide stronger supervision for the position, especially since the ED&T Supervisor is in Iqaluit.

#### 7.4. TRAINING NEEDS

IN GENERAL, TRAINING IS NOT KEEPING PACE WITH THE GROWING DEMANDS FOR SERVICE AND QUALITY IN PANGNIRTUNG'S TOURIST INDUSTRY.

ED&T did not adequately follow capital development with human resource development.

This was on account of:

- ED&T decided that it was best to make capital infrastructure development a priority in the early 1980s [5.].

- By the time training became essential in the mid-1980s, funds were not as readily available [5.].

- TIA re-organized training programs across the NWT and fewer courses were allocated to the Baffin region [5.].

By 1991, outfitter training was fairly well established in the region. However, this had not yet resulted in a standard quality of service.

There were four main reasons for this:

- Most outfitters were unilingual Inuktitut [4.2.2; 5.2].

- Outfitters received little to no interpretive training [5.2].



- Outfitters did not fully understand what tourists expected [4.2.2; 5.2].
- There was too little emphasis on local knowledge and skills [5.2; 5.3].

Women felt excluded from general tourism and guide training. This limited their opportunities and their awareness of tourism's potential for women in the community [4.2.1; 5.2].

Angmarlik Visitor Centre hosts and hostesses did not receive adequate training in hospitality, information services, or interpretation.

Three factors were involved:

- Their supervisor did not have the skills to properly train the hosts [5.2].
- Not enough time was allowed to conduct training before tourists began to arrive and hosts began to work [5.2].
- Student employment programs provided the necessary funds to fill the need for tourism hosts. However, students were too young to act as either cultural interpreters or as community spokespersons [5.2].

QUESTION FOR CONSIDERATION: If local people consider the student hosts and hostesses as too young to properly represent their culture and their community, then what kinds of alternatives are available? Can better training of tourism hosts and hostesses solve this problem?

## 7.5. COMMUNITY AWARENESS

ALTHOUGH THE GENERAL ATTITUDE TOWARD TOURISTS IS GOOD, COMMUNITY AWARENESS ABOUT TOURISM HAS DECREASED OVER THE YEARS. THIS HAS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE YOUTH IN PANGNIRTUNG, IN PARTICULAR.

Community awareness was important to keep a positive 'host-guest' relationship.

This relationship has been sensitive; for example:

- Tourists had become critical about the garbage they saw around town, which helped to create a negative image about the local 'hosts' [5.3].
- Local people had seen negative articles written about the Inuit by Qallunaat 'guests' [5.3].

POSSIBILITY: A viable job-creation opportunity exists for a seasonal street-cleaner in the community. Also, the PTC or the Hamlet Council could encourage residents to keep their home-area tidy (a by-law?).

To high-school students, tourism remained somewhat of a foreign concept.

This had several implications:

- Young people were not learning about tourism simply by growing up with it around them [5.3].
- Young people did not realize that tourism might be a potential career opportunity [5.3].
- Some young people were beginning to hold negative attitudes toward tourists [5.3; Dialogue 5].

POSSIBILITY: There is an opportunity for the PTC together with the Community Education Council [CEC] to better integrate the Angmarlik Visitor Centre Host program with the high-school curriculum. For example, on return to school in September, student hosts could report on their learning experience. Also, tourism could be included as a career course during block sessions in the spring, perhaps as a pre-requisite to getting a hosting position.

#### 7.6. CULTURAL CONSEQUENCES

EMPHASIS ON THE WHALING PERIOD OF CUMBERLAND SOUND INUIT HISTORY GIVES PANGNIRTUNG SOMETHING CULTURALLY UNIQUE AS A TOURIST DESTINATION. HOWEVER, THIS IS NOT ALWAYS WELL UNDERSTOOD OR WELL ACCEPTED BY LOCAL INUIT.

Elders and other residents felt that tourists left Pangnirtung with a one-sided view of Inuit culture and history.

There were three primary reasons for this:

- Too much emphasis was given to the 70-year period during which Qallunaat were commercial whaling up North [6.1].
- There was not enough written material available for tourists to read in order to create a balance in terms of the long pre-whaling Inuit history [6.1].
- Elders were not involved enough in cultural interpretation for tourists or for local youth [6.1; 6.2].

Local youth needed to be aware of and to accept the reasons why their culture was presented as it was. Also, once a 'culture-tourist' was lured to Pangnirtung, there was an opportunity (and a demand) to present a more balanced story [6.2].

POSSIBILITY: Elders could be given a greater opportunity to become involved in the cultural interpretation of the museum and in story-telling. If desirable and/or practical, Elders could have more formal participation in Angmarlik Visitor Centre activities during the tourist season. (This might present a partial solution to the problems with youth as hosts, as indicated in 7.4.)

## 7.7. PANGNIRTUNG'S TOURISM PILOT-PROJECT AS A MODEL OF COMMUNITY BASED DEVELOPMENT

FOR OTHER BAFFIN COMMUNITIES WHICH ARE CONSIDERING TOURISM DEVELOPMENT, PANGNIRTUNG'S EXPERIENCE PRESENTS A RELATIVELY GOOD MODEL TO FOLLOW.

This study presented the benefits, the risks, and the difficulties involved in community based tourism development in an Eastern Arctic community.

In general, the following points should be noted:

- 'Community based' tourism did not necessarily mean that the community 'controlled' development. Rather, it meant that the community was 'involved' in GNWT plans for economic development through tourism.

- Pangnirtung was correct to choose a slow and gradual type of development. This allowed local people the time to adjust to and manage the changes that tourism brought to the community. However, the development of tourism training and awareness was too slow, and resulted in poor local command over the industry.

- The Pangnirtung Tourism Committee was a key organization in the development of tourism according to community wishes. However, together with ED&T, they tended to involve themselves primarily in the capital projects, and neglected other more general tourism issues such as awareness, training, management, and industry growth. Hence, when the capital projects were complete, the PTC 'fell apart' and was unprepared to take control of the 'operational' phase of development.

- After ten years of development, the economic benefits of tourism were relatively small. They did not meet the initial expectations held by people in Pangnirtung. This continued to be a slow process that required patience and commitment on the part of community residents.

- Pangnirtung was a unique community in terms of its natural and cultural attractions, and its human resources. Therefore, the lessons learned from this pilot-project could not be applied perfectly to other Baffin communities.

**APPENDIX A:  
KNOWN RELEVANT TOURISM STUDIES AND REPORTS:  
NWT, BAFFIN REGION, AND PANGNIRTUNG**

- 1975 THE DEVELOPMENT OF TOURISM IN THE CANADIAN NORTH AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE INUIT, WITH SUPPLEMENTARY TEXT. Consultant, Richard Butler. Prepared for Renewable Resource Studies, Inuit Tapirisat of Canada. Director J.G. Nelson.
- 1979 TOURISM DEVELOPMENT AND MARKETING STRATEGIES FOR THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES. Consultants, Outcrop Ltd., Balmer, Crapo and Assoc., Qaivvik Ltd. Prepared for the Tourism Steering Committee, Economic Development and Tourism.
- 1981 PANGNIRTUNG COMMUNITY TOURISM STUDY. Consultant, Marshall Macklin Monaghan Ltd. Prepared for GNWT.
- 1982 BAFFIN REGIONAL PLANNING PROJECT: COMMUNITY TOURISM DEVELOPMENT PLAN, BROUGHTON ISLAND; QIQTARJUAK. Consultant, Marshall Macklin Monaghan Ltd. Prepared for GNWT Economic Development & Tourism.
- 1982 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: REGIONAL TOURISM DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY AND COMMUNITY TOURISM DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE BAFFIN REGION. Consultant, Marshall Macklin Monaghan Ltd. Prepared for GNWT Economic Development & Tourism.
- 1982 PANGNIRTUNG RESIDENTS' TOURISM STUDY SUMMARY. Consultant, Marshall Macklin Monaghan Ltd. Prepared for Residents of Pangnirtung.
- 1982 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: PANGNIRTUNG TOURISM DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS. Consultant, John H. Pattimore, The Siqoq Group - Outdoor Recreational-Environmental Research Planners. In fulfilment of NWT Service Contract for GNWT Economic Development & Tourism.
- 1983 PANGNIRTUNG COMMUNITY TOURISM PLAN: YEAR 2. Consultant, Peter Strahlendorf. In fulfilment of NWT Service Contract for GNWT Economic Development & Tourism.
- 1983 COMMUNITY BASED TOURISM: A STRATEGY FOR THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES TOURISM INDUSTRY. Department of Economic Development & Tourism, GNWT.
- 1983 PRELIMINARY SUMMARY REPORT OF KEKERTEN / USUALAK FIELD PROJECTS, CUMBERLAND SOUND, BAFFIN ISLAND. Consultant, Marc Stevenson. Prepared for Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre.
- 1983 THE KEKERTEN PROJECT: PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS. Consultant, Marc Stevenson. Prepared for Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre.

- 1987 THE INTEGRATED HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION OF PANGNIRTUNG AND ENVIRONS. Consultant, Marc Stevenson. Prepared for Pangnirtung Tourism Committee, Saipalaseequitt Society, Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre, GNWT Economic Development & Tourism, & Architecture Division - GNWT Department of Public Works.
- 1984 KEKERTEN: PRELIMINARY ARCHAEOLOGY OF AN ARCTIC WHALING STATION. Consultant, Marc Stevenson. Prepared for Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre.
- 1984 KEKERTEN: RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT. Consultant, Marc Stevenson. Prepared for Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre.
- 1984 PANGNIRTUNG MUSEUM AND VISITOR CENTRE: REPORT, STORYLINE STRUCTURE, PRELIMINARY INTERPRETATION AND DISPLAY CONCEPTS. Consultant, Jean-Jacques Andre.
- 1984 HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY IN PANGNIRTUNG. Student Research Project under Summer Canada Works. Sponsored by Hamlet of Pangnirtung.
- 1985 TOURISM PROJECTS REPORT: PANGNIRTUNG, NWT. Consultant, Roel Teunissen. Prepared for Pangnirtung Tourism Committee and GNWT Economic Development & Tourism.
- 1986 TOURISM PROJECTS REPORT: PANGNIRTUNG, NWT. Consultant Roel Teunissen. Prepared for Pangnirtung Tourism Committee and GNWT Economic Development & Tourism.
- 1986 DOCUMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF THE PANGNIRTUNG PILOT STUDY AND TOURISM PLAN: PROGRESS REPORT AND FIELD DATA RESULTS. Masters Thesis Draft, Bob Kuiper, UBC.
- 1987 DOCUMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF THE PANGNIRTUNG PILOT STUDY AND TOURISM PLAN: FINAL REPORT. Masters Thesis Draft, Bob Kuiper, UBC.
- 1988 FINAL REPORT OF INSTALLATION OF EXHIBITS IN ANGHARLIK CENTRE. Consultant, C. Robson Senior.
- 1989 RESIDENT ATTITUDES TOWARDS TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN PANGNIRTUNG, NWT. Researcher, Gwen Reimer. Report Prepared for Northern Scientific Training Program.
- 1990 A HERITAGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PANGNIRTUNG, BAYPIN ISLAND, NWT. Consultant, Stevenson and Associates. Prepared for Pangnirtung Hamlet Council and GNWT Economic Development and Tourism.
- 1990 TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN CLYDE RIVER: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS. Consultants, George Wenzel & Simon Milne. Report Prepared for the Tourism Committee, Hamlet of Clyde River.

APPENDIX B:  
OUTFITTER TRIP PRICING FORMULA - 1991

Outfitter Trip Pricing Formula - 1991  
Lake Winnipeg Boat

Expenses	Auyuittuq Inugaruluk	Kekerton	Koolik
Gas and oil	\$74	\$145	\$20
Assistant	\$20	\$50	
Equipment (see below)	\$89	\$89	\$89
Food	\$25	\$35	
Owner Drawing	\$60	\$125	\$50
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$268</b>	<b>\$444</b>	<b>\$159</b>
Profit margin	10%		
Profit	\$27	\$44	\$16
<b>Price of Trip</b>	<b>\$294</b>	<b>\$488</b>	<b>\$175</b>

\*\*\*\*\*

Determining Equipment Expenses - 1991

Value of boat (22 ft Lake Winnipeg)	\$11,689	
Life of boat (years)	7	
Annual cost of boat		\$1,670
Value of motor (70 HP OMC outboard)	\$6,707	
Life of motor (years)	4	
Annual cost of motor		\$1,677
Value of other equipment	\$1,000	
Life of other equipment (years)	5	
Annual cost of other equipment		\$200
Annual depreciation on equipment		<u>\$3,547</u>
Relative use for outfitting	25.00%	
Depreciation due to outfitting		<u>\$887</u>
Average # of trips per year	10	
Equipment costs per trip		<u>\$89</u>

The Globe and Mail, Saturday, January 4, 1992 FOCUS D5

# The last whaler

BY CAROLYN LECKER  
SPECIAL TO THE GLOBE AND MAIL  
PANGNIRTUNG, NWT

**C**RADLED in a spectacular setting surrounded by rugged rock walls, glaciers and an immense ice cap lies this isolated hamlet on Cumberland Sound, just a few kilometres south of the Arctic Circle. It is remarkable not only for its physical beauty, but for its stubborn upholding of the old Inuit ways.

Certainly, there are vestiges of the white man's incursion in this Baffin Island community. There are prefab houses and a Business Row with a Northern Store (once the Hudson's Bay store), a variety store and a craft shop. Snowmobiles zip along the main street.

Yet to this day, women carry their babies in *amautags*, cozy handmade parkas with oversized hoods. Men still go out to fish and hunt — seal, walrus, caribou and car — with dogs and sleds, and keep warm and dry in caribou clothing and sealskin boots. Even now, when a hunter returns with a great prize, everyone troops down to join in. While a stew simmers, the community comes together, to share food, to drink tea.

Etuangat Aksayook is a respected elder of the village and the last of Baffin's old whalers. When he smiles, it is enough to melt your heart. In his handsome Inuit face are etched a thousand lines that bespeak a harsh climate where it is difficult simply to exist — but where, too, the years have been full. He is about 90 years old, though no one is quite sure when he was born.

In his youth, fortune and circumstance brought together two disparate cultures. Because of an abundance of beluga, narwhal, bowhead and right whales, Cumberland Sound became the principal destination for many British whaling ships seeking oil and baleen, the flexible mouth bones that were in great demand for comets, carriage springs and furniture. In Inuit communities such as Etuangat Aksayook's village on Pangnirtung Fjord, the white men set up land stations to have access to indigenous whaling skills: The Inuit provided the technique, the Europeans provided modern technology.

Older members of the community well remember their dealings with the newcomers. Etuangat Aksayook recalls having misgivings, but "that was normal because everybody used to be scared of them."

"We loved the white man's food but we were always afraid of him," recalls another.

Still another elder remembers a man they called Mapath: "Though he was a white man, I used to share my own meals with him. He used to cry when I did that, he was very thankful." Recalls another: "The whalers were very fond of dancing. When our people first heard the accordion, some of them fell down, so pleased were they to hear that wonderful sound. Though there were often many people living together at the same camp there was never any trouble, never any crime or fighting."

Eventually, throughout the region, the nomadic Inuit population shifted their living quarters to be close to the whaling operations. The new lifestyle provided greater security in a harsh land.

*Etuangat Aksayook was just a boy when white men first sailed into Cumberland Sound, lusting for whale oil. For his community, the arrival of those early seamen introduced strange juxtapositions to their traditional way of life*

Not all Inuit men were employed on boats. Some hunted seals and caribou as food for the whalers; the men who killed the most were the first to receive rations and ammunition from the white men — which led to over-hunting and so depleted local animal reserves that the Inuit on occasion came to rely on processed food and woollen clothing. New diseases wiped out entire villages.

Whaling was not a new way of life for the people of the Eastern Arctic, for they had been whaling for millennia without the white man. The meat and organs had fed them; the blubber and skin supplied essential vitamins; rendered oil lit stone lamps; whale ribs were used for the rafters of houses; jawbones were fashioned into sled runners; shoulder blades became snow shovels; baleen, the horny palate parts, was used for fishlines, nets, knife blades and carved toys for children.

When the British entered the scene, they encouraged — and often insisted upon — permanent settlement by Inuit. In time the Inuit became employees of the British.

Etuangat Aksayook had a brother who steered the whale boats. The young Etuangat was chosen by his Inuit community leader to become a whaler, too. Special oars were fashioned for the small boat.

Learning about whaling came from watching his elders. The dangers are still clear in his mind: "The whale would really thrash around in the water after it had surfaced at the end of a harpoon line. We would have to wait a few minutes while it settled down so we could attack it with a killing spear through the heart." Gradually, he learned precisely where to harpoon the whale in the way of his forefathers. "A lot of blood spurted out of the whales after they had been stabbed in the heart."

And so life went on. "All winter and into the summer we just waited on the edge of the ice for the whales to approach, then the chase would begin." So mighty were the whales that, after being harpooned, one sometimes dragged the boat through water, weaving wildly between immense chunks of ice. Occasionally, the boat would be pulled up onto the ice, only to be dragged off again.

Sometimes the rope played out so fast that it sizzled. Etuangat Aksayook recalls throwing water on the gun-whale where the rope burned the wood.

Relief came in August when they were allowed to hunt animals for skins that became boots, parkas and gloves. In August the animals' coats were at their peak.

Etuangat Aksayook was still a young man when commercial whaling came to an end in Cumberland Sound. In the last year, probably about 1920, he recalls the killing of only four whales. "After the white whalers left, their boats were given to leaders of each crew, which in turn were inherited by their children." But not Etuangat Aksayook: He was too young to be a crew leader and would never earn one of the white man's boats. For him, the age of whaling came to an end too soon.



## CHAPTER 5

### PARTICIPATORY DEVELOPMENT: THEORY AND PRACTICE

In this chapter, my intent is to provide a theoretical context, in which to situate the community-based tourism pilot-project in Panguitung. I do this by reviewing the literature on development theory and practice as it relates to participatory models of economic development. Specifically, I ask, are community-based, participatory models a successful alternative approach to problems of northern development? This question is important because previous attempts at economic development in the Arctic, based on policies and theories of modernization and centralized planning, have had little success in effecting positive change in isolated Inuit communities. My central concern is how participatory development relates to concepts of self-sufficiency and self-reliance in ways that are both culturally appropriate and locally controlled.

To answer these questions, I trace the roots of the participatory development paradigm that grew out of the practical experiences of aid agencies, and from academic criticism of development policies. I briefly review how anthropologists fit into this domain of academic analysis, and



the role they have played in promoting more participatory, holistic, local-level models of economic development.<sup>1</sup>

Again, as in my discussion of participatory research, much of the development literature presents participation as an ideal. Thus, I assess more pragmatic arguments that are first, critical of the ideological basis of participation in development, and that second, address various problems of implementation. Finally, I review the tourism development literature: tourism's unique obstacles to local participation have caused analysts to propose small-scale, community-based strategies that follow the theoretical premises of participatory development.

#### The Roots of a Participatory Paradigm of Development

The relationship between participation and development has its origins in the history of foreign aid to less developed countries (LDCs), correlated with prevailing theories of development in academia. The participatory paradigm of development evolved in reaction to development theories borne out of the colonial era and maturing in the

---

<sup>1</sup> I rely on secondary sources as the basis of my discussion of the history of development practice and theory. Cochrane (1979), Cohen & Uphoff (1980), Gallacher 1990, and Butz, et.al. (1991) provide a variety of perspectives on the evolution of foreign aid and development practices, correlating these to contemporary theories of development and underdevelopment. Hoben (1982), Mair (1984), and Bennett (1988) offer summaries of the role of anthropology in development throughout this time. I direct the reader to these publications for a list of primary sources on these subjects.

decades after World War II.

According to Mair, when colonial territories gained political independence in the first part of the 20th century, ideas shifted away from European powers with a "duty" towards populations over which they exercised authority, toward a "wider feeling that rich countries collectively had a responsibility towards the poor ones" (1984:3). Anthropologists engaged in fieldwork in these "poor" areas attempted to deal systematically with associated changes they observed in the lives of Third and Fourth World tribal peoples. They analyzed development impacts within theories of acculturation that feature the idea of two cultures in contact, resulting in localized transformations in the weaker or less-developed group. While this analytic, objectivist approach permitted some engagement with real-world processes of change, anthropologists tended to avoid participation or intervention in the development process and its consequences for indigenous peoples (Bennett 1988:5).

Following World War II, it was politically "fashionable" for rich nations to take part in development activities (Mair 1984:4). Foreign aid and development efforts from the 1940s to the 1960s focused first on differences in the level of technology and later on resources and resource-gaps. Both approaches were capital centred and induced. Cohen & Uphoff indicate that these approaches implied a passive role

for the majority of people in "target" areas: participation meant either adoption of new technologies, or resource contributions such as taxes, consumption of imports, or extraction and production for export (1980:215). Theorists and practitioners had little interest in active popular participation which was viewed as "an unnecessary luxury and quite possibly an impediment" to economic development (Cohen & Uphoff 1980:216). Based on "top-down," "ethnocentric technofix" strategies of development, these economic models emphasized strong central control (cf. *ibid.*; Hoben 1982:354).

Modernization and Marxist dependency theorists who offered views of underdevelopment during this era, confined their analyses to large-scale, macro-level economies, and ignored locally distinctive non-western and non-materialist priorities (Butz, et al. 1991:148). Anthropologists who attempted to connect observed instances of localized change with these global perspectives, framed their analyses according to "technological change theories" (Bennett 1988:5). Change was explained as something caused by modern forces introduced from outside the traditional culture. Most aid agencies viewed anthropologists as "constructive participants" who conducted research and applied their theories toward goals of less-disruptive development (*ibid.*). Within the discipline, however, applied anthropologists were criticized for facilitating imposed change in indigenous regions (Hoben

1982:354).

By the late 1960s it became increasingly clear that official policies and practices were not achieving development objectives. As Cochrane puts it, "the rich in the Third World became wealthier as the poor became more impoverished" (1979:1). Hence, development perspectives shifted in the 1970s, stressing the productive use of labour as LDCs' most abundant resource. This was accompanied by ideas of "appropriate technology," and a participatory, decentralized "basic needs" approach to development (Bennett 1988:12-13; Cohen & Uphoff 1980:216; Hoben 1982:357). According to Hoben (1982), anthropologists began to actively intervene in criticizing and influencing development policy and activity during this time. The discipline confronted assumptions of "tradition-bound peasants" that stressed westernization as the only avenue to development, and refuted suppositions of homogeneity manifested in the implementation of identical projects for a variety of divergent contexts.

Consistent with this new assimilation perspective, theories of "intermediate technology" proposed the adoption and development of small-scale industrial technology requiring low capital, high labour and local resources (Butz, et al. 1991:150). In the context of the Canadian Arctic, development anthropologists broadened this concept to one of "intermediate adaptation," which factors in the social and cultural

character of Inuit peoples "intermediate between primitive and sophisticated Western technology" (Freeman et al. 1969).

Although cultural perspectives brought the analysis of development down to the micro-level, they continued to be based on what Edwards describes as a "banking" concept of development: knowledge and technology deposited into areas seen to be lacking these assets (1989:117). As well, "intermediate" concepts of development analysis had little utility for incorporating macro-level linkages (Butz, et al. 1991:151). A theoretical deadlock between "statist" (macro-level) and "communitarian" (micro-level) analyses prompted Tickner to propose that "self-reliance must be considered as a multi-level strategy of development" including individual and local self-reliance, national autonomy, and Third World (LDC) solidarity (1986:464).

Signalling an end to "political innocence," anthropologists began to advocate an "actor-oriented" view of development "from below" (cf. Long 1975; Bennett 1988). The Case Study demonstrates this approach by its overt bias toward community concerns and perspectives. This bias is recognizably anthropological, as it speaks for the micro-level and by doing so, forces the attention of planners on alternative strategies (Bennett 1988:14). As a form of critical ethnography, the evaluation report chooses between "conceptual alternatives" of tourism development and "asks what could be" with regard to

political devolution and local control (Thomas 1993:4). This is evident in Section 3.4 of the Case Study where, by asking "When should the pilot-project end?", we suggest that the capacity for local control will be achieved only when the GNWT in fact relinquishes their control. One reason why the co-researcher methodology is so important to the "critical" evaluation process, is because it provides a foundation for "communicating cultural meanings" and understanding the tension between control and resistance, played out at the local level, throughout the tourism pilot-project in Pangnirtung (*cf. ibid.*).

Overall, the new "basic needs" perspective required a new methodology, including efforts to improve project **process**. The idea of popular participation gained favour particularly among development practitioners who knew projects would stagnate and fail without the support and cooperation of the community affected (Cohen & Uphoff 1980:217). In this context, anthropologists became involved as "participant employees" in project administration teams, or as either hired or independent evaluators of development projects (Bennett 1988:7). Social scientists generally began to consider theories of participative development that focused on local-level autonomy and community-based development. This move advocates a type of development planning in which "the **direction** and **rate** of change affecting localities would be

set, to the extent possible, by the local people themselves" (Bennett 1988:15, my emphasis).<sup>2</sup> This trend has gained momentum, and the development literature is now replete with case studies that demonstrate the positive effects of participation as a solution to "total development" (Chopra, et al. 1990:143).

In Canada, the Government of the Northwest Territories Economic Development and Tourism department's decision to promote a community-based tourism initiative on Baffin Island cannot, therefore, be viewed as coincidental or in isolation from other contemporary development events on the international scene. Hence, Rahnema suggests, that in the decade of the 1980s, "participation" became the "new human software" of official development jargon (1990:203).

The decade of the 1980s also brought swift attention to increasing environmental dangers associated with industrialization and ecological deterioration due to natural resource extraction, energy production, and competing land-use. Large-scale economic development projects placed increasing pressure on local subsistence options. In particular, the Brundtland Report (*Our Common Future* --World

---

<sup>2</sup> Michael Cernea's edited volume Putting People First (1985) includes Norman Uphoff's case study "Fitting Projects to People," as well as other of Uphoff's work co-authored with Cohen (1980) or Esman (1984). These are classic examples of the move toward establishing participation as a key to successful development in Third World countries.

Commission on Environment and Development, 1987) brought the concept of "sustainable development" to the considerable attention of both practitioners and theoreticians (DeKadt 1990; Gallacher 1990; Butz, et al. 1991).

The Brundtland Commission recommends "alternative development" strategies that are ecologically sound and scaled-down, that pay attention to the informal economy, and which promote a devolution of power toward self-reliant communities. These are concerns shared by local Inuit in Pangnirtung: elders, for example, believed that the strongest reason for local control over tourism is to ensure that environmental damage, and interference with hunting, will not result. This model of development requires a "structural adjustment" at both the political and economic levels of administration. Theoretically, a restructuring of industry at the international and national levels should occur in a way that will be conducive to the ecological and economic well-being of local communities (Gallacher 1990; see above, Tickner 1986). This theory rests on making the distinction, as Altman suggests, between: **developmentalism** -- unbridled economic growth based on material expansion, and; **development** -- economic growth in a context that includes social and cultural components with potential for increased political power and widened options for the future (1989:460).

Within this context, anthropologists have preferred to



define development in process- as opposed to project-terms. Our local-level and holistic perspective has nurtured views of development as a social process of capacity-building within a community. Ethnographies illustrate communities' ability to define and respond collectively to needs and problems, in a process of choices and options which allow people to take control over the forces that shape their lives (cf. Dacks 1983; Van Willigen 1986; Rodman 1989; Edwards 1989). Pangiirtung outfitters' and artists' use of development in the formal tourism sector, to supplement informal cash and subsistence activities, is an example of this process. Attention to "cultural factors" in development situations thus leads to the conclusion that local values, wants and "felt needs" are often different than those of development planners and donors (Cochrane 1979; Van Willigen 1986).

Hence, participatory models of development from a cultural perspective, must account for what Butz et al. (1991:144) term "community consciousness," or the "role of emotion" in understanding problems of development (Edwards 1989:121), and the "psychological and spiritual motives" for participation in development (Rahnema 1990:203). For example, in Pangiirtung, cash continues to be circulated in ways that directly or indirectly support the hunting economy. Inuit hunters are motivated to involve themselves in seasonal activities such as tourism in the summer, according to their

need to earn the cash and to allow the time they need or want to pursue subsistence activities.

Furthermore, Inuit "community consciousness" defines economy as a social as well as a material concept (Nuttal 1992; Wenzel 1991; cf. Berger 1985; Butz, et al. 1991). This firm association between Inuit social relations and economy has been well established in early ethnographies (Boas 1888; Damas 1963) and is reaffirmed in the most current ethnographic literature of the Canadian Eastern Arctic (Wenzel 1991) and of Greenland (Nuttal 1992). My interviews with women in Pangnirtung reinforce the idea that Inuit do not distinguish between what is 'social' and what is 'economic' according to strict academic categories. In their view, a healthy family in social terms is essential to create a healthy community in economic terms.<sup>3</sup> Simply put, development, and community participation in development, are phenomena more complex than the sum of their economic values (Young 1982; Bennett 1988).

In addition to cultural-symbolic aspects of community participation, anthropologists, along with other social scientists, insist that certain "institutional factors" need

---

<sup>3</sup> My thoughts on this matter were further crystallized during the 1991 Northwest Territories elections. A televised interview with a woman from the Western Arctic drew attention to the blurred distinction and intimate link between social and economic aspects of Inuit life (CBC North: October 15, 1991). The major political issue for women, she stated, was twofold: family violence and economic development.

also be considered. Chopra *et al.* go so far as to suggest that a participatory development approach calls for "the emergence of a fresh social institution to be called 'participation'... a new socio-economic force aiming for sustained development at the village level" (1990:18). Esman and Uphoff (1984) define and measure participation, in part, as a network of local membership organizations, because as Rodman (1989) confirms, participation in development is correlated with participation in society. Existing leaders and social institutions provide the catalyst for development, and also mediate between public, private and local development interests. So, for example, the previous Tourism Committee chairman is also an active Council member and a Board member on the local community-owned commercial fishing company, while the Mayor of Pangnirtung is also an instigator of the development of a revived commercial sealing industry in the region.

Government institutions such as GNWT ED&T generally play a crucial role in any development scheme, including those which are community-based. In following a participatory model, these public agencies must devolve power and budgetary control to allow for greater local autonomy (Gow & Vansant 1983; Henriksen 1985; Bennett 1988). As the Case Study and Chapter Six demonstrate, this is a politically slow process. Because concepts of devolution and local autonomy seldom leave the realm of political ideals, some anthropologists adopt a

pragmatic view of development emphasizing "adjustments" and "adaptations." As the following section illustrates, their approach considers development a two-way street in which local communities culturally incorporate new economic strategies, but also in which development plans and programmes are formally or informally influenced and transformed in the process (cf. Young 1982; Bennett 1988; Sherraden 1991; Nuttal 1992).

Pragmatic Approaches to Participation  
in Development: Case Studies

Similar to participatory research, models of development which rest on the premise of participation in projects and programmes have generally been defined and used in vague "moralistic", "normative" or "utopian" terms (DeKadt 1990; cf. Cochrane 1979; Cohen & Uphoff 1980). As such, promoting participation as an inherent good in development has become subject to "popular and politically expedient recognition" without much analytic or practical utility (Butz, et al. 1991:151). In light of this fact, I discuss some pragmatic considerations of community participation as presented in several development case studies in Third and Fourth World settings. These are followed by a review of critical analyses of the ideological basis of the participatory development paradigm.

In their separate reviews of published case studies,

Pigozzi (1982) and Gow & Vansant (1983) each conclude that participation in development projects is subject to serious constraints, and/or may manifest outright negative results for the local population. One of the chief problems comes from assuming that communities are homogeneous and that participation will allow participants to benefit equally.<sup>4</sup> This presumption ignores gender and status differences, and shrouds the political dimensions of diversity within any community. In Pangnirtung, for example, women did not benefit from tourism because it was intentionally developed as a male-oriented economic activity. Furthermore, as the Case study indicates (Section 4), individual entrepreneurs were few and far between, and only one Inuk man had registered a full-time (seasonal) outfitting business. Historically shaped attitudes

---

<sup>4</sup> Two case studies illustrate the results of community diversity. First, Chaiken (1990) documents a project involving women in Western Kenya, where planners mistakenly assumed that women in the community would work cooperatively. They failed to recognize that recent historical changes in marital patterns, which tended to disperse women-kin, and an increasingly cash-dependent economy, which tended to weaken reciprocal working relationships, combined to create a social reality that could not support collective participation. Second, Stone (1989) illustrates a similar situation in Nepal where existing hierarchical caste relations prevented equal participation; local low-caste communities saw the process of development to consist of high-caste community members' connections to the outside world of power and resources. Hence, participation in the benefits of development projects in Nepalese communities relied on **interdependence** between low- and high-caste members, a matter which planners had failed to recognize. This contrasts with Chaiken's case study in Africa where an **individualized** approach was the most appropriate form of development participation among local women.

of dependency on government support, and the social and cultural tensions inherent to individual entrepreneurship prevent local Inuit from "benefitting equally" from tourism development.

As Pigozzi (1982) illustrates, participation in development projects may in fact produce potentially, albeit unintentional, negative consequences. In the Honduras, for example, participation in a project contributed to greater social differentiation and community factionalism through processes of redistribution of decision-making, technical skills, and income.<sup>5</sup> Also, Rodman's (1989) evaluation of a commercial fishing project in Vanuatu concludes that participation in development risked not only co-optation whereby local entrepreneurs "consumed development" resources to further their own ends, but also resulted in a reduction of existing and potential economic options in the form of subsistence opportunities. Each of these cases studies demonstrates the variability within Chopra, et al.'s conclusion that "the degree to which participation can develop in the context of a particular village economy depends on its socio-cultural and economic structures" (1990:139).

Added to circumstances of heterogeneity within a

---

<sup>5</sup> Similar consequences of increased social heterogeneity have been observed as a result of participation in tourism development projects (see Dogan 1989).

community environment, Gow & Vansant indicate that national and international policies and bureaucratic structures also present considerable constraints to participation in development projects (1983:431-2). Similarly, based on case studies in India, Tickner concludes that positive results of participation at the local-level are highly dependent on "re-ordered" national priorities and protection, on "bureaucratic institutions ...responsive to local needs" (1986:478). Norman Uphoff, a major proponent of participatory processes, points out that participation in development does not necessarily translate into **participatory** development.

This is evident in the Pangnirtung tourism pilot-project. Here, the political pervasiveness and financial necessity of territorial intervention in the Arctic economy -- both in terms of employment and investment -- precludes the theoretically ideal definition of "community-based" as development initiated, and controlled by, local Inuit. This may explain why Economic Development and Tourism initially defined the concept to mean community involvement as opposed to local control (Case Study, Section 3). Although administrators in Iqaluit were sensitive to local input, they continued to find it difficult to exercise the "prudent courage" needed, to allow people in Pangnirtung to initiate policies and strategies which they felt were necessary to get economic development under way (cf. Gow & Vansant 1983;

Dickerson 1992). This dilemma was manifested in ED&T's initiation of the *Heritage Development Plan For Pangnirtung* in 1990, a strategy implemented with the formal approval of the Hamlet Council, but with little participation or ongoing interest on the part of the community as a whole (Case Study, Section 3.3; cf. Chapter Three).

Several critics isolate the cause of pragmatic problems of participatory development, indeed of development itself, to rest in its ideological basis in western "self-help" values of "rugged individualism," "democracy" and "independent nationalism" (Belshaw 1976; Hsu 1983; Stone 1989; Pinel 1992). Like participatory research, participation in development is never a-political or a-ideological, particularly when it is expert-oriented and externally driven (Edwards 1989; Rahnema 1990). International and national development aid and research have become an industry unto themselves, embedded in a western set of political motives and economic interests (Edwards 1989). Hence, Stone (1989) suggests that promoting community participation in development may create a new arena for the expression of western cultural values. Majid Rahnema, likely one of the strongest critics of the participatory paradigm, lays bare what he considers its superficiality:

Can participation, or any superficial, outwardly organized form of relationship or cooperation, change, in any serious way, a society of persons who have



psychologically remained the same? [...] (I)s it not more realistic to accept the fact that such methodologies can change, at best, only the external, superficial reasons, the objectives pursued by the participants, also submitting them to more democratic rules? [...] It serves no one to make a new fetish out of participation, only because nonparticipatory development has failed in every way. To do so will be to create yet another illusion (Rahnema 1990:222, my emphasis).

The point is not that participatory development has no humanitarian or practical merits, but that it is as subject to hegemonic tendencies as is any other paradigm.

This leads to the fundamental consideration of *praxis*, as a critical approach within the participatory paradigm. If subjective action and practice of development does not support our objective understanding and theory of participation in development, participatory models are as bound to fail as did previous non-participatory programmes (cf. Dacks 1983:305; Edwards 1989:117,121). As with participation in research, theorists and practitioners point to the basic flaw in development plans, strategies that are too inflexible to incorporate indigenous technological and socio-economic knowledge (Uphoff 1985:366). In my view, this is a factor of the power hierarchy in which only certain types of knowledge are considered valid, generally those generated and understood by the controlling agent or culture. Hence, GNWT Economic Development and Tourism supports development according to economic models deemed valid by its (industrial) standards,

and does not consider hunting, for example, as an alternative basis of community development. For instance, any funds available to assist people engaged in hunting are not administered by the department in charge of development, but rather by the Department of Renewable Resources (Quigley & McBride 1987).

What is required, some argue, is a "peoples' science" which gives power to local knowledge in the search for solutions to local economic problems (Edwards 1989:120). This implies a "process orientation" rooted in dialogue and based on mutual learning and capacity building (Gow & Vansant 1983:432). Premised on the notion that "no one really knows" and that reality must be "discovered together," Rahnema differentiates between what he considers superficial "relations of participation" and a "genuine relationship" (1990:215, 218). This relationship implies and expects a dialectic in which **self-reliance is both a requirement for, and a product of participatory development** (Gow & Vansant 1983:427; Uphoff 1985:381). So for example, it is partly because Pangnirtung was seen to possess a degree of self-reliance not evident in other communities, that ED&T selected Pangnirtung as the pilot-project site. While it was that attitude of self-reliance that contributed to local people's decision to accept ED&T's proposal, the participatory nature of the development project has, according to some government

observers, helped to nurture a stronger sense of self-reliance within the community (p.c. February 1992).

A *praxis* approach thus requires that practitioners and social scientists take great care when applying the principles of community participation in development, and when evaluating the reasons for its success or failure. Despite its problems, the idea of community-based projects remains a prominent alternative to previous approaches, as will be seen in the following discussion of tourism development in Third and Fourth World destinations.

#### Participation and Tourism Development

The development of a tourist industry possesses its own unique set of constraints and obstacles to community participation. At the same time, tourism is being promoted as one of the few 'renewable' resources for development in areas with otherwise limited economic options. Island microstates in the South Pacific, for instance, present classic situations for such development. So do aboriginal regions encapsulated within larger nation-states, as is the case on Baffin Island. In fact, the Pangnirtung Case Study presented in the previous chapter illustrates several similarities that exist between Third World island microstates and Fourth World regions: they both possess relatively small populations, limited resource bases, general lack of employment opportunities with the public sector as the main employer, extreme isolation,

dependency on expensive air-lift and sea-lift cargo, and continued involvement in subsistence activities (cf. Milne 1992). Thus, although the bulk of published material on tourism development is based on research in microstates in the southern hemisphere, the lessons drawn can be applied more generally.

A significant difference between the north/south case studies involves concepts of "local control" and "sustainable development." In reference to Third World microstates, these concepts imply national government autonomy and self-reliance within an international political arena (cf. Wilkinson 1989; DeKadt 1990; Gallacher 1990; Milne 1992). In Fourth World contexts such as Baffin Island, these concepts apply to regional or municipal self-determination and self-sufficiency within the Canadian national political context. Nevertheless, tourism development in any destination, by the nature of its market, generally requires some degree of interaction at both national and international levels.

Tourism involves a strategy of development that, as noted in several studies, requires the "necessary involvement of the state" (Dogan 1989:227; cf. Place 1991). This is true in terms of initial capital investment toward infrastructure and in ongoing operation and management funds. Also, as indicated in the Pangnirtung Case Study, it involves federal intervention in managing national parks and territorial

support in terms of tourism training, marketing, and regulation (see also Schulte-Tenckoff 1988; Browne & Nolan 1989; Altman 1989). At the local-level, this public factor in tourism development complicates the issue of community members' willingness to participate in the project, and may also affect their attitudes as hosts to incoming tourists. In the Canadian Arctic context, a general mistrust of governmental structures, of southerners, and of non-native northerners precludes full Inuit participation in development planning. As the Case Study indicates, government agencies failed to devolve much actual authority to local committees. Consequently, some Inuit now feel that participation is merely a new word for "tokenism," and the question of development planning is ultimately a question of power and control.<sup>6</sup>

The essential argument for community-based types of tourism in Third World regions has come in response to the negative social, cultural and economic effects of rapid and externally-initiated, mass-tourist developments (see Dogan 1989; cf. Wilkinson 1989). In the wake of large-scale, foreign-owned tourism infrastructural development, local people find themselves unable to gain an "ownership stake" in

---

<sup>6</sup> For the mid-1970s, Brody (1975:120-1) describes the apparent "withdrawal and indifference" of Inuit as the result of federal and territorial governments' refusal or reluctance to give local people power over those matters most important to them.

the industry (Milne 1992:200; cf. Oliver-Smith, et al. 1989). Tourist flows based primarily on package-tours, for example, are almost completely managed and controlled by operators in generating regions. Hence, only a fraction of profits remain in the host country, usually in the form of wages for low-skilled labour. This is well illustrated in a study of package-tour development in the Maldives, where foreign-owned resorts were built on uninhabited atolls, and local participants were only minimally involved in the provision of services. While this enclave-strategy significantly reduced negative socio-cultural effects attendant upon tourism, the industry also had almost no positive effect on the local economy, the reason why development was promoted in the first place (Sathiendrakumar & Tisdell 1989).

Furthermore, the often rapid pace of outside investment in tourism development does not allow community members "the luxury of time" to accumulate capital to invest in local tourist facilities and services (Place 1991:195).<sup>7</sup> Hence, tourism development tends to follow a "more complex path than strict unilinear transfer of control" from external

---

<sup>7</sup> Uphoff (1985) indicates that the pace of a project is an issue in development situations generally. In three case studies, he demonstrates how, with large sums of money at stake, governments and private investors are in a "great hurry to prepare and implement the project as soon as possible" (Uphoff 1985:363). He concludes that "flexibility is the requirement of realism. Participatory capacity cannot be built... it must be developed" (Ibid.:378).

to local sectors (or vice versa); its success for community members depends on how well the tourist industry is integrated with the existing local economy, both formally and informally (Oliver-Smith, et al. 1989:345; cf. Place 1991; Milne 1992).<sup>8</sup>

This last point is particularly significant with regard to tourism development in Fourth World regions inhabited by aboriginal peoples who maintain strong ties to their land and to subsistence activities. Jon Altman's work in Australia demonstrates that Aboriginal people face distinct dilemmas in the prospect of tourism as a "road to economic advancement" (Altman 1989:470). On one hand, colonial relations with whites leave Aborigines reluctant to interact with visitors. Blundell (1993) and Schulte-Tenckoff (1988) discuss similar social phenomena in the Canadian context. Each emphasizes how aboriginal peoples have resisted, negotiated and controlled the degree to which tourists are allowed to

---

<sup>8</sup> For island microstates where agriculture and fishing are the main sources of subsistence, integration with the tourism sector of the economy can be measured according to the amount of local produce sold to hotels, restaurants, etc. (see Place 1991; Milne 1992). In a mixed economy that includes hunting, such as that in Canadian Arctic communities, this is more difficult to measure. Health regulations prevent the sale of 'country food' to public establishments unless federally inspected, and in the absence of federal inspectors in all but one community (Iqaluit), it is impossible to integrate subsistence hunting with the commercial sale of meat. Also, as Nuttal (1992) points out, it is questionable whether Inuit hunters would wish to commercialize seal meat in this way, although in Pangnirtung I was told that on a small-scale -- eg. keeping the local lodge supplied -- this would not be a problem.

interact in native culture through, for example, the sale of handcrafts and souvenirs. The degree to which indigenous groups maintain control over cultural art forms for public consumption, offer an important indicator of local political integration in the tourism industry and in the dominant society generally (cf. Milne 1992).

For Australian Aborigines however, there also existed a risk that economic benefits from tourism, would be offset by costs associated with reduced access to subsistence, and reduced government program and welfare funding (Altman 1989; cf. Rodman 1989). A lack of capital resources and necessary skills were major hurdles for those wishing to establish tourism enterprises or to enter the sector as labourers (eg., guides). Furthermore, accepting welfare as a reliable income supplement was a conscious choice for people who preferred to participate in land-based activities. Similarly, Quigley & McBride demonstrate that in a Canadian Arctic community, "social assistance payments... provide a supplement to the pool of funds available to the cash-constrained families who participate in the traditional sector" (1987:209). In other case studies of aboriginal communities in the USA and Canada, authors note that tourism also often represents a **supplement** to other revenue resources, including welfare and transfer payments (eg., Browne & Nolan 1989). This point is particularly salient in view of the seasonal nature of



tourism, especially in a destination with summers as short as in Pangnirtung.

In view of these distinct problems, theorists and practitioners of tourism development unanimously conclude that small-scale, gradual, community-based strategies provide the only viable answer to potential benefits for local people (Cohen 1983; Wilkinson 1989; Place 1991; Milne 1992). Essentially, this means that planners must place the needs of the community before the needs of the industry, and that tourism be considered but one of several local resources (cf. Wilkinson 1989:171). As defined in Chapter One, community-based development is premised on the unique features of the specific village, region, or microstate. As such, theorists predict that tourism can "facilitate maximum use of local resources and reduce the dependence on imported goods and services, including cultural and physical characteristics" (Milne 1992:208). This also means that active stakeholders -- local people, industry representatives and operators, government and visitors -- must 'cooperate' in sharing the responsibilities and rewards of development.

Questions of self-determination and local control are fundamental to the proposition of participatory types of tourism development (Altman 1989; Browne & Nolan 1989; Oliver-Smith, et al. 1989; Milne 1992). Not only is a significant measure of local control over such an industry important to

Native hosts in either Third or Fourth World communities, but community-based strategies are proposed as the only likely means by which this control can be achieved. That is, to optimize benefits in the long-term, local host populations must be actively consulted and involved in tourism plans and should have a voice in determining the extent and nature of developments. In the following section I explore the degree to which people in Pangnirtung participated in all phases of the tourism development process.

#### Measuring Community Participation in Tourism in Pangnirtung

The definition and extent of community participation in the tourism pilot-project in Pangnirtung is discussed at some length in the Case Study (Section 3). My purpose here is to apply Cohen & Uphoff's criteria to the measurement of that participation. The notion of participation is a complex construct whose validity can be measured in terms of local people's involvement in decision-making, implementation, and the benefits and/or costs of tourism to Inuit residents.

In terms of decision-making, the Pangnirtung Tourism Committee (PTC) was highly involved in tourism planning and implementation and, as such, represents significant community participation in the development process. However, as the Case Study points out, the government's definition of "community-based" as local **involvement** meant that the Tourism Committee did not possess final authority. This arrangement, typical in

Arctic administration, may well have been a crucial factor in the ultimate demise of the Tourism Committee, as there was little opportunity for capacity building through trial and error during the development process. This situation has further political significance in terms of the struggle between Inuit demands for devolution of territorial powers to the local level, and GNWT's position for a strong centralized government in the North (cf. Dickerson 1992).

Cohen & Uphoff's second criterion specifies who is doing the participating; as Krefetz & Goodman state, without specifying who the participants are, assertions about participation tend to be meaningless (1973:375). Hence, it is useful to determine not only how many people, but also who in Pangnirtung is benefitting from tourism; likewise, it is critical to know who evaluates the consequences of tourism development as either benefits or costs. This is because, as it became clear during our research, different stakeholders used separate yardsticks in evaluating the economic benefits of tourism.

For example, local Inuit participants measure the benefits of tourism according to the options it presents as a supplement their family's cash income. Thus, although only one Inuk man took the venture seriously enough to commit his full time efforts to summer tourism, virtually all local residents believe the tourist industry is economically beneficial. Local

Non-Inuit business people, on the other hand, measure tourism as an high-risk industry of low returns in view of the high operating costs of, for example, a hotel in the Arctic. Alternatively, Economic Development and Tourism weighs economic returns against "opportunity costs," although they are also concerned over the low rate of return on their capital investments in Panguitung toward the tourism infrastructure, and ongoing core-funding toward operation of the industry.

Cohen & Uphoff's third dimension defines how participation occurs. It is possible to outline the steps taken -- either externally imposed or internally initiated -- to create participation and to achieve community based development in an Eastern Arctic community. For example, when Panguitung was selected in 1980 as the pilot-project site for tourism development in the Eastern Arctic, the basis of local participation was initiated "from above". The Government of the Northwest Territories Department of Economic Development and Tourism -- represented at the local level by the Economic Development Officer (EDO) -- instigated the formation of a community tourism committee consisting of local Inuit

"volunteers" who were paid an honorarium.<sup>9</sup> As indicated in the Case Study, once the honoraria stopped and the EDO withdrew his primary involvement in the committee, local participation declined almost to non-existence. This decline was encouraged, in part, by the committee's complete loss of power over budgetary matters, and a consequent feeling that they were merely advisors, as opposed to decision-makers. Eventually, in the apparent absence of local commitment, ED&T increasingly took over the task of planning and implementing tourism-related programs and projects, as well as the seasonal operation of the industry.

In view of these facts, the tourism pilot-project tended toward what might be called "pseudoparticipation," a situation where governments use local participation to justify rather than formulate decisions (Uphoff 1985:369). Hence, as development progressed, ED&T presented tourism proposals to the Hamlet Council in order to gain the local sponsorship necessary to satisfy funding criteria. It seems that local

---

<sup>9</sup> Payment of honoraria is a widespread phenomena in Arctic communities. However, GNWT's official policy discourages this form of incentive, apparently in the belief that Inuit should 'help themselves.' Several researchers I met shared this attitude and refused to pay interview fees. In my experience, however, a gift of money for the time and knowledge people shared was an important aspect of my reciprocal relationship with Inuit residents in the community. Richards (1982:228) also noted the importance of "money as motivation" to "bring more bodies and souls" to community development meetings, particularly in areas where cash was a limited resource.

participation in tourism development diminished from that which was "genuine" (implying influence), to that which was "symbolic" -- intending to ratify rather than influence official behaviour (in Krefetz & Goodman 1973:373).

Nevertheless, some extent of local commitment and participation in tourism planning and implementation in Pangnirtung, continued for a relatively long period (at least eight years), and covered a wide range of activities. It is significant to note that, for example, local residents continue to view the success of tourism as a direct result of PTC members' past efforts on behalf of their community.

As suggested earlier, community-based approaches have prompted several social analysts to view tourism development as a process of "adaptation." Thus, not only does the industry influence changes in the social, economic and political life of a community, but in turn, the tourist industry is changed fundamentally in order to survive within the community's

existing social, economic and political structures.<sup>10</sup> This means that, in the context of an Inuit mixed economy, community-based tourism structures are the product of a unique combination of *self-determining* and *southern-imitation* development models, that are at the same time both "imposed" and "invited" (Altman 1989:465; cf. Weick 1988).

As I discuss in the next chapter, these issues take on a unique character in Pangnirtung, a community characterized within the distinct history of Canadian economic and political relations between aboriginal interests in the North, and government and commercial interests in the South.

---

<sup>10</sup> Young (1977) refers to this phenomenon as one of 'adaptation', but other more recent writers couch similar explanations of this process in terms of "indirect control" (Bennett 1988), "strategies of adjustment" (Dogan 1989), and "social exchange" (Ap 1992). This may imply the need for a restructuring of the technological know-how to create and implement viable development strategies that can integrate with regional, national and international economies. For example, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (ITC) has examined the restructuring of the sealing economy into a self-sustaining industry by developing projects which would use the entire seal as a resource -- including the manufacture of fine leather goods and the retail sale of meat (Weick 1988:325). In this proposal, the ITC would need to restructure the nature of local production, particularly in the shift from an exchange to a commodity market.

## CHAPTER 6

### COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY IN THE CANADIAN ARCTIC

In this chapter I address broad theoretical and policy issues of economic development in Pangnirtung that are raised only indirectly in the Case Study. First, I consider community-based tourism -- as experienced by local Inuit -- as a participatory process, analyzed according to criteria set out in previous chapters (One and Five). Then, I discuss the social and political context in which local participation in tourism took shape. This is followed by a discussion of community-based tourism development as a culturally appropriate process in an Inuit community. This leads to a broader discussion of Canadian northern economic policy as historically situated in the international political and theoretical movement toward community participation in development. I conclude by addressing how changes in development theory and policy relate to issues of aboriginal land claims and self-government in Canada, and to Nunavut in particular.



Community-Based Economic Development  
as a Participatory Process

Section 3 of the Case Study outlines the ways in which the community-based tourism strategy was ideally and practically "participatory." Primarily, the formation and function of the Pangnirtung Tourism Committee (PTC) provided the channel for local involvement in the pilot-project. The strength of the PTC to provide an avenue for local input and control fluctuated over its first ten years of operation. Nevertheless, Andrew and I conclude that this committee's role was crucial, and relatively successful, in achieving the goals of community-based tourism development. More importantly, as already indicated, community residents viewed the PTC as the major force in directing tourism according to community values and interests. However, there also existed a number of specific constraints to community participation in tourism planning, decision-making, and the distribution of benefits among residents.

Community planning and decision-making conventionally takes place within the framework of local committees which have blossomed in number over the past twenty years in every Inuit community. From our interviews with residents in Pangnirtung, it is apparent that cultural factors affect participation, or the lack thereof, in all local committees. Unilingual Inuktitut-speakers are often unable to participate

fully in decision-making because a language barrier prevents them from fully understanding procedural or policy-related issues that have originally been defined in English. Consequently, there exists a tendency among government officials and bi-lingual leaders to undermine, and perhaps underestimate the contribution unilingual members can make to committee work.

As well, there is little evidence that committees in Pangnirtung are based on customary modes of Inuit leadership and problem-solving (cf. Ittinuar 1981). For example, elders indicated they had little input into the formal decision-making processes within the community, although some committee and council members claimed they consulted with elders informally about issues, particularly land-related concerns. One elder suggested that the elders themselves should form a committee and hold meetings to discuss community issues and to agree on problem-solving decisions (p.c. December 17, 1991).

Finally, family, subsistence and income concerns generally take precedence over committee work, often resulting in poor attendance records and at times, a difficulty in achieving *quorum*. Attendance and activity-levels among committee and board members differ according to their immediate goals and purpose, and rely to a large extent on the strength of their current leadership.

The Mental Health Committee, for example, is a

grassroots response to immediate and serious social problems among local families, problems which women in particular were committed to address. For example, the woman who founded the Mental Health Committee has continued to provide strong leadership throughout the committee's ten year history, and the concept has since spread to other Baffin communities.

Inuit women in general have become very active in organizations from the local to the national and international levels. Pauktuutit attributes this to "the traditional equality between the sexes that has helped give Inuit women the confidence and support necessary to be able to take such an active and productive role in these organizations" (1991:14). Women in Pangnirtung contrasted their commitment to committee work to that of men in the community, asserting that women are generally more reliable and consistent when it comes to attending meetings. They attributed their more outspoken and persistent involvement in committee discussions to their cultural upbringing: as daughters, mothers, and friends, Inuit women talk together more than do Inuit men. Hence, women believe themselves better able to **negotiate** decisions. Local women also believed that, as caretakers of the home (community), they focused more on long-term issues and goals, whereas men tended to dwell upon more immediate concerns. This is consistent with the emphasis that Inuit women place on the intimate link between economic and social concerns, as I

discussed in the previous chapter.

This type of committee experience, and the relative success of the Tourism Committee, are examples of the capacity-building potential of local organizations in social, economic, and political arenas, even as these influence regional developments. As noted in the Case Study (Section 1), the Pangnirtung Tourism Committee was an active force in the promotion of community-based tourism, and of local tourism committees in the Baffin Region. Another example is the Uqqurmit Inuit Artists Association in Pangnirtung which, since its recent inception in 1989, has spurred the formation of similar artists' associations in other Baffin communities (p.c. March 25, 1993).

However, as the Case Study also demonstrates, the lack of actual authority awarded by government agencies to local committees, is one of the biggest constraints to their long-term effectiveness in terms of commitment by memberships, high activity-levels, and genuine influence over effecting positive change. This is particularly true among committees instigated from the outside -- generally by Federal and Territorial departments seeking local input. The role of the Auyittuq Park Advisory Board is one example of a local committee formed as a result of government request (Chapter Four; Section 3.3). Legal and political constraints limit local participation to an advisory capacity. The existence of such a committee,

motivated by expediency rather than by locally-felt needs, raises the issue of "pseudo-participation" (cf. Uphoff 1985; see Chapter Three). Dacks reports that many northerners feel that participation in development advisory committees is "simply an exercise in co-opting that allows powerful outsiders to claim their plans meet the final approval of the native people" (1981:190). Hence, as indicated in the previous chapter, participation in planning is essentially a question of relative power and powerlessness.

In addition to barriers to participation during the planning phase, there are obstacles that limit the distribution of benefits of development among local Inuit. Section 4 of the Case Study describes in detail the barriers to local Inuit involvement in the formal economy: these include educational, financial, and social barriers to both small business ownership and employment opportunities. Gender and age factors further complicate the issue; as indicated, it was mid-aged men who were the primary beneficiaries of tourism development. However, women in Pangnirtung view themselves as a strong economic force in the community, possessing a generally higher level of education and training than their male age-mates who continue to take more of an interest in the subsistence economy. Due to this fact, a mid-age Inuk business-woman I interviewed, believed there are more female role-models for young women wishing to pursue a career in the

formal economy, as opposed to young men who point to "uneducated" local hunters as successful role-models (p.c. August 29, 1991).

As Nuttal confirms with respect to Greenlandic Inuit, women's work belongs to the "known domestic sphere of the community," while men's work to the "uncertain hunting sphere" (1992:140). While this strict division is certainly changing in the context of a modern settlement, from an ethnographic viewpoint, tourism development planning in Pangnirtung that originally emphasized the participation of men over women, is now seen locally to be inadequate, if not inappropriate. In fact, my interviews with women in Pangnirtung reveal a continuation of the traditional Inuit cultural division of labour (cf. Pauktuutit 1991:12). Consequently, Inuit women see themselves to take their in-community responsibilities more seriously than their male counterparts.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, it is still the men who hold the formal decision-making positions in the community, and, at the time of field-research, the Hamlet Council was 100% male dominated, although a few portfolios

---

<sup>1</sup> This is evident in formal education where more young women graduate from high-school and/or go to college than do young men. The school drop-out rate is much higher among male youth than among females. Also, as more Inuit enter local management, it is primarily women who occupy these positions. Inuit men have a poorer employment reputation, especially with regard to punctuality and permanence, and are not often seen in an office setting. Several Inuit men who had office jobs told me they would prefer an outdoor job.

have been held by women in the recent past.

Local involvement in the formal sector of the economy is affected also by historical and colonial Inuk/White relations. For example, Andrew reported that the Hamlet Council was hesitant to re-form a tourism committee on the basis of relevant business representatives, because this would weigh the membership too heavily toward *Qallunaat* interests. The majority of private businesses in Pangnirtung are owned and/or managed by non-Inuit entrepreneurs, each of whom has felt various degrees of resentment directed at them from their Inuit employees.

These historical and cultural barriers are manifested by frequent incidents of miscommunication between, for example, tour-operators from Toronto and local Inuit outfitters (see Case Study, Section 4.2.2). The problem is one not only of language, but of values as well. Southern business-people expect quality service within a pre-defined and restricted budget. However, outfitters in Pangnirtung, under the guidance of the EDO, have come to expect a standard (high) price for standard service. When southern operators attempt to negotiate a lower price for services on a volume basis (a guaranteed number of tourists per trip), local outfitters are resentful, and suspect that the operators are trying to take advantage of them. They view the situation as one in which "rich" southerners are "too greedy" to give the

local people their fair share of package-tour profits.

One southern operator felt the problem stemmed partly from Inuit outfitters' inability to separate business from social relations. He stated that although an operator and an outfitter might have a friendly social relationship, at some point business ethics require impersonal dealings characterized by the dollar as the bottom line (p.c. August 18, 1991). It was these "ethics" that Inuit outfitters apparently did not understand. From the southern operator's point of view, the inability to deal with local operators at a strictly business level, ultimately jeopardized the success of Pangnirtung as a tourist destination.

In sum, political, economic, and cultural factors that affect community participation in development planning and decision-making, similarly affect the full and equal distribution of tourism's benefits among local Inuit. This is particularly true because **development policy and programs are directed at the formal economy where the greatest number of barriers to local Inuit participation exist.** Unemployment rates among Inuit in the Northwest Territories average 31%, and statistical evidence suggests that the NWT formal economy tends to exclude Native people, especially those living in the small, isolated communities (Dickerson 1992:141-151). One might argue that this reason alone is enough to justify development efforts in formal sectors, in that it aims to



provide for and encourage increased economic benefits among residents. However, it also means that the current concept of economic development is severely limited in scope, within a context of an Inuit mixed economy.

The Socio-Political Context of Community-Based  
Tourism in Pangnirtung

A number of institutional factors at the federal, territorial and municipal levels affect the process of economic development in an Inuit community. The Case Study points out that policies and actions of government agencies, such as the department of Economic Development and Tourism and the Canadian Parks Service, serve to both limit and encourage community participation in tourism development planning and implementation in Pangnirtung. Likewise, existing private business interests influence the direction of development, as do the activities of national, regional and local Inuit organizations. Each of these factors played a role in shaping local attitudes toward participation in the tourism development pilot-project, and in economic development generally.

The Government of the Northwest Territories department of Economic Development and Tourism was the most active player in the tourism development process in Pangnirtung. The pervasiveness of territorial government activity in all Inuit communities is one of the most obvious legacies of the

political history in the Eastern Arctic, and it is likely that tourism would still be a haphazard activity in Pangnirtung had ED&T not initiated a planned strategy in 1980. This is true if for no other reason than that the department was the major, if not the only capital investor in the pilot-project. The fact is that no matter how receptive an Inuit community might be to participating in processes of economic development, if public funds are not made available, development will be severely limited. This is because access to start-up and operating capital through financial institutions such as banks and credit unions, is not available in most Arctic communities. Furthermore, most potential Inuit entrepreneurs do not have the collateral or equity necessary to qualify for private loans. It is for this same reason, in fact, that Inuit individuals often discover they are also not eligible for public loans, contributions, or grants. In the sense that the pilot-project was devised and funded entirely by government, tourism development in Pangnirtung was "imposed;" however, as the Case Study makes clear, this was possible only on the grounds that it was also "invited" (cf. Altman 1989).

Over the past decade or so, the concept of community-based development has increasingly taken on characteristics of local control, particularly in light of pressure by Inuit organizations for the political devolution of power to regional and community levels (in Dosman 1975; Duffy 1988).

Academics reinforce this call for decentralized, participatory processes of public decision making in the North. They advocate greater local control as a solution to economic and social problems in Inuit communities (Wenzel 1991; Dickerson 1992; Nuttal 1992).

At the regional level, decentralization has occurred through the creation of regional councils. In the Eastern Arctic, the Baffin Regional Council (BRC) was the first such organization, established at a conference of Baffin mayors and leaders held in Pangnirtung in 1977. The desire for a regional council came in response to feelings that Yellowknife was too far away to understand local problems in the Eastern Arctic. Individual community leaders felt ignored by territorial administrators, and believed that a regional body could offer more political clout than could a single community. As a collective effort of the thirteen community councils from on or around Baffin Island, the BRC represents "an indigenous aspect of constitutional development in the NWT, creating a third tier of government between local and territorial organizations" (Dickerson 1992:98).

At the territorial level, GNWT recently adopted recommendations in the *SCONE Report* (1990) and the *Strength at Two Levels* report (1991), to devolve powers to the community-level. This includes the goal to create employment through small, community-based economic development projects involving

small groups of people. While territorial policies increasingly move in the direction of local economies, and more programmes are created to fund local projects, the change still needed is for the development "engine" to be community driven (Dickerson 1992:151).

There is evidence in Pangnirtung that this has begun to occur. For example, in 1990 GNWT formed an organization called the 'Economic Development Corporation,' with an objective to support investment in local businesses. This corporation's first project was support of the Uqqurmiut Inuit Artists Association in Pangnirtung, formerly the territorially-run "weave shop." Local individuals took it upon themselves to restructure the arts and crafts industry in Pangnirtung by lobbying for corporate status with full control by a local board. This board negotiated the funds for a new multi-arts centre, based on an Inuit architectural design, to house weaving, print-making and eventually carving studios.

The woman who spearheaded the project is a strong leader, and continues on as president of the Uqqurmiut board which includes representatives from each art-group, elders, plus community members-at-large. Her direct efforts and demanding negotiations with Yellowknife officials, along with the support of her board, resulted in a local cooperative business. However, Uqqurmiut continues to struggle against GNWT to free themselves of government control, without

jeopardizing their core funding (p.c. March 25, 1993). The Uqgurmiut experience is but one demonstration that the human resources necessary for local control do exist in Pangnirtung. It further demonstrates that GNWT's colonial attitude that communities do not possess the capacity to shoulder economic and political responsibilities, is increasingly outdated (cf. Dickerson 1992).

However, this type of local economic initiative is still in its nascent stages in Pangnirtung, and the human resources capable and willing to undertake new ventures are not necessarily widespread. This is evident in the Case Study where both the Pangnirtung Tourism Committee and the Hamlet Council lacked the political will and the capacity to take greater control over and responsibility for tourism as a sector of long-term significance to the local economy. Also, individual entrepreneurs are few and far between, evident in the tourism industry where, as mentioned earlier, only one Inuk man had registered a full-time (seasonal) outfitting business (Case Study, Section 4). Historically shaped attitudes of dependency on government support, and the social and cultural tensions inherent to individual entrepreneurship -- the contradiction between competition and cooperation, for example -- prevent many Inuit from taking a risk in private business.

Attitudes that prevent people from taking a risk in

"the white man's world" of business, or caution others from supporting those who do, are fostered by: years of welfare dependence; culture and language barriers that continue to exclude many mid-age and older Inuit from government programmes aimed at supporting local businesses, and; a history of non-Inuit domination of industry and trade in the Arctic characterized by *Qallunaag* boss/Inuk worker relations (see Chapter Three). This continues to be manifested by a lack of confidence among potential Inuit entrepreneurs, and a subsequent weakness when it comes to independent initiative in the community's formal economy. However, it should also be noted that many Inuit may not view certain jobs and roles as socio-culturally rewarding or satisfying (p.c. Wenzel, April 1994).

Nevertheless, local Inuit attitudes toward non-Inuit and government activities are no longer "compliant" or "acquiescent" as described by Brody (1975:179). A new generation of Inuit who have increased access to formal education, and increased political awareness as a result of Nunavut land claim negotiations, are now searching for economic opportunities that are free of government ties, and that are Inuit owned and operated. For example, "P and L Services" is a private company jointly owned and operated by two local families in direct competition with "Pangnirtung Fisheries Limited," a community-based venture in which the

majority of shares are held by the GNWT Development Corporation. The owners of P and L Services saw the commercial turbot winter fishery as a resource with the potential to develop local business outside the purview of direct government control.

However, in the face of non-Inuit business-people who have years of previous experience and post-secondary education, young people in Pangnirtung feel intimidated at the prospect of competing with established entrepreneurs. This is evident in the outcome of the ED&T decision to redefine the Angmarlik Centre General Management as a contract position open to private bids. After a workshop to explain the bidding process and requirements, department officials cancelled the contract because local Inuit were "overwhelmed" by the technicality of the process. It soon became apparent that a non-Inuk would likely be the only successful bidder on the contract, a situation that was politically unacceptable to both the ED&T and the community. For the time being, local people preferred to resign the Angmarlik Centre to government protection and control, rather than have it fall into the hands of "white" owners, as is the case with most private businesses in Iqaluit.

Local Inuit and regional government administrators agreed that a primary reason for the general lack of business and management skills in Pangnirtung, is that adequate and

consistent education and training programs have not accompanied or complemented development initiatives (see Case Study, Section 5). This is evident not only in recent developments such as tourism, but also in economic initiatives with as long a history as the Co-operative movement. Despite this lack, studies show that the Co-operative movement in the Arctic has proven to be a type of activity that encourages "development" according to Altman's (1989) definition as a holistic social and political process (cf. Vallee 1967; Myers 1982; Coates 1985; Duffy 1988). Andrew and I conclude that community-based tourism development in Pangnirtung has had similar positive and potential results, despite its present problems and failure to fully meet everyone's political or economic expectations.

In terms of cultural expectations, tourism and other forms of economic development in the formal economy potentially possess critical long-term, transformational effects. This is particularly true with regard to Inuit social cohesion that was dependent upon customary modes of sharing before the integration of a cash economy. Because tourism development in Pangnirtung is being promoted as a small business opportunity grounded in ideas of competition and the individual, it is a potentially divisive influence. In Wenzel's view, all economic solutions presently being "imported" -- including tourism -- are "far from the mark"



(1991:183). Wenzel concludes that:

All are the product of non-Inuit imagination. Past experience with externally developed strategies for Inuit cultural 'development' suggests that even the best ideas, proposed without indigenous input, invariably produce little else but greater change (*ibid.*).

For instance, because local Hunters and Trappers Associations (HTA) are central to the maintenance of a viable land-based economy, HTAs have argued for greater participation and decision-making powers in community and regional affairs (Ittinuar 1981:295). In tourism development in Pangnirtung, for example, the HTA continues to be a strong force in directing where local outfitters may or may not take tourists.

On this note, I turn now to a consideration of community-based tourism development in Pangnirtung as a concept appropriate to an Inuit mixed economy, one that continues to be influenced by cultural values of land and reciprocity.

#### Community-Based Development as a Culturally Appropriate Concept

Native people have maintained a strong commitment to what Nuttal (1992:8) refers to as "symbolic" community -- the people and the land with whom they identify. This commitment places importance on the community as the "only viable context within which the more inclusive 'human development,' as distinct from the narrow concept of 'economic development,' can take place" (Lockhart & McCaskill 1986:163). For Inuit

communities today, this means re-defining the concepts of economy and subsistence, in a way that, as Wenzel suggests, bridges the "contradiction" between 'living off the land,' and institutionalized economic structures (1991:98). That is, development policy must be flexible enough to incorporate the cultural, spiritual and nutritional values that frame the Inuit subsistence economy.

Anthropologists have argued that development strategies need to deal with the formal wage-oriented economy -- including informal cash-transaction activities as described in the Case Study -- and the economy of reciprocity which rests on the expectations and understanding of sharing and cooperation that exists between Inuit members in the community. Hence, Butz, et al. (1991) are critical of conventional development research that neglects the "holistic" reality of indigenous societies, which does not segregate economic from social concerns (cf. Nuttal 1992; Wenzel 1991; cf. Berger 1985).

During conversations with Inuit in Pangnirtung, it was made clear to me that the extended family -- *ilagiit* -- was the basic economic unit. One young man said:

In southern terms, Pangnirtung is below the poverty line. Yet no-one is starving and no one is homeless. It is this that cannot be measured. This is the economic foundation of Inuit life (p.c. August 10, 1991).

Success is defined, ideally, in one's ability to support and

maintain their family, following the Inuit saying, that "if you can build an igloo, you are old enough to marry" (p.c. August 14, 1991). As mentioned in the previous chapter, Inuit tend to define economy as a social, as well as a material concept. For example, my questions to women about their economic concerns were seldom understood: the interpreter was unable to convey my meaning, and the women were unable to give meaningful replies. Inuit women had difficulty distinguishing between the two, as what was social and economic were inextricably intertwined in everyday life. So, for example, the issue of a day-care centre was an economic issue in that it affected working mothers, but also a social issue in terms of quality care for children.

A *praxis* approach to development, as I advocate in this thesis, implies that Inuit traditional socio-economic knowledge and technology is valued as solutions equal to those offered by outside, educated "experts." The day-care issue mentioned above illustrates this point: in 1991, a day-care facility in Pangnirtung was closed after its first year of operation, due to poor management and a subsequent withdrawal of public funds. Many women believe that some type of formal child care service continues to be a critical need in the community. However, these same women are uncomfortable with the idea of one central day-care facility in the community, both because it is too "institutionalized," but also because

a large centre is too difficult to operate with limited management skills and training opportunities. Hence, they suggest an alternative "home-based" system of child-care. They propose that running several small daycare centres in homes throughout the community would decrease the financial risk, and increase the quality of formal child care. As well, this type of daycare would be a culturally familiar extension of the current system of baby-sitting within and between Inuit families.

However, as the Case Study indicates (Dialogue 4), "business activity" is not allowed in housing units leased by the GNWT Housing Corporation because, in legal terms, these units are "public" property. Consequently, women's knowledge that clearly identifies a solution to a local problem is invalidated at the outset by legislation predicated on another, more powerful source of knowledge embedded in formal economic models concerned with market protection, and justified by ideas of "fairness to all".<sup>2</sup>

Another example, found in Dialogue 3 in the Case Study, demonstrates the tensions between bureaucratic and

---

<sup>2</sup> One way in which women in other communities are dealing with this issue, is by developing centres that combine child care services with another type of economic activity. For example in Arctic Bay, Kakivak Association is assisting a group of women in starting a joint daycare/sewing centre, where women not only look after each others' children, but where they also produce sewn items for sale.

local solutions to the issue of licensing of outfitters and yearly inspections of their equipment. Over the years, the Pangnirtung Outfitters Association has advocated for more local control over these matters because, they argue, they possess a more current, accessible, and hence accurate knowledge of each others' boats and safety equipment. Local outfitters also wish to have greater input into the standards needed to meet licensing requirements, in order to encourage better service and to enhance their reputation as professionals. At the same time, some outfitters want recognition for their years of experience as "an Inuk hunter." They argue that traditional knowledge of the local geography and climate is essential, and should be both included and credited in training programmes prerequisite to attaining a Territorial outfitting license (Case Study, Section 5.2). To date, these ideas have not been incorporated into licensing regulations.

Arguments for community-based approaches emphasize long-term, small-scale and culturally-appropriate development, and which ideally focus on strengthening local control over the economic future of Arctic communities (eg., Dickerson 1992:149). While community-based economic development is primarily concerned with improving the cash economy, it **ideally** does so in full cognizance of the importance of the subsistence economy, and works toward strengthening the

relationship between the two. If development is not to reduce options, then the economic future of Inuit communities rests on the continued operation of a mixed economy (cf. Robitaille & Choinière 1985:41; Salisbury 1986; Weick 1988; Duffy 1988).

For example, in Pangnirtung, cash continues to be circulated in ways that directly or indirectly support the hunting economy. Many women who hold full-time wage employment provide the cash resources necessary to allow husbands, sons and brothers to provide meat resources for the immediate and extended family (*ilagiit*). Women I interviewed describe this as a cooperative, complementary arrangement, particularly since the collapse of the seal-fur industry:

You need money to go out on the land -- you need bullets and gas. A big part of our diet is the country food, and if someone is going to go out on the land, it might as well be the husband. I might be making the money, but he might be getting the food. I can't make ends meet at all by just what we buy at the [Northern Store]. It works out really well (p.c. September 3, 1991).

I think Inuit have been known to improvise, and this is one of those things where they had no choice but to face the facts. And the fact now is that now women have to be working in order for the man to go out [hunting] (p.c. August 29, 1991).

Inuit men continue to decide the extent to which they involve themselves in seasonal activities such as commercial fishing in the winter or tourism in the summer. This type of income activity allows part- or full-time hunters to earn the

cash and to reserve the time they need or want to pursue subsistence activities. Cash is also circulated informally through the winnings from gambling events such as community bingos. For example, one young woman who had just won an \$800 bingo jackpot said she "did not like to win" (p.c. September 21, 1991). Everyone then knew she had money, and people, particularly relatives, would expect gifts of cash. The understanding is that "public" money is to be "shared." Because the young woman felt uncomfortable about being the centre of attention with regard to requests for money, she used or gave away the cash as soon as possible. Within twenty-four hours the \$800 was "gone." Other jackpot winners also quickly distribute the cash among family members who, for example, need to pay overdue hydro bills, or credits for hunting supplies at the Northern and Co-op stores. It is in these ways that, as Nuttal points out, "cash and subsistence are not juxtaposed but co-exist" (1992:173; cf. Berger 1985:58).<sup>3</sup>

Wenzel suggests that Inuit worked as "economic bricoleurs" in the 1970s and 1980s, using casual and seasonal

---

<sup>3</sup> The gradual changes in the cultural rules governing sharing practices have led to some areas of confusion over, for example, how money earned from wage labour should be shared (Pauktuutit 1991:16). Apparently, an Inuk who is financially well-off may be criticised because s/he is perceived by others in the community that s/he is not generous enough to those with less access to money and material goods.

wage opportunities, job-sharing, and informal cash-sales to collectively put together the cash resources necessary to sustain the hunting economy and the reciprocal social system based on meat sharing -- *ningiqtuq* (1991:112-113). However, with the final European ban of seal-fur imports, wage alternatives such as tourism now being offered to replace seal harvesting incomes, have caught many Inuit in a "sociological double-bind:"

(W)age work carries the risk of alienating individuals from the social context which is the traditional centre of the subsistence system; but without money, the most skilled hunters are economically unable to contribute to the non-cash wealth that provides the material substance of *ningiqtuq* (*ibid.*:177).

As I touched on earlier, this "double-bind" is evident in Pangnirtung by peoples' struggle over whether or not to act competitively. This has produced a mixed response in the community.

For example, younger outfitters who are prepared to compete as individual entrepreneurs, are well aware of senior outfitters' endeavors to strengthen the cooperative efforts of the Association.<sup>4</sup> The forcefulness of this general attitude of cooperation is evident in some outfitters' attempts to outwardly abide by the Association's decision to "share" clients on a roster system, while secretly they "stole"

---

<sup>4</sup> This is an 'ideal' generalization, as not all younger outfitters want to strike out on their own, and not all older outfitters are against individual entrepreneurship.



tourists when it was not their turn. As indicated in the Case Study (Section 4.2.2), this practice was severely denounced by the Association as behaviour unfitting to "the Inuit way" and to the good of the community and the local tourism industry. However, it appears that the Association prefers not to enforce any type of regulation in this regard, but rather to shame the wrong-doer as someone who is violating Inuit cultural values.<sup>5</sup>

In essence, I interpret these tensions as rooted in cultural values in constant negotiation between that which is 'modern' and that which is 'traditional.' Traditionally, cooperation was essential among camp members for the survival of the group. Competition was considered inappropriate behaviour as it could cause tensions within the group (Pauktuutit 1991:15). I believe this interpretation sheds light on peoples' "envy" and "jealousy" toward new private business ventures mentioned in the Case Study (Section 4.1.1). Theoretically, resentful attitudes among local Inuit in Pangnirtung are more an outward expression of cultural values in flux between generations, than of negative feelings between

---

<sup>5</sup> Nuttal addresses this conflict between sharing and commercialism with respect to meat distribution in a Greenlandic community. For example, Greenlanders stereotyped attitudes and behaviour to distinguish Inuit ("real Greenlanders") who gave freely, and *Qallunaat* (Danes) who sold for a price: an Inuk who sold to another Inuk was said to be like a *Qallunaag* (Nuttal 1992:144,148).

individuals.<sup>6</sup>

The question that remains then is not whether economic development will change Inuit culture, for change is inherent to the concept of culture. Rather, the question is whether the direction and pace of development as a force in culture change is first, chosen by the cultural group affected, and second, under their control. It is then a question of how public policy and programming either prevent or promote the achievement of these goals. It is according to these criteria that I (and seemingly writers like Nuttal) judge development as culturally appropriate. This does not mean there will not be unintended consequences such as increased tension between community members as to how development should proceed, or the consequences of increased competitiveness at the cost of cooperation, if formal economic models of development are adopted. As Nuttal concludes for Greenland, the conflicts between national/regional development schemes and community aspirations do not disappear with "home-rule," just because it is presumably more culturally appropriate than the previous colonial type of governance.

Appropriate development includes economic policies and programmes that do not threaten sources of cash alternatives

---

<sup>6</sup> Hence, Nuttal concludes that economic development is a form of "slow cultural genocide" for Inuit hunting settlements (1992:180; cf. Dacks 1981).

to those available in the formal wage and income economy. For example, social assistance payments are important to many Inuit families who may chose not to declare earnings at the risk of reducing or losing this source of income (cf. Altman 1989). Furthermore, as the Case Study points out, tourism provides another income option that for many Inuit men, is but one cash supplement to other forms of informal (underground) income activity, that help to support the hunting economy. From a southern business and formal economic point of view, however, this type of "on-again-off-again" work behaviour might be interpreted as a sign of low-level commitment on the part of local men to make tourism a thriving industry. On the other hand, considering the historical "boom and bust" nature of northern economic development, long-term commitment may not be an effective strategy for most Inuit (cf. Pauktuutit 1991:18). For this reason, it is significant that community-based tourism development in Pangnirtung has developed in a way that tolerates the high level of part-time, informal or underground economic activity associated with the tourist trade (see Case Study, Section 4.2).

In part, the significant character of the informal tourism economy is a by-product of the gradual pace of tourism development in the community, which has allowed the growth of local forms of tourism income activity (Nickels, et al. 1991;

cf. Nuttal 1992).<sup>7</sup> This exemplifies an active role played by Inuit individuals in Pangnirtung in not only adapting to tourism, but also by influencing the transformation of the industry to meet local needs and values, and to increase cash-income options within the community. It is also an example of how people at the local level influence government policy: as the Case Study indicates (Section 4.2), ED&T has for now turned a blind eye to an array of "underground" income activity which they know is occurring, but that they also realize brings significant economic benefits to many local families.

As I discussed in the previous chapter, one of the problems with development generally, and with participation in development more specifically, is the tendency to assume that communities are homogenous entities that will respond cooperatively (cf. Pigozzi 1982; Chaiken et al. 1990). In terms of control of the development process and the industry, Economic Development and Tourism recognized that Pangnirtung is a community with diverse views on the matter. The tourism Case Study, and my previous discussion of outfitters, both point to ways in which different groups in Pangnirtung respond

---

<sup>7</sup> In fact, the Inuktitut name for the GNWT department of Economic Development and Tourism is created from the verb stems: -valliä- meaning "gradual" and; -liri- meaning "do" or "work." For example, the Inuit refer to their area Economic Development Officer as *pivalliäjuliriji* -- "one who gradually develops things."

and/or benefit in a variety of ways according to age and gender. Another example is the feeling by many women that they are excluded from directly participating in the training and income benefits tourism brought to the community (Section 5.3). Local youth, on the other hand, are not so sure they wanted to participate in tourism: Sections 5 and 6 demonstrate a tendency among young people in Pangnirtung as less willing than their parents and elders to welcome tourists with open arms.

With regard to Inuit youth, appropriate development policies need to address the issue of building human resource capacities. One problem has been an education system that has to date failed to prepare Inuit young people to live in two worlds. Based on an imitated southern model imported from Alberta, education in the Eastern Arctic does not adequately prepare Inuit students to make a choice between the modern industrial lifestyle, the traditional "Inuit way," or a balance between the two (Dickerson 1992). Taught to strive for a career-oriented lifestyle based on formal education, most Inuit graduates discover that their lessons were not grounded in an economic system that can support such aspirations.

To this end, one of the goals of Inuit organizations is to develop expertise in the economic sphere in order to help native people keep pace with the rapidly changing

economic conditions in their land (Ittinuar 1981:295).<sup>8</sup> The Nunavut Land Claim Agreement -- Article 37, for example -- calls for the establishment of an Inuit implementation training study to identify jobs needed to put the final Agreement into effect. This will include jobs that will help Inuit take advantage of the economic opportunities provided in the final Agreement, by identifying the skills and qualifications required, and by establishing short- and long-term training programs needed to fill these jobs.

In the meantime, Inuit graduates must either leave their home community or the North to pursue career interests, or they can stay within the community and forfeit these goals. As indicated in the Case Study (Section 5), young people find it extremely difficult to live and to study in the South. Severed from their family ties that provide both material and moral support, and challenged by an urban lifestyle that requires a host of social and cultural adjustments, many Inuit young people return to their home community within the first few months of college in, for example, a southern city such as Ottawa. This is despite the many comments made to me by teenagers expressing a desire to leave what they consider a

---

<sup>8</sup> Makivik Corporation is a good example of such an organization. Created out of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, Makivik aims to stimulate economic expansion and establish profit making organisations, the Inuit-owned First Air airline, for example.

"boring" place, a town with limited facilities and high unemployment rates (cf. Pauktuutit 1991:14).

Inuit young people who do complete post-secondary schooling, are motivated partly by a desire to use their professional skills "back home" in the Arctic. Salisbury notes a similar tendency among the Cree of James Bay, most of whom were reluctant to work away from their home villages (1986:88). Hence, Salisbury advocates local control over village employment to ensure jobs for native people and to provide a more culturally appropriate style of operation and management, one that complements and integrates part-time subsistence activities.

In Nuttal's words, a "sense of locality" is a powerful factor for most Inuit youth who choose to seek a future place in their home economy (1992:180). This is a strong argument for training and skill development that is "closer to home." As well, development policy-makers (Inuit or non-Inuit) must recognize this as an important cultural factor that speaks for the promotion of community-based economic strategies that will provide income opportunities for local youth.

When that development is tourism-related, locality takes on additional significance, as tourism commodifies the cultural meaning of location for tourists' understanding and consumption. The role that the community plays in defining their sense of locality to outsiders can have a revitalizing

effect and serve as an important aspect of cultural education for Inuit young people. In Pangnirtung, the Angmarlik museum is the physical centre of a revived whaling heritage, a unique contribution of tourism development. However, the heritage originally defined for touristic purposes, is not necessarily a perfect fit for all age-groups within the community, nor for all time (see Case Study, Section 6). Several high school-age students in Pangnirtung have difficulty relating to, and hence they feel uncomfortable about, the singular cultural image presented to tourists of Cumberland Sound Inuit as "whalers."

This strong orientation toward local identity and loyalty must, in the final analysis, be considered as part of the contentious issue of "effective" local governments and organizations in Arctic communities. I will now explore this issue further as it relates to the historical and political context of economic development in the Canadian Arctic.

#### Development Policy and Practice in the Canadian North

In the past decade, Federal and Territorial policy-makers have seriously considered community-based initiatives as a means by which underdeveloped regions in the North can achieve both economic and political self-sufficiency. A history of failed centralized economic schemes, and of 'boom-and-bust' cycles of non-renewable resource development, has necessarily influenced the evolution of the community-based idea and the promotion of local native participation in



economic policy and development.

Duffy characterizes the federal government, pre-World War II, as a "reluctant guardian," reflecting the *laissez-faire* attitude and lack of long-term economic policy concerning its Arctic territories (1988:3). Throughout the first half of the century, policy and law in the Arctic was dictated by the federally appointed commissioner and council in the Northwest Territories. Generally, federal commissioners clung to the idea that native northerners could remain economically independent of the Canadian state by maintaining a traditional way of life. According to Dickerson, federal priorities toward Canadian sovereignty in the North were manifested in the establishment of "two worlds of policy-making: the world of resource development and the world of Native people -- and rarely did these two worlds meet" (1992:57-58).

Nevertheless, there is evidence that Inuit were not passive actors in resource development. Rather, they actively participated in commercial activity beginning during the 19th century whaling era (cf. Ross 1981; Goldring 1986; Eber 1989). As the Case Study (Section 6) indicates, Cumberland Sound families welcomed the incorporation of commercial whaling into their livelihood, as an option that could expand their formerly exclusive subsistence economy (cf. Coates 1985:139). In 1921 the Hudson Bay company established posts at both

Pangnirtung and at Blacklead Island (in Cumberland Sound), and Inuit chose whether or not to participate in the fox-fur trade and/or the white whale industry (Coates 1985; Duffy 1988).

Canada's immediate economic policy for the Arctic after 1945 also had no consistent strategy. Throughout the 1950s, the fox and seal fur trade industry remained unpredictable, and the federal government responded to starvation and illness among Inuit by implementing new social policies that involved settlement in permanent communities. However, the lack of corresponding and consistent economic policy left northern residents in these settlements with few cash-income options other than welfare payments (Dosman 1975; cf. Brody 1975; Dacks 1981).

The future of the local and regional economies in the Arctic was helped little by weak federal policies in the 1960s and 70s that gave the southern private sector a great deal of leverage over the policy process (Dosman 1975:88). An ideology of frontierism motivated politicians and entrepreneurs to promote development "for development sake," despite discouraging facts that spoke contrary to long-term economic successes (Brody 1975:225-27).<sup>9</sup> Large inputs of labour were

---

<sup>9</sup> Nuttal (1992:13-14) indicates that this attitude of exploitation for Euro-American markets was pervasive throughout circumpolar regions at the time, and that relations between Denmark and Greenland were similar to those between the Canadian government and its arctic territories.

needed only in the initial construction stage of development. Furthermore, doubt was creeping in as to the value and extent of the North's resources (cf. Dosman 1975:191). Local participation was limited to policies of integration and assimilation into mainstream Canadian economic (wage-labour) life (Dickerson 1992:17; 79).

Consistent with the "basic needs" perspective taken by international aid agencies, national policy reordered priorities in northern development. A report on the *Government's northern objectives, priorities and strategies for the 70's* affirmed that the "needs of the people in the North are more important than resource development and that the maintenance of ecological balance is essential" (Canada 1972). However, collaborations between federal agencies and the private sector continued to deepen during the 1980s, and corporate interests -- particularly mineral extraction and oil/gas pipeline projects -- dictated practices that accepted foreign control of resources, primacy of exports, and exclusion of public participation (Dosman 1975:100).

Economists at this time recommended that stable economic growth in the Canada's northern territories depended on the expansion of the North's resource base and development of "basic industries" such as tourism (Stabler 1985:23; cf. Berger 1985:44-5). It was during this time that the meagre tourism economy in the Eastern Arctic received a "powerful

boost" in the form of lands reserved for national parks. The establishment of Auyuittuq National Park Reserve (ANPR) in 1972, drew attention to the recreational potential of the Canadian Arctic. The importance of Auyuittuq to local Inuit, was the potential revenues the park would generate locally, and in the employment opportunities it would bring to residents. Subsequently, the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement attempts to build on existing economic benefits from Parks such as Auyuittuq, insisting that first priority be given to qualified Inuit companies or organizations for contract bids and employment (Article 8.4.8).<sup>10</sup>

At the territorial level, tourism was added to the department of Industry and Development in 1979 (Duffy 1988:185; Dickerson 1992:90). Changed in name to Economic Development & Tourism, the department released a sweeping new community-based tourism strategy report in 1983, predicated, in part, upon the Pangnirtung pilot-project experience (Souchette 1985).<sup>11</sup>

Nevertheless, for the majority of Inuit, life in a

---

<sup>10</sup> Article 24 provides similar guarantees for Inuit firms bidding on any and all government contracts, as well as priority to hiring Inuit employees. Also, the Agreement allows Inuit to set up new outpost camps in Parks and Conservation areas (Article 7).

<sup>11</sup> In the Northwest Territories, tourism has become the number two income-generating enterprise, after mining; approximately 15% of the NWT tourist flow enters Baffin Island (Souchette 1985).

settlement means they are becoming increasingly alienated from their own means of production, with little access to southern means of production (Brody 1975:229-30; Wenzel 1991). Subsistence hunting depends upon a cash income that could supply guns, ammunition, snowmobiles and fuel. For example, Pangnirtung with its high growth rate, low income levels, high unemployment, and underdeveloped business and service sectors, is categorized as an Arctic community "caught in transition between traditional, land-based economies and wage-oriented mixed economies of the larger regional centres" (in Dickerson 1992:22). It has become increasingly obvious to Inuit and government administrators, that development theories predicated on assumptions that the non-renewable resource economy will generate employment, are unfounded. Furthermore, northerners believe their problems cannot be solved by policy decision-makers in the south, far from the local problem.

At the present time, the wage economy in the Arctic is largely controlled by the Government of Northwest Territories and federal service sector. Inuit hope that a more representative ratio (by population) of non-Inuit/Inuit employees in the public work-force, will emerge as result of provisions in the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (TFN & DIAND 1993) that address issues of Inuit employment within government (Article 23). In the private sector, Inuit residents of Nunavut hope to participate in the benefits of

large scale non-renewable resource development through a system that gives Inuit a share of government royalties from multinational corporations (Article 25).

However, non-renewable resource development will always be subject to booms and busts. Furthermore, the limited resource base and the lack of internal economic links restricts the potential for wage-economy development. Communities are isolated except for air cargo and transportation and annual sea-lifts. This results in an exorbitantly high cost of living and business expenses, making the northern economy precarious, and meaning that development opportunities must be extremely lucrative to overcome the cost factor. Together these factors make the North's cash economy weak and dependent, and continually vulnerable to outside forces (Dacks 1981:20). This unstable economic situation reinforces the idea that if community-based development means development not only **controlled by** the community, but whose character **conforms** to the community, then development must address both wage and subsistence sectors of the Inuit economy.

Suggestions for community-based types of development in the formal sector of community economies include: small-business expansion (Dickerson 1992); worker-controlled native enterprises (Dacks 1983); joint-venture partnerships (Ferrazi 1989); and a "unified approach" to the development of the

"next economy" in native communities (Robinson & Ghostkeeper 1987; 1988). Theoretically, each is a means of "adapting" non-native institutions and technology to native purposes (Weick 1988; Nuttal 1992). As such, these models are presented as solutions to the dilemma between native and non-native corporate values, dilemmas of consensus as opposed to hierarchical decision-making processes and structures, between sharing and collectivity versus competitiveness, and the integration as opposed to separation of socio-cultural from economic values (Dacks 1983:293-295; cf. Robinson & Ghostkeeper 1987; 1988).

On a grander scale, these dilemmas are recognized by Inuit leaders as choices that must be made in order to accommodate the different interests and goals that currently exist in the North, juggled with their expectations of sovereignty, social and economic benefits together with cultural and linguistic survival (Muller-Wille 1987). These speak directly to issues of land claims and self-government.

#### Self-Government and the Nunavut Economy

Participatory models of economic development are closely linked to issues of land claims and self-government. As mentioned, the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement was legislated in May 1993 (TFN & DIAND 1993). The Agreement potentially provides the capital and the legal land-use rights needed as a basis for community-based, as well as larger-scale

development initiatives (*Ibid.*; cf. Dosman 1975; Usher 1986). The ability of Inuit to redefine and redesign their position economically, to control the character and direction of economic development in their communities, now requires the continued implementation of the Nunavut Agreement. Local and regional governments are necessary to defend subsistence and manage resources. To many Inuit, political power is logical to economic development, and thus a land claims settlement that involves self-government is essential to any measure of meaningful local control over their communities (cf. Dacks 1981:38-39; Duffy 1988:242). This logic is preceded by the James Bay experience, where "the permission of the state" to control administration and service delivery allowed the Cree people to "vitaliz(e) the entire local economy" (Salisbury 1986: ix).<sup>12</sup>

For example, funds from the Nunavut Trust (Article 31) may be used as investments in small Inuit-owned tourism or other business enterprises (cf. Dacks 1983). In turn, native leaders argue that local control of development provides the economic basis fundamental to political self-determination and self-government (in Cassidy (Ed.) 1991). This is so not only in terms of its economic benefits, but also with regard to management training and to building self-confidence as

---

<sup>12</sup> As Salisbury argues, this was effected by the Cree through regional changes they made to the service industry.



important influences in native politics (Dacks 1983). This is particularly relevant in light of an expanding Inuit population -- the average age is twenty-two years -- in which young people are encouraged by the education system toward higher career aspirations, but feel left with few employment choices other than leaving their home community or the Arctic altogether (Robitaille & Choinière 1985:12; cf. Damas 1969:63-4).

At the same time, warning signals have gone out concerning cultural survival in the face of economic development as the foundation for self-government (eg., Dickerson 1992:169-171). Nuttal's ethnography of a community in Greenland (1992), demonstrates that Home Rule does not guarantee an end to the conflicts and dilemmas between industrial development interests and subsistence values. Studies of the James Bay & Northern Quebec Agreement and the Inuvialuit Final Agreement, suggest that these claims create closer ties to industrial development and, in essence, move "the lightning rod into the native camp" (Weick 1988:321; cf. Salisbury 1986). For example, the Nunavut Agreement will establish an Impact Review Board (NIRB) to screen and review all project proposals, and to advise the federal Minister as to whether developers should be allowed to begin work. However, any NIRB decision on socio-economic impacts will be "recommendations only" (Article 12.2.2(d)).

Dickerson conceptually links self-government, land claims, cultural preservation, and economic development thus:

(L)and is crucial for Native people in the region... The land was the key to cultural survival... Clarifying land holdings in the NWT, then, is an essential factor in determining their future survival in the region. [...] Economic development is part of the cultural dilemma facing Native people. As they opt for a higher standard of living, it may be more difficult to preserve traditional cultural values. Economic development, then, may clash with the goal of cultural preservation. Most Native people now feel that rectifying economic development will have to come from within their communities (1992:169-171).

In sum, while community-based development may not be **sufficient** for success in view of political and economic constraints, it appears to be **necessary** for successful results. Community-based development initiatives remain vulnerable to the same external and internal constraints as other forms of development, but have the advantage of addressing both subsistence and wage elements of an Inuit mixed economy. As such, it is **culturally-appropriate** development. In terms of **locally-controlled** development, community-based initiatives are necessary with regard to the Inuit political call and action for self-determination and self-government (cf. Dosman 1975; Dacks 1981; Coates 1985; Duffy 1988).

## CHAPTER 7

### COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND THE RESEARCH-DEVELOPMENT LINK: PARALLELS, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Two themes of argument conclude my dissertation: first, I synthesize the results of the data presented in the previous six chapters, and; second, I address the implications that the Pagnirtung Case Study holds for policy-makers and academics.

I begin by presenting a thematic summary of my findings which point to important parallels between participatory processes of research and development as they are theorized about in the literature, and as they are experienced in an Arctic community. Essentially, research and development are linked not only as processes of a single enterprise, but also as products of the social, cultural and political context in which researchers and developers must operate. Thus in Pagnirtung, a history of colonial relations influences how people in the community participate in research projects, and in economic development programs. Negative effects of paternalistic policies and practices have subsequently led to concerns about how research and development are planned and implemented. In sum, research and development in the North are analogous with respect to their

colonial histories, and with respect to more recent and related demands by Native organizations for more cooperative, appropriate and locally controlled approaches.

The second theme of this concluding chapter addresses the specific implications of the tourism pilot-project and its evaluation. Pragmatically, the Case Study demonstrates several community-level limitations (but also possibilities) that exist along the political and economic road to Inuit self-determination. Academically, the Case Study has implications for reconciling the dichotomy between applied and basic research.

I end the thesis by speculating on what these political and theoretical messages about research and development might mean with regard to training future anthropologists, who, as potential applied social scientists in Canada, must develop effective methods of responsible research.

#### Participatory Research and Development: Parallel Issues

The **colonial history** of research and development in the Canadian Arctic prompted new concerns -- led primarily by Native organizations -- about the **processes** of research and development. These concerns focused primarily on obtaining an increased level of local participation and control over both types of activity. My data suggest that there exist remarkable parallels in the contextual events and processual issues

surrounding research and development in the North. For discussion purposes, I will separate my treatment of the historical context, from that of the demand for a revised process, although in every way these are intimately connected.

Chapters Two and Six outline the colonial policies that emphasized short-term solutions to northern problems, and that were aimed primarily at gleaning profits for southern interests. A pervasive ideology of frontierism across circumpolar regions promoted "development for development's sake." By the 1970s, it was apparent to governments and to Inuit people that large-scale development, predicated on trickle-down theories would provide few benefits to northern residents in isolated Arctic communities (Duffy 1988; Nuttal 1992). In the meantime, federal policies of research directed funds at studies that contributed data useful to resource development or sovereignty issues (Adams et al. 1987; Brizinski 1989). Independent academic research was perceived to lack coordination, coherence, and relevance, leaving many Native people in northern communities complaining of being "studied to death" (Lange 1987; Warry 1990).

My dissertation suggests that the legacy of this colonial history affected community participation in the tourism development pilot-project, and the subsequent evaluation that Andrew and I conducted in Pagnirtung. This is manifested in four areas of social and political behaviour:

relations between Inuit and non-Inuit; local responses toward economic development and research; non-local government and academic reactions to the idea of 'community participation', and; demands for, but limits to, Inuit local-level control over research and development activities.

Just as relationships between Inuit and Qallunaat have been influenced by resentment-ridden inequalities in the workplace, so Andrew and I as co-researchers struggled to overcome the legacy of colonial Inuk/White relationships. This is evident not only in the conflicts arising from our culturally distinct work ethics, but also from the distance between our levels of formal education. Andrew was intimidated by my university background, and despite my commitment to give equal value to indigenous and external (academic) knowledge, this proved insufficient to overcome colonial attributes of research in the North. Daily, weekly and monthly realities of cash-loans, pay-sheets, agenda-setting, discussion and report-writing frequently transformed our idealistic equal partnership, into the more familiar and unequal worker/boss, interpreter/researcher relationship. On a positive note, the one-on-one nature of our co-research enterprise allowed Andrew and I a significant measure of freedom and flexibility to pursue an equal partnership. This stands in contrast to business ventures and economic development schemes which tend to involve powerful Qallunaaq stakeholders with capital,

political, and training assets beyond the reach of local Inuit entrepreneurs and organizations.

This same history of relations also affected local peoples' response to the tourism development pilot-project, and subsequently to its evaluation. Attitudes of mistrust toward government are evident in the Hamlet Council's suspicion of yet another "broken promise" when Economic Development and Tourism initially refused to pay printing costs for the final report. Similarly several local people were hesitant to be interviewed because researchers are known to make promises about the usefulness of their work, but then are never heard from again. Furthermore, Qallunaat government officials, teachers, business-people, and researchers are suspect because they are seen to be getting "rich" from the administration, education, resources, and knowledge of Inuit.

The data suggest that local attitudes toward economic development and research differ between generations and according to gender. Mid-age and young adult residents -- members of the Hamlet Council for example -- appear to possess a much sounder understanding of research processes and issues than do older councillors. Andrew attributes this distinction to the differences in formal education, and in bilingual abilities between age-groups.

The heterogeneity within the community is more evident in local participation levels in the economic development

sphere than in the research sphere. That is, the sociological "double-bind" described by Wenzel (1991), produces a mixed response that is more pronounced in economic activities, as opposed to research activities, within the community. Economic development is an ongoing and ever-present activity: its immediate relevance to peoples' everyday lives creates a greater degree of commitment to a community-based development process. Research, on the other hand, is sporadic, abstract, and the results much less immediate: the relationship between research recommendations and policy or programme change is neither obvious to, nor understood by, most local informants.

Economic Development and Tourism officers have often confronted this mixed response from Inuit in Pangnirtung, particularly in the area of funding. While some individuals prefer to distance themselves from government in every way (the owners of P and L Services, for example -- see above, p. 245), others continue to lead persistent demands that government "give" more to the community both in terms of funds and political control. The president of Uqqurmiut Inuit Artists Association and the former Pangnirtung Tourism Committee chairman, are examples of the latter (see above, Case Study Section 3.2, and p. 243).

The mixed response is also evident at an everyday level. Women in Pangnirtung have adapted to full-time wage employment in the community differently than have Inuit men,



who tend to use wage- and cash-income as a supplement to land-based activities. In the tourism sector, local women feel excluded from both its training and income benefits, because tourism has been developed as an out-of-town activity, primarily directed at male boat-owners and outfitters. Among outfitters too, there exists a heterogeneous response to development regarding the issue of competition versus cooperation, for example. Cultural tensions are evident between older outfitters who tend to disagree with a competitive system, and some younger, more independent entrepreneurs who feel restricted by the current roster system for transporting tourists. Hence, there appears to be nascent stages of social differentiation and possibly community factionalism as different generations of Inuit attempt to adjust to the rapid social and economic changes taking place in their community.

The concept of community participation in research and in development has been subject to shared responses by both government agents and academics. Theoretically and politically these responses are shaped in part by the historical context in which the idea evolved. From a policy point of view, community participation in development and research has been well received. However, both enterprises remain vulnerable to paternalistic decisions and actions based on expediency. This is especially evident during times when "the community" does

not participate as ideally anticipated.

For instance, when the PTC was weak in terms of leadership and membership, it was unable to act as either a research committee for Andrew and I, nor as tourism planners representing community interests to ED&T. Lacking the support we expected, Andrew and I communicated with the Hamlet Council, but basically forged ahead with research plans as we saw fit. As indicated, the lack of community participation and control over the research process was largely due also to the type of research we were conducting; both local and government stakeholders preferred to distance themselves to allow for an independent evaluation of the tourism development program in Pangnirtung. On the other hand, evaluation research has in itself a reputation of expediency in justifying government policies or delaying decisions (Cassidy 1991). Furthermore, the fact that the community had not been involved at the "front end" of the evaluation process, also limited participation (cf. Greene 1988). GNWT ED&T chose not to participate fully because of our openly community-oriented bias and the risks this might present for criticism of government policy and action, especially as this was a common result of academic-model approaches. At the same time, ED&T officials continued to plan and implement tourism-related projects in the absence of "full" local participation, according to their stated mandate to promote economic

development in Baffin communities. This was especially pronounced in the tourism pilot-project because, by definition, tourism as a national and international activity requires the involvement of "the state" (Dogan 1989; Place 1991).

Both in the evaluation research and in the tourism development process, "community-based" tended to imply involvement as opposed to control. At times a "rubber-stamped" approval from the Hamlet Council was enough to justify the label "participation." Hence, as Uphoff (1985) points out, the political expediency of attaining community ratification puts the participatory process at risk of mere pseudoparticipation, without analytical or practical utility as a concept aimed at self-determining strategies of research and development.

Finally, the colonial history of research and development in the North has generated demands that are similar in terms of increased control over these processes by Inuit at national, regional and local levels. Beginning in the 1970s, national and territorial Native organizations first demanded increased involvement in oil and gas development plans and activities in the NWT. This was coupled with involvement in research to support Native political and economic interests (Brizinski 1989). National organizations such as the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (ITC) have been critical of research and economic development as enterprises organized

by and around the needs of the South, with little relevance to needs of the North. A perceived need to acquire policy-making power from the distant South, in order to find solutions to local problems in the North, led these organizations to demand a more cooperative approach to research and to economic development. In their view, unless Native people can interact in full partnership -- defined in terms of control and ownership of both intellectual and economic resources -- then the colonial nature of research and development will be perpetuated, and northerners will continue to feel exploited.

In Pagnirtung, however, the data indicate that at the community level, cultural and political factors serve to limit the ultimate ideal of local control as an important aspect of the partnership/cooperative model. This is true with regard to the reluctance by government agents such as ED&T, and academics such as myself, to rescind control over purviews each once considered our own. However, achievement of this goal was also limited by the inability and/or unwillingness on the part of local bodies to accept the responsibilities that accompany control. To some extent, this is understandable in light of the serious and immediate social and economic concerns to which local individuals are committed and obligated, with respect to their households and extended families.

As I indicate in Chapter Three, participatory research

is possible only if academics are willing to relinquish ownership of knowledge, and the processes by which knowledge is commoditized. Likewise in Chapter Five, I suggest that community-based development can only achieve its ultimate goals if government is willing to practice "prudent courage" to devolve budgets and power. At the same time however, the Pangiirtung Tourism Committee and Hamlet Council demonstrated a reluctance to assume responsibility for either the tourism development or the research project. In both instances, I suspect this is because the projects were initiated from the outside. In each case, the local body involved did not have control over the funds for the projects, and hence they did not presume final decision-making power.

It appears that once local authorities give initial assent to projects -- decisions which are seriously arrived at -- they relinquish responsibility for implementation to other stakeholders. This may be because the necessary skills to carry out a tourism development project, or a research project, are lacking at the local level, and outside experts are needed to meet the agreed upon objectives. Hence, the Hamlet Council preferred that I administer the evaluation research in partnership with Andrew as their sole representative in the project. In longer-term projects such as tourism development, the Hamlet Council has relied upon a wider group of individuals to operate the industry and to

direct development. This includes outsiders such as the Economic Development Officer, working together with insiders such as the Angmarlik Centre General Manager, and members of the Outfitters Association.

As mentioned, the overriding message from Inuit groups such as ITC and TFN has been for a "partnership" model of cooperative research on topics relevant to the social and economic problems and to the political prospects for self-determination in Arctic communities (Lange 1987). That is, there has emerged a concern among Northerners not only about the content of research or the type of development, but about the processes of those activities as well.

This brings me to the second major point of discussion in this section, that being the call for a politically **revised process** of research and development. Academics, practitioners and administrators have joined that call. My data and discussion indicate that four distinct parallels can be drawn from concerns for more participatory processes of research and development in the North. These are: both share a similar ideological basis; both strive toward pedagogic qualities and goals; both espouse a *praxis* approach, and; both recognize the importance of existing cultural and institutional factors.

As I set out in Chapter One, both the community-based tourism strategy and our participatory model of evaluation were critical and ideological acts in reaction to previous

centralized and paternalistic policies of development, and positivistic and elitist paradigms of research. The tourism pilot-project in Pangnirtung is predicated on the theory that long-term economic development in isolated Arctic communities, can be achieved only if the Inuit population is involved in directing and controlling development in locally appropriate ways. Ten years later, this same theoretical basis provided the foundation for a cooperative evaluation of the pilot-project, a research endeavour that received support by government and community leaders, because it claimed the same ideals of participation and control as did community-based development.

Ideologically, participatory paradigms of both research and development have been chastised for their proselytism of western democratic, self-help, individualistic values (Belshaw 1976; Hsu 1983; Stone 1989; Edwards 1989; Rahnema 1990). However, in view of national Inuit organizations' statements of self-determination and the recent legislation of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement, these theoretical and ideological premises of participatory strategies are pragmatically and potentially more consistent with Native aspirations, than previous policies and paradigms that excluded popular participation. **The message is clear and crucial: we as non-Native southerners can no longer pursue our careers among Native northerners in isolation from the**

political goals of the communities in which, and for whom, we profess to work. In this sense, a participatory ideology provides the basis for discourse between local Native people, non-Native administrators and academics.

This means learning to develop the economy, and to conduct research, with the people rather than for the people. This is a pedagogic ideal shared by both community-based development and participatory research, an ideal that has remained, to my knowledge, unfulfilled in any real situation. However, this does not mean that the ideal should be discarded, but rather that administrators, academics, and Native front-line workers need to be willing to participate in the testing of pragmatic models of research and economic development. In essence, this is what constitutes the core of my dissertation.

From a pragmatic point of view, I have offered the co-researcher relationship as one avenue by which researchers and Native communities can engage in a pedagogic process. I have also attempted to convey the ways in which community-based tourism development contributes pedagogically to the people in Pangiirtung. This does not necessarily imply that peoples' expectations and goals are fully met, nor does it mean that human resources will develop without some patient and organized effort. For instance, after ten years of development, there remains a serious need to coordinate



programs that address the lack of tourism skills and training in the community.

Likewise in research partnerships, it is evident that I should have included a more rigorous training period in order to adequately orientate and prepare Andrew as a local co-researcher. My goal was to reduce barriers that separate research subjects from the product of research, by including Andrew as an equal participant in the production of an applied or "participatory ethnography" (Thomas 1993:26). However, this objective was compromised somewhat by my mistaken assumption that Andrew would understand and accept not only the techniques of evaluation research, but the principles of participatory research as well. As a participatory researcher, I consciously chose "relevance over rigor" in an attempt to identify closely with the needs and concerns of local people (cf. Whyte 1991). Nevertheless, I propose that the production of a participatory ethnography implies the need for co-researcher training and orientation, rigorous enough for participation to be meaningful and for the product to be relevant.

As I discuss in Chapter Two, education and training are important elements in effecting genuine community participation in either research or development (Warry 1990; Price 1991). However, my data suggest that despite the shortcomings of externally initiated programs, there are

people in Pangnirtung who took it upon themselves to build the human resources necessary to achieve locally valued goals. This is true, for example, with the two families who started the private fishery, and the individuals who have worked to make the Uqgurmiut Arts and Crafts Centre a physical reality. The Outfitters Association and several individual tourism entrepreneurs took advantage of available government programs, but also self-initiated changes based on what they learned from experience, to further develop the tourism industry in Pangnirtung. In our research, Andrew learned to initiate changes in the project and became increasingly assertive in directing the research according to issues of local significance. While these examples may seem small, taken together they indicate a quantity and quality of human resources capable of local control that should not be underestimated. The value of participatory research and development in this process, is in its recognition and promotion of capacity-building that is already occurring at the local level. This is in contrast to top-down models in which governments and academics continue to stifle local initiative, in the belief that it does not exist, or that it is inadequate to manage economic development or research projects.

Hence, both participatory research and community-based development espouse a *praxis* approach which implies that self-

reliance is both a prerequisite and a product of each process (cf. Gow & Vansant 1983; Uphoff 1985). This is because both Native and non-Native stakeholders must possess the will and ability to engage in dialogue, and to negotiate a process that will produce legitimate knowledge or appropriate economic solutions. This political and ethical process recognizes the potential of shared knowledge and technology as an instrument of self-determination and of self-government.

In the research enterprise, a praxis approach demystifies the process through an interactive exchange in which intellectual and cultural traffic travels two ways (Light & Klieber 1981; Lockhart & McCaskill 1986; Brizanski 1989). Expertise must flow back and forth between Native people with valuable knowledge validated by local experience, and researchers with broad-based analytical skills and knowledge validated by formal educational processes and previous fieldwork.

For example, government officials and local people relied on Andrew to fill the role of "local expert" by virtue of his knowledge as a member of the Inuit community. Conversely, I was seen to fulfil the role of "outside expert" by virtue of my university education, and by my identity as a *Qallunaag*. In practice, Andrew's role influenced the pace of research to more closely fit the social context of an Inuit community, but also to better accommodate insight into what he

viewed as important issues. His proactive approach to the evaluation helped to create a closer link between the results of our research, and possibilities for development toward improving tourism's immediate benefits to the community. In complement, I was instrumental in initiating the research objectives and in setting and maintaining an agenda that would satisfy both government and community expectations. Academically, my skills contributed a broader perspective on relevant issues which aimed toward less-immediate policy oriented effects. The expertise that Andrew and I "exchanged" allowed for a participatory research process supported by *praxis*.

In participatory development, a *praxis* approach demands a process of dialogue in which indigenous traditional socio-economic knowledge and technology, is valued as equal to outside development expertise in the search for solutions to economic problems. For example, Inuit define economic activity according to blurred categories that do not differentiate between material, as distinct from social, concerns. In our evaluation, we needed to consider this definition in order to more accurately reflect the holistic impacts of tourism in Pangnirtung. In order to be relevant, concepts of economy need to move beyond formalistic analyses that concentrate on the cash and wage sectors, to analyses that include the material, social and symbolic value of subsistence activities in an

Inuit community.

This leads my discussion to a concern shared by participatory approaches to research and development: the emphasis on cultural factors as they affect "locally felt needs." I argue in Chapter Six that a cultural tension exists between "traditional" and "modern" institutions and values in Inuit society, as represented in the community of Pangnirtung. The tension is most pronounced when there is a perceived threat or compromise to "the Inuit way" of life, so inextricably interwoven with hunting and sharing practices. This is evident in Andrew's struggle to find a balance between subsistence and wage activities while he was working full-time in the research project. It is more evident in the way many local Inuit men incorporate tourism into their seasonal economic cycle, choosing to use outfitting as one supplement to other cash activities, that subsequently help to support seal and caribou hunting and camping trips. Hence, to measure the success of community-based tourism in Pangnirtung, one must determine how well the industry is integrated with the Inuit mixed economy. If tourism does not help to support the hunting economy, or if it threatens to reduce economic options such as welfare, I suspect that local Inuit men would face a serious cultural dilemma in their decision to commit themselves to such a form of development.

In the final analysis, I suggest that the concept of

development -- by economic definition aimed at the formal sectors -- must be expanded in scope to include participation by Inuit whose main occupation is hunting, but who also require modes by which to acquire the cash necessary to operate as a hunter. To date, I conclude that community-based tourism development in Pangnirtung has been relatively successful in accomplishing this goal. As well, academics such as myself who pursue similar participatory goals in research, need to recognize and deal with these important cultural factors both in our everyday research practices in an Inuit community, and in our topics and objectives of research.

Community Participation and Self-Government:  
Policy Implications

In Chapter One I propose to consider community participation in research and development as a potential instrument of self-determination and self-government in the Eastern Arctic. Following Partridge's (1987) lead, I attempt to analyze participatory theory and action insofar as they affect ethical political behaviour. My intent here is to clarify the policy implications of the data presented in the thesis.

Evaluation research itself begins by asking policy questions in search of **relevant** answers and solutions (Rossi & Berk 1981). My argument in this thesis is that the involvement of all stakeholders in the evaluation process --

particularly those in the community -- is important to ensure that answers and solutions are indeed relevant to the people who are most affected by the program being evaluated. My data indicate that local commitment to the process and results of research depend upon participation at all stages of the project, most importantly the planning phase when objectives and questions are formulated. Furthermore, devolution of research funds to the community may also be critical to an effective and locally controlled participatory research process.

In the final analysis, the Hamlet Council was alienated from the tourism evaluation not only by choice, but by exclusion as well. Although I maintained communication with the Council during the planning phase of the evaluation, they continued to see it as a research project imposed from the outside that required their approval, but little else. Toward the end of the project, however, the presence on Council of two key proponents of the tourism evaluation -- the former Tourism Committee chairman, and Andrew the local co-researcher -- provided a forum for the research results as a product of insider input, worthy of Council consideration and commitment. To this end, a revived and restructured Tourism Committee was proposed as a sub-committee of Council to oversee and to promote the tourist industry in Pangnirtung.

We presented the findings of the evaluation as a set

of conclusions in the hope that these would provide the information needed by the community to make self-determined changes. Although the known effects of this method are meagre to date, the immediate response by ED&T to meet with the Outfitters Association to discuss revisions to inspection and licensing regulations, is at least one indication of the potential for empowerment this approach might hold.

Finally, the research skills and understanding that Andrew acquired by his full participation in the tourism evaluation, potentially contribute to the Hamlet Council's internal ability to make informed decisions about externally proposed research, and perhaps also to the need for self-initiated research in the future.<sup>1</sup> From a cultural point of view, the Council's seeming lack of commitment to and participation in the evaluation may be interpreted as an appropriate response, one that conferred responsibility for research tasks upon Andrew who possessed the recognized leadership skills in that area. This view modifies the participatory research requirement for strong local organizations capable of carrying out research effectively. In an Inuit community, the sanctioned participation of a local individual may be not only sufficient, but culturally

---

<sup>1</sup> This was evident shortly thereafter when, in the spring of 1993, Andrew was appointed by the Hamlet Council to represent the community in a research project sponsored by the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.



appropriate as well.

Probably more immediate to local Inuit concerns, however, is what a community-based model of tourism development can contribute toward achieving goals of human resource capacity building, and of economic self-sufficiency as the basis of self-government (cf. Cassidy 1991). The policy implication of the data presented here is that until political and financial control is devolved from the territorial level, participation in development planning and implementation will fall short of empowerment. However, this conclusion is not without risk, particularly in light of rather weak financial management capabilities among local residents, alongside evidence of mis-management and corruption in Inuit organizations at the regional and national levels (eg., *Nunatsiaq News* October 8, 1993:5).

Hence, Government of the Northwest Territories department of Economic Development and Tourism maintains that "community-based" implies local involvement as opposed to control, because it is the public purse that fits the bill for development projects. Furthermore, GNWT ED&T insists that plans forge ahead despite the level of involvement by local Inuit, because it is the department's mandate to promote economic development in Arctic communities. At the same time, however, Inuit organizations and academics are pressuring for a devolution of powers where the "development engine" is

community driven (Dickerson 1992). This implies that it is the mandate that must be devolved, as well as the political and budgetary means to take responsibility for that mandate. This is the crux of what Price (1991) asserts in his proposal for processes of community-based self-government.

The Case Study presented here has policy significance in this regard, and my conclusion is consistent with other academics' and Inuit organizations' call for a significant devolution of powers to the local level (Lange 1987; Cassidy 1991; Dickerson 1992). This conclusion is supported by cultural evidence that speaks for the strong sense of locality and family that ties all generations of Inuit to their home communities, and to the land that surrounds it (Wenzel 1991; Nuttal 1992). The evaluation of the pilot-project in Panguitlung concludes that tourism's main form of economic benefit, has come in the community's power to create its own unique mix of formal and informal cash-related activities that can best meet the needs of local families and the community as a whole. Tourism has so far been a supplement and a complement to the mixed economy, and as such has served to increase economic options to local residents. The community-based model of development does not exclude significant local participation, as do large-scale, foreign-owned tourist industries, as described in the literature. Hence, both economically and culturally, community-based tourism has been

generally consistent with the sense of locality the people of Pangnirtung possess.

It is at this juncture that the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement plays a crucial role. While under current Federal legislation a land claim cannot include arrangements for self-government, the Agreement does lay the basis for Inuit control at the regional level. A new Nunavut government will have important regional mandates that must, for example, address the educational and training needs in order to build human resources capable of self-government. The data presented here about youth in Pangnirtung, support the notion that more appropriate and relevant education and training is an area in need of attention. The apparent apathy and poor level of awareness about tourism and research among local Inuit youth, is disturbing to parents and elders who fear that poor training and negative attitudes among young people, forecast an unstable future for Pangnirtung and for Nunavut. The sense is that future leaders are poorly equipped to make informed political and economic decisions.

It remains unclear what type of self-government model will be negotiated, and to what extent powers will be devolved to the community level. Nunavut leaders have the advantage of reviewing the results of an Inuit model of self-government in Greenland, where, as indicated by Nuttal's (1992) ethnography, "Home Rule" is not the panacea to development problems in

isolated Arctic hunting communities.<sup>2</sup>

Methodological Implications of Participation  
in Research and Development

In Chapter One I state an aim to explicate the connection between the applied and academic contribution of the tourism evaluation research project. The applied contributions to policy are discussed above. What remains is to link these to more theoretical implications of community participation in economic development, to tourism, and to research methodologies.

Generally, this dissertation demonstrates a means by which the theoretical assumptions held by anthropologists, can be negotiated with the theoretical understandings of community members. Together, indigenous people and applied ethnographers can engage in a discourse, whereby locally perceived reality provides the basis for critique and action, within the ideal of community-based development (cf. Thomas 1993). As Partridge (1987) asserts, theory and action are in constant adjustment - the theoretical model of community-based tourism development has changed over time in light of people's active (or

---

<sup>2</sup> Also in northern Quebec, for example, Makivik Corporation executives have recently been the subject of controversy by members who are suspicious of their "closed file" policy of salary distribution and amounts. The fear is that capital resources are being directed into the hands of leaders at the expense of local community residents (Nunatsiaq News, March 26, 1993:1-2). This same situation has been an issue of open debate at recent Tunngavik Nunavut meetings (Nunatsiaq News, December 17, 1993:1-2).

inactive) involvement in the tourist industry in Pangnirtung. As the model changes -- from a recognition of control as opposed to mere involvement, for example -- so does the type of action taken by local people and government agents. That is, subjective experience is imperative to the formation of objective knowledge (*ibid.*).

Because an aim of participatory research is to incorporate traditional knowledge in the reach for empowerment, it is a methodology consistent with academic attempts to close the gap between theory and action, between pure and applied fields of interest. By testing means to relinquish control of the research process, and by maintaining a flexible approach to cultural and institutional factors, participatory research is also consistent with Native theories of devolution as a basis for political action to achieve goals of self-determination. This aspect of participatory research has the potential to also include the concerns of government bureaucracies, who are suspicious of academic models that measure and criticize government action and community reality against a theoretical ideal.<sup>3</sup>

Economic Development and Tourism, for example, found

---

<sup>3</sup> Crick points to the paradoxical nature of anthropological research which tends to be critical of the very society and power system whose organizations fund our research, while suspending judgement about the culture we are studying (1985:83).

the policy-related criticisms in our report acceptable on the grounds that these are based upon lengthy investigations by both an insider and an outsider. These include, for example, our critique of the problems related to legislation prohibiting home-based business such as tourist accommodation, and to the department's failure to devolve real authority to local tourism-related committees. ED&T officials also felt that the report's numerous quotations create a balance, by demonstrating the human complexity as an important variable in meeting the goals of the community-based ideal in an Inuit community. This is in contrast to "conventional" development research that tends toward what Sansom (1985) identifies as "spurious objectivity" -- reports in which evidence of subjectivity is seized upon as unscientific and the researcher is distanced from the development reality.

In my opinion, the distance between applied and basic anthropology is less an issue of theory versus action, and more a factor of personal research ethics concerning the issue of involvement versus non-involvement (cf. Partridge 1987). Often this dichotomy is couched in terms of whether the research topic is potentially practical and useful, as opposed to theoretically interesting. My thesis supports the idea that practice and theory are linked in a dialectical process which includes the participation of local people, in the construction of our theories of how development works in their

world.

The question that remains, is whether current systems of anthropological training equip those of us who chose to become involved in the ethical and dialectical processes of action and theory. The reality that faces many anthropology graduates today, is the extreme lack of academic positions and the increasing search for applied career paths (see Richer 1988). In light of this fact, one would hope that anthropology departments would commit themselves to a *praxis* approach to university training, one that teaches students to not only "think" like an anthropologist, but also to "do" anthropology that is consistent with the political and economic realities of the fields in which we traditionally have studied. This dissertation shows that the message from "the field" -- in Canada at any rate -- is that it is increasingly difficult for anthropologists to work as independent researchers. To survive, we must learn to negotiate, communicate, interact, and above all share control over the research process and product (cf. Arratia 1992). The fact that several Native communities and Bands now require written contracts of research, in which students and social scientists must sign away ownership and control, should sound an alarm in academic departments that continue to require only a theoretically and methodologically sound proposal before Ph.D. field-work can begin (Efrat & Mitchell 1974; Richer 1988). Learning to write

a proposal for an academic audience does not prepare a candidate for the political and ethical realities of the field-situation in which s/he plans to work.

This type of preparation and training has begun to happen to a small degree at individual levels, where a faculty member with experience in applied anthropology undertakes to guide graduate students through the political maze of doing responsible research. Optimally, training of this sort should include the study of alternative methodologies of qualitative research, as well as training in the specifics of research techniques associated with applied social science -- evaluation research, for example. As well, there is a need to pay more attention to the "pre-field" research process. This could require, for example, a visit by the student to the community to determine research needs, and to establish a line of communication (discourse) about mutually beneficial research objectives and methodology.

There is little sense that this type of action is being encouraged by university policies, or by coordinated departmental efforts.<sup>4</sup> We need to learn to recognize our own theoretical limitations as academics who have acquired knowledge second-hand, and to recognize the importance of

---

<sup>4</sup> The extent and direction of change within graduate studies in anthropology in Canadian universities is, I suggest, a topic for future research.



"community participation" in showing us what is relevant and what is not (Edwards 1989:134). At the very least, we need to learn to monitor ourselves as accountable researchers, to set aside the funds and the time to personalize and return our findings to the community (cf. Lange 1987). These issues boil down to two primary directions of applied research, and perhaps of social science as a whole: a move toward relevance and toward responsibility.

It seems to me that anthropology is the logical discipline to promote a process of more responsible and relevant research in the social sciences. We have a history of involvement with indigenous peoples, a concern for the disenfranchised, and a professional ear for Native "voice." Combined with the method of participant observation, that for Ph.D. candidates requires at least a year in the field, these features can help create a dialogic and pedagogic process of local participation in research. We have the opportunity to avoid what Andrew referred to as, the "isolated" and "fly-by-night" research operations that people in Pangnirtung witness each summer. However, in order for this to occur, we must first accept and embrace a tenet of cooperative research in which both subject and researcher are equal participants.

Metaphorically, I can reduce the issues of responsible and relevant research to the quest of distancing myself as an anthropologist, from the uncomfortable identification as a

tourist. Tourism development has been a major theme in this thesis, and ironically, the anthropological field-experience has been equated with tourism, and evaluated as its own form of development -- that of a research industry (Dumont 1984; Crick 1985; Richer 1988). Critical of tourists who use other cultures for their personal pleasure, anthropologists have also been accused of using "the other" to create itself. Tourists may be after souvenirs, but anthropologists are after university degrees or publications.<sup>5</sup> As one Native poet has written: "...here comes the anthropologist on another holiday..." (Lloyd Westerman, in Richer 1988:414). Likewise, Edwards is critical of the "rural development tourism" practised by many academics and practitioners who treat development situations like a "spectator sport" (1989:122).

The literature presents participatory research as an "alternative" to the "dominant paradigm" of research. In this light, it is significant to note that both Dumont and Crick relate their analyses of the kinship between anthropologists and tourists, as it relates to **positivistic** approaches to social science. Although positivism has long been rejected by many anthropologists (Bernard 1988), we continue to arrive in the field, just as tourists arrive at their destination, with

---

<sup>5</sup> Richer (1988) analyzes field-research from a Marxist viewpoint, defining it as a form of labour, a process of cultural production in which anthropologists appropriate culture for their own use.

"a set of ready-made hypotheses [and prejudices] rather than to enhance (our) perceptivity" (Dumont 1984:149). Hence, Crick concludes that "healthy science" may require a certain degree of "epistemological anarchism."

I argue that this epistemological anarchism must include the participation of the host population as well, if we are not to perpetuate a scientific colonialism. Given the politics of third and fourth world communities, we as students of anthropology need to learn that we can no longer be "intellectual tourists" who just grab data and run (Crick 1985:71). To us, tourists are painful to look at because they act like a "cracked mirror" which reflects the social system which produces anthropologists as well (*ibid.*:78). The educational institutions in which we receive our training are part of that social system, and the challenge is to adjust our programmes to the political and economic realities in the modern world.

In conclusion, my thesis advocates the idea that development cannot only be "studied." As Edwards suggests: "A proper understanding of the problems of development requires a measure of **involvement** in the process of development itself" (1989:125, my emphasis). The potential among anthropologists to actively contribute to development studies in Canada's fourth world, has a solid foundation in the work of applied

scholars such as Richard Salisbury. As an early proponent of involvement, Salisbury's concern for the usefulness of anthropological knowledge and his applied research emphasis, led to his advocacy on behalf of the James Bay Cree. What remains is the continued development of a process of research that is negotiated with local front-line workers and community leaders. This means that as academics, we must rigorously pursue alternative research methodologies grounded in praxis. In terms of our product, anthropologists need not discard ethnography, which is our strength. Rather, we have the skills to test and refine alternative forms of ethnography that are, for example, both critical and applied.

**APPENDIX I**  
**METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION**

As discussed in the text of this thesis, the methodology that Andrew Dialla and I followed was participatory, based upon ideals of co-production and co-ownership of the research data and results. Our goal was to create greater community access to, and control over the research. While this participatory process differed from previous research conducted in the community, our actual methods of data collection are consistent with those generally employed in social scientific investigations. Following is a list and detailed discussion of the methods of data collection used to evaluate the tourism pilot-project, and, subsequently, to produce my dissertation.

**Purposive Sampling:**

Also known as a "judgement" sample, we used the purpose of the study -- that of evaluating tourism -- as our guide for choosing informants. We relied on our joint judgement to find informants that could reflect the variety of perspectives on tourism issues, as outlined in the objectives of the research project. In other words, we selected individuals who could act as "key informants" with regard to

tourism development in Pangnirtung.

A random sample was inappropriate for two reasons. First, the study population was small in size (1,200), and a representative sample would have been too large for us to handle. Second, and more importantly, a random sample runs the risk of excluding those informants with the most knowledge about tourism in Pangnirtung.

This does not mean that we interviewed only those individuals who had a stake in the tourism industry, or were involved in tourism at some point in its development. We also interviewed a number of residents who were not involved, but who nevertheless had thoughts on the overall impact of tourism on their community. These individuals were selected informally, often after a casual conversation with either Andrew or myself, in which they expressed a willingness to share their opinions, or in which they made a request to be interviewed.

In all, 93 people were interviewed on an individual basis. The various groups were represented, as follows:

Interest Group	Number of Individuals Interviewed
Private Business Sector	11
Carvers	4
Elders	9
Public Sector - Federal	2
- Territorial	5
Outfitters (past & present)	29
Local Groups - (eg., Tourism Committee)	8
Women	<u>25</u>
	<u>93</u>

It should be noted that there is considerable overlap within the categories listed above. For example, several of the outfitters that Andrew interviewed were also Tourism Committee members, as were some of the women that I interviewed. However, the list above accounts for each individual once, and only once. So, while the "Local Groups" category appears small, in fact these groups are well represented by key informants counted in other categories (for example, in all, we interviewed at least 10 current and previous Tourism Committee members). As well, several individuals were interviewed twice, once during the data collection phase, and again during the "feedback" phase two months after the report was released.

Of the individuals listed above, 17 were non-Inuit (18%): government officials, non-Inuit business people, teachers, and administrators. We interviewed 76 local Inuit (82%) spanning the age, gender, education and occupation spectrum: elders, teenagers, political leaders, unilingual Inuktitut speakers, bi-lingual men and women, hunters, office workers, etc. This ratio reflects the "community" bias evident in the tourism evaluation, which is consistent with our objective to determine the outcome of "community-based" tourism, as reflected in the lives of residents.

#### Focus Group Interviews:

In addition to the individual interviews, we also

conducted 14 group interviews. These involved a total of 108 people, some of whom are included in the individual interview list above. Focus groups included the following:

Sessions	Focus Group	Attendance
1	Economic Development and Tourism Officials	4
1	Pangnirtung Outfitters Association	6
2	Pangnirtung Tourism Committee	5
1	Angmarlik Centre Summer Hosts (1991)	4
1	Attagoyuk School - CALM-20 class (Grade 11)	9
1	Elders	6
7	Visitor Voices Sessions (tourists)	<u>74</u>
		<u>108</u>

The purpose of the focus group sessions was two-fold. First, interesting data can be generated when people interact with each other about issues, and when they respond to each others' opinions. This type of "reactive" data cannot usually be obtained in an individual interview. As well, it was important that we gain some sense of the degree to which groups agreed or disagreed about events, issues, etc. For example, did Tourism Committee members generally agree about the role of that committee in representing the community in tourism development. Did members agree on goals for the future? Conversely, was there general consensus among government officials about development policy and practice, and the future direction of tourism development in Pangnirtung and the Baffin region?

The second reason for focus group-interviews was its effectiveness in obtaining data from tourists. Most tourists



are reluctant to give their holiday time to researchers. By arranging for an open group session in the elders room, and by inviting tourists to join local people for (free) coffee and cookies, we were able to "lure" tourists from their tents and hotel rooms for an educational and cultural evening. We received rich responses from people with a wide range of backgrounds, and with a wide range of motivations for, and opinions about, visiting Pagnirtung. Tourists appreciated this opportunity to meet other interesting travellers, and to ask questions about the community, directly to community members (many said they were too shy to do on their own).

As indicated in the Case Study, these "Visitor Voices" sessions ended as a cultural experience for all involved. They also provided a rich data source about tourists needs, wants, criticisms, that proved valuable to local outfitters, government officials, and to us as researchers.

#### Semi-Structured Interviews:

The individual interviews we conducted were semi-structured, whereby we used standardized guide sheets to achieve consistency and reliability. Questions were open-ended, and we allowed a certain amount of freedom for people to "deviate" from our question-guide, and to say what was on their minds. Several basic questions were asked to each and every informant (see Appendix I.a: "General Interview Guide"). We ended each interview with questions about the research

process itself. Other questions were specific to the group in which the informant belonged. So, for example, the guide that Andrew used when interviewing outfitters, was somewhat different from the guide I used in my interviews with women.

All but a few interviews were tape-recorded (some individuals felt uncomfortable with the tape-recorder, and in these cases, we took notes). We preceded each interview with an explanation of the purpose of our study, a brief description of the nature of the questions we were about to ask, and assurance of confidentiality. Informants were also assured of their right to withdraw from the study at any time. In this way, informed consent was received (verbally) before going ahead with the interview.

Andrew and I conducted about half of the interviews together. Usually I took the lead in asking questions, and Andrew followed with questions or comments of his own. In many cases, Inuit informants preferred to listen and reply in Inuktitut, and in these instances, Andrew also acted as interpreter. However, he undertook to interview all of the outfitters on his own, which he did in Inuktitut, and then transcribed and translated each into English. Meanwhile, I conducted interviews with local women, and hired a female interpreter to work alongside me. Andrew and I travelled together to Iqaluit, and jointly conducted interviews with officials in the Department of Economic Development and

Tourism.

In general, questions were issue-oriented. We asked about what problems local people faced in dealing with tourists, what difficulties they had in entering the industry if they so desired, what educational or training barriers stood in the way of more effective involvement, and the extent to which local Inuit benefitted or not, from the industry. We targeted individuals who had worked as tourism managers over the years, as tourism hosts at the Angmarlik Visitor Centre, and as wardens for Parks Canada. In order to gather data on the local political process of decision making as it affected tourism development, we talked to past and present members of the Pangnirtung Tourism Committee, and political leaders such as Hamlet Councillors and Mayors. Interviews with elders focused on the cultural effects of the tourism pilot-project, and its representation of local history. Interviews with young people centred on what tourism might offer in the future. Because women appeared to be excluded from this sector of the economy, I conducted a special series of interviews to determine their view on tourism, and on development in general.

In our interviews with government officials, we asked questions about the process of development in Pangnirtung, from the inception of the idea in the early 1980s, to the status of government involvement in 1991/92. Interviews with

non-Inuit business people aimed at a private sector perspective of the industry, its problems, its successes, and of the role of a "community-based" approach.

After each set of interviews was complete, and all interviews were translated and/or transcribed, a "field summary" of the interview data was written. These were descriptive summaries, as free from interpretation as possible. Andrew wrote the field summary of the outfitter interviews, and I wrote the field summaries of interviews with women, government officials, elders, youth, carvers, and visitors. We both reviewed and revised each summary, and these then provided a manageable data base from which we composed the final evaluation report.

#### Feedback Interviews:

Andrew and I also conducted interviews two months after the report was released, returning primarily to key informants who participated in the initial data collection phase. We attempted to contact at least one representative of each "stakeholder" group. These consisted of 15 interviews with one or two people at a time, and one group session:

Interviews	Stakeholder Group	Number of Individuals
4	Private Business Sector	5
1	Elders	5
4	Public Sector - Federal	1
	- Territorial	3
6	Local Groups (eg., Tourism Committee)	<u>6</u>
		20

Based on these interviews, I wrote a "Supplement" to the evaluation report, which I then submitted to Andrew, the Department of Economic Development and Tourism in Iqaluit, and the Pangnirtung Hamlet Council. The contents of this supplement are summarized in Chapter Four (Preface). The data collected from these interviews has been instrumental in my analysis of the participatory research process as presented in this dissertation.

Quantitative Data - Household Surveys:

We conducted two surveys. The first is a more general economic survey (see Appendix I.b: "Community Economic Survey"). The second is a tourism-specific economic survey (second page only of the Community Economic Survey). The purpose was to obtain quantitative data on the economic benefits of tourism to local Inuit (see Section 4.1 in the Case Study). We originally planned to survey the entire community, that is, a 100% sample. However, this was not possible for several reasons, a primary reason being that methods are culturally inappropriate. The two greatest difficulties were in hiring surveyors, and in obtaining reliable answers to quantitative questions. These issues are discussed in Chapter Three (pp. 100-102).

In the end, only 22% of Inuit households were surveyed. This sample was "random" only in that these were the households that surveyors were able to obtain information

from, before they decided that they no longer had the time, or the interest, in continuing with the survey work. At best, this data provides some contextual information.

One of the problems is that the general survey was rather long and time-consuming. When we shortened the survey questionnaire down to a single page, with a focus on tourism only, we had better success. Respondents could now relate the survey questions to what they knew was the topic of our research: tourism. The questions were logical and relevant, and hence, people seemed more willing to answer them. Of crucial importance, was our good fortune in hiring a woman (Sheila Maniapik) who was both interested, and very conscientious about the survey work. Through her efforts, we were able to survey 70% of Inuit households.

#### Participant Observation:

The method of participant observation is particularly important to the collection of contextual data, which contributes to both the tourism evaluation, and to the analysis of research and development as contained in my dissertation. As an insider, Andrew was able to provide context to issues and events as a result of his life-long experience in the community. This was invaluable. As an outsider, the best I could do was to take systematic field notes, and to keep a daily journal on my experiences and observations in the community during my year of fieldwork.

I participated in numerous community events, tourism related or otherwise. For example, I learned a fair bit about the informal exchange of cash among community members, by attending Bingo on Friday evenings. Because I was a regular at Bingo, people freely discussed their winnings with me. I learned much about the community spirit of participation, while enjoying games during the Christmas festivities. I also spent much of my leisure time visiting with the elders in their meeting room at the Angmarlik Centre, or visiting with several families in whose homes I had come to feel welcome. This gave me insight into the everyday lives of Inuit, and into what they mean by "the Inuit way," which is so important to them.

Some of my most valuable participant observation occurred when I was allowed to accompany outfitters who were taking tourists out to the park. Observing and experiencing firsthand, the nature of the interaction between tourist and Inuk outfitter, helped me to understand frustrations and rewards each later spoke about with me. To get a glimpse of training issues, I joined a full-day hospitality training session for new Angmarlik hosts, given by the Parks Canada Visitor Services warden (also a local Inuk). Finally, to gain a perspective on the private sector, southern tour operator viewpoint, I gained permission to accompany Adventure Canada (Toronto) as an assistant guide into Auyuittuq Park, for two

consecutive weeks. The trekking involved gave me a feel for the motivation and rewards hikers feel in travelling to a destination such as Pagnirtung. This experience also allowed me to see the people of Pagnirtung through the fresh and foreign eyes of a tourist.

Document and Literature Search:

Andrew and I sifted through boxes of old Tourism Committee files that included minutes from meetings, correspondence, and consultant reports. I was also given access to some files in the local Economic Development and Tourism office, and in the Angmarlik Visitor Centre. From these, I was able to reconstruct a chronology of events in the development of tourism since 1980. I was also able to acquire data on the growth of tourist numbers visiting Pagnirtung each year, and some financial data on projects and infrastructure development.

For dissertation purposes, I have conducted an extensive literature search, as indicated in the references section that follows at the end of the thesis.



## APPENDIX I.a

## COMMUNITY BASED TOURISM RESEARCH PROJECT 1991

## GENERAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

## TOURISM / ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:

- In what ways is tourism development important to Pangnirtung?
  - economically (both men and women?)
  - politically (local control?)
  - culturally (eg., museum; Inuit/non-Inuit exchange?)
- When tourism first began, how did you expect it to benefit Pangnirtung? Have these expectations been fulfilled?
- What now needs to be planned and developed to make tourism a stronger economic force in Pangnirtung (ie. to benefit more local people)?
- Is there a need for more private entrepreneurship in Pangnirtung? (Eg., should the outfitters work privately / competitively?) What are the difficulties in starting a new business here?
- Do you think the Cumberland Sound Fisheries has more potential to improve Pangnirtung's economy? Is it important for Pangnirtung to have both tourism and the fisheries?
- Do you think Pangnirtung's economy is diversified enough? How important is this to goals of economic self-sufficiency?
- What are your major concerns about the economy generally?

## EDUCATION / TRAINING:

- Has there been enough training for people who are involved in tourism? Have there been enough awareness programs so that people in Pangnirtung understand what tourism is about and how it can help the community? Is enough being done now to teach people how to get involved in tourism if they wish to?
- Do you think the Angmarlik Centre general manager is trained well enough for his job? Do the summer host/hostesses need more training?
- Do you think young people here view tourism as a potential career opportunity?
- Has the Angmarlik Centre and museum helped young people to learn more about their Inuit culture? How could it better benefit cultural education? Do you think working with tourists fits in well with the Inuit traditions (of working with whalers, for example)?
- In general, is education (eg., high school graduation, college) important? Why / why not?
- What kinds of education / training are needed to build a stronger economy in Pangnirtung?

## POLITICAL / LOCAL CONTROL:

- Has the Pangnirtung Tourism Committee (PTC) played an important role in planning and implementing tourism since it began ten years ago? What is the purpose of the PTC now? Is it

still necessary?

- Should Hamlet Council take the responsibility of tourism development? What other local means of control might be better?

- What does it mean for Pangnirtung to have "local control" over their economy and over economic development? Do you think this is important for political goals of self-government -- i.e. Nunavut?

- Do you know the meaning of "community based" development?

- When Nunavut is created, what changes do you hope to see in terms of control over the economy in this region?

## APPENDIX I.b

## COMMUNITY BASED TOURISM RESEARCH PROJECT

## COMMUNITY ECONOMIC SURVEY (1991)

**\*\*\* ALL INFORMATION IS CONFIDENTIAL !!!**HOUSE # \_\_\_\_\_  
CONSULTANT: Father \_\_\_\_\_; Mother \_\_\_\_\_; other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_**GENERAL INFORMATION:**# of PEOPLE LIVING IN THE HOUSE:  
\_\_\_\_\_ adults (18 +); \_\_\_\_\_ teenagers (13-17); \_\_\_\_\_ children (0-12)**WHO LIVES IN THIS HOUSE?**

#		#		#	
_____	Grandfather	_____	Brother	_____	Uncle
_____	Grandmother	_____	Sister	_____	Aunt
_____	Mother	_____	Brother-in-Law	_____	Nephew
_____	Father	_____	Sister-in-Law	_____	Niece
_____	Son	_____	Grandson	_____	Boyfriend
_____	Daughter	_____	Granddaughter	_____	Girlfriend
_____	Son-in-Law	_____	Cousin	_____	Friend
_____	Daughter-in-Law				

**WHICH IS YOUR HOUSEHOLD'S MOST IMPORTANT RESOURCE?**

_____	Hunting	_____	Social Services
_____	Wages	_____	Private Earnings (eg., craft sales)

**LIVING COST (IN TOWN):****ABOUT HOW MUCH DOES IT COST YOUR HOUSEHOLD TO LIVE EACH MONTH?**

Food / every 2 weeks:	\$ 50-100 _____	\$100-200 _____
	\$200-300 _____	\$300-400 _____
	\$400-500 _____	Over \$500 _____

Rent: \$ \_\_\_\_\_/month Mortgage: \$ \_\_\_\_\_/month

Power: \$ \_\_\_\_\_/month Telephone: \$ \_\_\_\_\_/month

Cable TV: \$ \_\_\_\_\_/month

Heating Fuel: \$ \_\_\_\_\_; or \_\_\_\_\_ Litres / spring/summer (Apr.- Sept.)  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_; or \_\_\_\_\_ Litres / fall/winter (Oct.- March)

**TOURISM INCOME:**

\*\*\*\*\* NOTE: "TOURISM INCOME" MEANS MONEY EARNED FROM VISITORS STAYING IN THE LODGE, FISHCAMPS, THE CRUISE SHIP, FILM CREWS, HIKERS (DOES NOT INCLUDE CONSTRUCTION WORKERS, TEACHERS, OR NURSES).

DOES ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSE EARN INCOME DIRECTLY FROM TOURISTS DURING THE SUMMER SEASON? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes / No \_\_\_\_\_

WHAT YEAR WAS YOUR MOST RECENT SEASON OF INVOLVEMENT IN TOURISM?  
\_\_\_\_\_ (eg., 1991, 1990, 1989, etc.)

IN WHAT WAY(S) WERE YOU INVOLVED WITH TOURISTS? ABOUT HOW MUCH DID YOU EARN FROM TOURISTS EVERY TWO WEEKS?

<u>Type of activity:</u>	<u>Full / Part-time:</u>	<u>\$/biweekly:</u>
_____ Angmarlik host/hostess	_____/____	\$ _____
_____ Auyittug Lodge staff	_____/____	\$ _____
_____ Parks Canada staff	_____/____	\$ _____
_____ Outfitting	_____/____	\$ _____
_____ Guiding	_____/____	\$ _____
_____ Fish camp	_____/____	\$ _____
_____ Carving	_____/____	\$ _____
_____ Crafts	_____/____	\$ _____
_____ Story-telling/Entertainment (#/summer _____)		\$ _____
_____ Country-food sales		\$ _____
_____ Other (specify _____)		\$ _____

**ON WHAT DID YOU SPEND THE INCOME YOU EARNED FROM TOURISTS?**

\*\* Please list the following in order of priority  
(eg., 1 = most spent; 2 = 2nd most spent, 3 = 3rd most spent, etc.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Living Costs (food, etc.)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Equipment Maintenance  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Transportation Fuel  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Savings  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Shared with family  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Consumer Goods (eg. VCR) -- please specify \_\_\_\_\_

DID YOU CHOOSE TO SPEND TIME AWAY FROM HUNTING, FISHING, OR CAMPING SO THAT YOU COULD EARN MORE INCOME FROM TOURISTS? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes / No \_\_\_\_\_

DO YOU BELIEVE THAT TOURISM HAS HELPED YOU AND YOUR FAMILY IN A FINANCIAL WAY? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes / No \_\_\_\_\_

HUNTING AND FISHING INCOME:

## WHO DOES THE MOST HUNTING FROM YOUR HOUSE?

Grandfather \_\_\_; Father \_\_\_; Brother \_\_\_; Son \_\_\_; Other \_\_\_\_\_

## HOW MUCH TIME DO YOU SPEND HUNTING FOR YOUR OWN FOOD?

	SPRING	SUMMER	FALL	WINTER
SEAL hunting				
# of weekly/wknd. trips:	_____	_____	_____	_____
# of camping trips:	_____	_____	_____	_____
# of SEALS caught:	_____	_____	_____	_____
CARIBOU hunting trips				
# of weekly/wknd. trips	_____	_____	_____	_____
# of camping trips:	_____	_____	_____	_____
# of CARIBOU caught:	_____	_____	_____	_____
# of FISHING trips:	_____	_____	_____	_____
Amount of FISH caught:				
10-50 lbs.	_____	_____	_____	_____
50-100 lbs.	_____	_____	_____	_____
over 100 lbs.	_____	_____	_____	_____
# of days spent BERRY picking:			_____	_____

## WHICH RESOURCE DO YOU HUNT THE MOST?

\_\_\_\_\_ Seals                      \_\_\_\_\_ Caribou                      \_\_\_\_\_ Fish  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Birds                      \_\_\_\_\_ Other (specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

## ABOUT HOW MANY SUPPLIES DO YOU NEED FOR A HUNTING TRIP?

	<u>Weekly/Weekend trip:</u>	<u>Camping trip:</u>
Ammunition (packs)	_____ \$_____/pack	_____
Gasoline - gallons	_____	_____
- barrels	_____	_____
Oil (cans)	_____	_____
Naphtha (cans)	_____	_____
Heater Fuel (gal.)	_____	_____
Groceries	\$_____	\$_____

IF NO-ONE FROM YOUR HOUSE HUNTS VERY MUCH, FROM WHOM DO YOU GET MOST OF YOUR COUNTRY FOOD? (eg., Father, Uncle, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

## WITH WHOM DO YOU MOST OFTEN SHARE COUNTRY FOOD AND/OR LEND EQUIPMENT?

_____ Grandfather	_____ Brother	_____ Uncle
_____ Grandmother	_____ Sister	_____ Aunt
_____ Mother	_____ Brother-in-Law	_____ Nephew
_____ Father	_____ Sister-in-Law	_____ Niece
_____ Son	_____ Grandson	_____ Boyfriend
_____ Daughter	_____ Granddaughter	_____ Girlfriend
_____ Son-in-Law	_____ Cousin	_____ Friend
_____ Daughter-in-Law		

**TOTAL CASH INCOME:**

**INCOME FROM WAGE EMPLOYMENT?**

**SEASONS**  
(spring/summer/fall/winter)

<u>Family member:</u>	<u>Type of Job:</u>	<u>Full/Part-time:</u>	
1. _____	_____	___/___	___/___/___/___
2. _____	_____	___/___	___/___/___/___
3. _____	_____	___/___	___/___/___/___

**DOES ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSE RECEIVE INCOME FROM GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS?**

Yes / No (spring/summer/fall/winter)

___ / ___	Social Assistance	___/___/___/___
___ / ___	Unemployment Insurance	___/___/___/___
___ / ___	Old Age Pension	
___ / ___	Family Allowance (___ # of children received for)	

**DID ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSE RECEIVE A GOVERNMENT OR BANK LOAN OR GRANT IN 1991?** Yes / No Amount \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Type of government program or loan: \_\_\_\_\_  
For what did you use the loan? \_\_\_\_\_

**HOW MANY PEOPLE IN YOUR HOUSE EARN INCOME FROM THE FOLLOWING?**

(spring/summer/fall/winter)

- 1) COMMERCIAL FISHING: Char \_\_\_\_\_ / Halibut \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_
- 2) PRIVATE BUSINESS OWNER: Type: \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_
- 3) HONORARIUM: Yes / No \_\_\_; Amount/meeting: \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ARTS & CRAFTS (Carvings, Wall-hangings, etc.)  
Type: \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_
- 5) OUTFITTING / GUIDING: Yes / No \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_
- 6) BILLETS: Yes / No \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

Do you most often sell your products or services (#4,5,6 above) to:  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Local Inuit \_\_\_\_\_ Construction workers  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Tourists \_\_\_\_\_ Non-Inuit Residents (teachers, nurses)

**HOW MUCH TOTAL CASH INCOME DOES YOUR HOUSEHOLD RECEIVE EVERY 2 WEEKS?**

(spring/summer/fall/winter)

_____ \$100 - 500	___/___/___/___
_____ \$500 - 1,000	___/___/___/___
_____ \$1,000 - 1,500	___/___/___/___
_____ \$1,500 - 2,000	___/___/___/___
_____ \$2,000 - 2,500	___/___/___/___
_____ \$2,500 - 3,000	___/___/___/___
_____ \$3,000 and over	___/___/___/___

**WITH WHOM DO YOU MOST OFTEN SHARE CASH?**

\_\_\_\_\_ Household Members \_\_\_\_\_ Other Relatives \_\_\_\_\_ Friends

**IF YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS ABOUT TOURISM OR ABOUT THIS SURVEY, PLEASE USE BACK OF THIS PAGE...**

APPENDIX II

*EVALUATION OF PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH METHODOLOGY  
USED IN PANGNIRTUNG TOURISM DEVELOPMENT STUDY*

by  
Jean-Philippe Chartrand, M.A.  
December 1991

RE: Co-researchers Andrew Dialla and Gwen Reimer

Interviewer and Evaluator: Jean-Philippe Chartrand  
-----

1. Introduction

Participatory Research is a new methodology currently at an experimental stage in Anthropological fieldwork. It differs substantially from received fieldwork methods in that it requires the involvement of local individuals working as legitimate, full investigators along with the anthropologist in all phases and aspects of a community research project. As the project focusing on evaluating tourism development in Pagnirtung had reached, approximately, the half-way point, the two co-researchers asked me to conduct preliminary interviews in order to evaluate the degree of success achieved in implementing the participatory research model.

Structured interviews were used with both researchers. The interviews for each co-researcher were constructed from a preliminary list of questions submitted to me by the other



researcher. All of the original questions submitted were used during the interviews. However, I added several questions to each list in order to provide additional background information on the topics covered. I felt this to be necessary as I had no direct involvement in the project, and as I perceived certain issues to require more detailed coverage. While the specific questions asked by each researcher were necessarily worded differently, the themes covered in each interview were essentially similar.

The central themes covered in the interviews included: (1) the relative degree of experience with social science research; (2) the perceptions of the status of social science work in the Arctic; (3) detailed questions regarding the quality of the working relationship between the co-researchers; (4) specific questions pertaining to cultural issues that may have affected the working relationship or the research agenda. The results of the interviews are analyzed below.

## 2. Interview Analysis

In terms of experience with research and expectations regarding this project, the co-researchers began with somewhat different impressions of the work they were to perform. Neither had worked within a participatory research project before. Andrew thought that this project was designed to gather information on tourism from the previous studies

conducted in the community. He was surprised to find out that the work was intended to gather new data on tourism. This misconception was probably due to some miscommunication, or misinterpretation of the project prior to hiring.

In a more general sense, however, the researchers possess good to strong qualifications for this study. In Andrew's case, this stems from his past involvement with tourism in the community, and his extensive familiarity with previous research projects (reports) in the community. Gwen's strengths lie in her anthropological training (data organization) and her previous research on tourism, which has provided a framework for evaluating the degree of local development in Pagnirtung. However, the co-researchers possess an uneven knowledge of each other's qualifications. Gwen has greater specific knowledge of Andrew's experience than Andrew knows about her training as a Ph.D student, and the academic requirements or expectations regarding the study. Future participatory research projects should incorporate a short, intensive phase of more mutual "debriefing" about the university training, background and programs of students. This would allow communities to become much better informed about the benefits and limitations of student research. It would also sensitize students to the communities' perceptions of their role and presence.

The structure of the working relationship defines

Andrew as the local "expert" on the community and Gwen as the "organizer" and agenda "leader". This structure maximizes the potential contributions of each researcher to the study. A crucial methodological goal has been achieved in that Andrew is clearly much more than "an interpreter" during interviews. He feels that he has been allowed, and encouraged to contribute suggestions regarding community consultation (with local councils and committees), the overall research agenda and specific interview questions and format. In several cases, particularly in meetings with organizations, he has directed the research agenda to involve consultation as opposed to merely debriefing. In a more subtle sense, he has also influenced the pace of the research schedule, by encouraging Gwen to focus on some issues in greater depth, even if this should mean cancelling some aspects of the work.

However, Andrew has ambivalent opinions regarding his status as "co-researcher". While he knows that his role encompasses much more than interpreting, he is quick to point out that, especially in the eyes of other community members, he cannot "be" a researcher, since he has not received the (formal) training of an anthropologist. His previous involvement with research projects were limited to interpreting, and he knows that most community members who will not yet have direct participation in this project will see him as "Gwen's helper". In this sense, the history of

colonialism within the research enterprise in the Arctic is impossible to eradicate, although the co-researcher relationship is noticeable to individuals who have taken part in the work. In Andrew's words: "Once people have seen how we work, they realize that I am not simply an interpreter". This still begs the question of the extent, and quality of his input that is perceived and understood by the community - it is likely somewhere between a simple interpreter and a legitimate researcher. Similarly, but to a much greater extent, I doubt that community members, apart perhaps from council and committee members, perceive any difference in their role by having been designated "consultants" as opposed to "informants". Much work remains to be done to "decolonize" and "de-mystify" social science research in the Arctic.

Compared with previous research, this project, and Gwen in particular, have thus far received good to excellent reviews from the community. The project itself is perceived as being potentially highly valuable by the community, particularly by Andrew. This is because it deals with a "concrete" issue, and one that concerns the entire community in everyday practical terms. More importantly, tourism is seen as potentially ensuring the future economic security for the community, and the present generation of teenagers and children. Current community leaders thus take their responsibility for having directed Pagnirtung in tourism

development very seriously. There is also a consensus that this is the right time to be conducting a study of this type, i.e., before further decisions are undertaken with regards to tourism. On a more personal note, Gwen is also seen in good terms by the community. In part, this is due to the fact that she stands out among the researcher population as an exceptional case. Almost all previous researchers have remained in the community for an extremely limited amount of time; Andrew referred to them as "fly-by-night" researchers. People have come to respect Gwen as she is "living up" to her word by remaining in the community as long as she has (even during the Holiday Season, when most Qallunaat return South). She is also seen to involve herself in public community affairs (both social and "business" meetings), to a much higher degree than most other researchers.

This is seen as an indication that she is concerned about people in the community, i.e., that she is not in town to simply get her work done as fast as she can. While she is extensively involved in the wider community, Andrew feels that Gwen is too cautious in her everyday interactions with Inuit. He feels that her attempts to "integrate" herself, particularly in the more "relaxed" social occasions, are slowed down by her desire to avoid making "mistakes" and acting culturally appropriately. He feels that, by "letting her guard down", and making "mistakes", that she could either

learn more about Inuit culture, or at least learn more meaningfully about it.

Perhaps the more significant area of difference in the working relationship lies in how each co-researcher attributes sources of miscommunication, or misunderstanding in implementing the research agenda. Gwen conceives the source of these "difficulties" as lying in cultural, and possibly culture/gender differences; Andrew tends to attribute these problems to personality differences. Based on my interview, I would suggest that both sets of factors are at play, and that the failure to acknowledge this is in itself a source of misunderstanding.

From the point of view of an outside researcher, it is almost impossible to distinguish idiosyncratic behaviour from cultural behaviour at the beginning of a fieldwork period, since cultural information is necessarily gathered from individual observation. Since Andrew is the person that Gwen interacts with the most, and since Andrew is an Inuk, then it seems logical that patterns in Andrew's behaviour are cultural patterns. To distinguish idiosyncrasies from culture, Gwen needs to develop comparable relationships with other Inuit. Time constraints will necessarily hamper these opportunities. On the other hand, Andrew attributes to personality factors, what might, in part, be due to the academic formation and requirements of the project, which he does not understand

completely. Gwen also exhibits a strong personal sense of discipline and organization, in her work but also in everyday life activities, and Andrew underestimates the role played by Qallunaat culture -- as compared to Inuit culture -- in this type of behaviour (e.g., the importance of meeting deadlines versus family obligations, etc). While personality differences are unquestionably involved, Andrew needs to try to view them as "extensions" (exaggerations?) of more general, cultural Qallunaat traits. Both researchers could benefit by being more explicit about why they perceive issues as being important.

### 3. Conclusions

Overall, the participatory research methodology used in the study has been successfully implemented; as successfully as possible under current circumstances (its largely ideal, untried nature; the inexperience of both co-researchers with this approach, and the colonial history of research in the NWT). As the researchers and organizations in the community continue to gain familiarity with it, additional methodological goals may be attained by the end of this project. Certainly, the community views the approach taken in this project as greatly increasing its legitimacy at the local level. A more complete evaluation of the project, focusing on the interrelation between the method and the research results, should be undertaken at the completion of the research in March.

The working relationship between Andrew and Gwen is, in general, excellent, and provides a frame for conducting more in-depth, and locally meaningful, research than traditional anthropological methodology. While there have been communication difficulties, they have, for the most part, been resolved by the researchers themselves. The contractual basis of Andrew's job is a very great asset to the project, as it ensures continuity and reliability. The quality of rapport achieved between the co-researchers has for some time exceeded the strict parameters of "work"; Gwen and Andrew have become friends as well as work-mates, and Andrew has indicated that he would like to maintain in touch with Gwen (and J.P.!) after the completion of the research. Apart from the few recommendations mentioned in my analysis, the working relationship is, in my opinion, as good as can be expected in a fieldwork situation.



## REFERENCES

- Adams, W.P., P.F. Burnet, M.R. Gordon & E.F. Roots  
1987 Canada and Polar Science. Ottawa: Circumpolar and Scientific Affairs Directorate, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.
- Altman, Jon  
1989 "Tourism Dilemmas for Aboriginal Australians." Annals of Tourism Research 16(4):456-476.
- Ap, John  
1992 "Resident's Perceptions on Tourism Impacts." Annals of Tourism Research 19(4):665-690.
- Arratia, Maria-Ines  
1992 "Participatory Methodologies: Grounding the 'Alternative Paradigm.'" Nexus: The Canadian Student Journal of Anthropology 10:113-119.
- Asad, Talal (Ed.)  
1973 Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter. London: Humanities Press.
- Barger, W.K., and E. Reza  
1989 "Policy and Community-Action Research: The Farm Labour Movement in California." In John Willigen, Barbara Rylko-Bauer, and Ann McElroy (Eds.), Making Our Research Useful: Case Studies in the Utilization of Anthropological Knowledge. Boulder, San Francisco, and London: Westview Press (258-282).
- Belshaw, Cyril S.  
1976 The Sorcerer's Apprentice: An Anthropology of Public Policy. New York: Pergamon Press Inc.
- Bennett, John W.  
1988 "Anthropology and Development: The Ambiguous Engagement." In J.W. Bennett & J.R. Bowen (Eds.), Production and Autonomy: Anthropological Studies and Critiques of Development. Monographs in Economic Anthropology, No.5. (SEA) Lanham: University Press of America (1-29).

- Berger, Thomas  
 1985 Village Journey: The Report of the Alaska Native Review Commission. New York: Hill & Wang.
- Bielawski, E.  
 1984 "Anthropological Observations on Science in the North: The Role of the Scientist in Human Development in the Northwest Territories." In W.Peter Adams (Ed.), Education, Research, Information Systems and the North. ACUNS 1986 (56-61).
- 1986 "The Northern Heritage Society: A Case Study in Developing Science Northerners." In W.Peter Adams (Ed.), Education, Research, Information Systems and the North. ACUNS (28-31).
- Blundell, Valda  
 1993 "Aboriginal Empowerment and Souvenir Trade in Canada." Annals of Tourism Research 20(1):64-87.
- Boas, Franz  
 1888 The Central Eskimo (1964 edition). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Brizinski, Peggy Martin  
 1989 "Participation as Social Science Method and Theory: Indigenous Response in the Mackenzie Delta." PH.D. Dissertation (Unpublished). Hamilton: Dept. of Anthropology, McMaster University.
- Brody, Hugh  
 1975 The Peoples' Land: Whites and the Eastern Arctic. London: Penguin Books.
- Brown, L. David & Rajesh Tandon  
 1983 "Ideology and Political Economy in Inquiry: Action Research and Participatory Research." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 19(3):277-294.
- Browne, Rita-Jean & MaryLee Nolan  
 1989 "Western Indian Reservation Tourism Development." Annals of Tourism Research 16(3):360-376.
- Butz, David, Steven Lonergan & Barry Smit  
 1991 "Why International Development Neglects Indigenous Social Reality." Canadian Journal of Development Studies 12(1):143-157.

Callaway, Helen

- 1981 "Women's Perspectives: Research as Re-Vision." In P. Reason & J. Rowan (Eds.), Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons (457-471).

Campbell, David J.

- 1987 "Participation of a Community in Social Science Research: A Case Study from Kenya Maassailand." Human Organization 46(2):160-167.

Canada, House of Commons

- 1972 A Report by the Honourable Jean Crétien, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on the Government's northern objectives, priorities and strategies for the 70's. Appendix "B" of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development

Cassidy, Frank

- 1991 "Implementation: How Will First Nations Self-Government Happen?"; "Aboriginal Governments in Canada: An Emerging Field of Study." In Frank Cassidy, Ed., Aboriginal Self-Determination: Proceedings of a Conference Held September 30 -October 3, 1990. Lantzville & Montreal: Oolichan Books & Institute for Research on Public Policy (130-139; 252-282).

Castellano, Marlene Brant

- 1986 "Collective Wisdom: Participatory Research and Canada's Native People." Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education 19(3):50-53.

Chaiken, M.S.

- 1990 "Participatory Development and African Women: A Case Study from Western Kenya." In M.S. Chaiken & A.K. Fleuret (Eds.), Social Change and Applied Anthropology: Essays in Honour of David W. Brokenshaw. Boulder: Westview Press (84-98).

Chambers, Erve

- 1985 Applied Anthropology: A Practical Guide. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Chen, H-T & Rossi, P.H.

- 1980 "The Multi-Goal, Theory-Driven Approach to Evaluation: A Model Linking Basic and Applied Social Science." Social Forces 59(1):106-122.

- Chopra, Kanchan, Gopal K. Kadekodi, M.N. Murty  
1990 Participatory Development: People and Common Property Resources. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Coates, Kenneth  
1985 Canada's Colonies: A History of the Yukon and Northwest Territories. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company, Publishers.
- Cochrane, Glynn  
1979 The Cultural Appraisal of Development Projects. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Cohen, Erik  
1983 "Insiders and Outsiders: The Dynamics of Development of Bungalow Tourism on the Islands of Southern Thailand." Human Organization 42(2):158-162.
- Cohen, John M. & Norman T. Uphoff  
1977 Rural Development Participation: Concepts and Measures for Project Design, Implementation, and Evaluation. Rural Development Monograph No.2. Ithaca, N.Y.: Rural Development Committee Centre for International Studies, Cornell University.
- 1980 "Participation's Place in Rural Development: Seeking Clarity through Specificity." World Development 8:213-235.
- Conchelos, Greg & Yusuf Kassam  
1981 "A Brief Review of Critical Opinions and Responses on Issues Facing Participatory Research." Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education 14(3):52-64.
- Crick, Malcolm  
1985 "Tracing the Anthropological Self: Quizzical Reflections on Field Work, Tourism, and the Ludic." Social Analysis: Journal of Cultural and Social Practice 17:71-92.
- Dacks, Gurston  
1981 A Choice of Futures: Politics in the Canadian North. Toronto: Methuen.
- 1983 "Worker-Controlled Native Enterprises: A Vehicle for Community Development in Northern Canada?" The Canadian Journal of Native Studies 3(2):289-310.

- Damas, David  
 1963 Iglulingmiut Kinship and Local Groupings: A Structural Approach. Bulletin No.196, Ottawa: National Museum of Canada.
- 1969 "Problems of 'Rural' Canadian Eskimo Adaptation." In Milton M.R. Freeman (Ed.), Intermediate Adaptations in Newfoundland and the Arctic: A Strategy of Social and Economic Development. Institute of Social and Economic Research. St. John's: Memorial University Press (55-66).
- 1972 "Central Eskimo Systems of Food Sharing." Ethnology 11(3):220-240.
- DeKadt, Emanuel  
 1990 "Making the Alternative Sustainable: Lessons From Development For Tourism." Discussion Paper 272, Institute of Development Studies. Brighton: IDS Publications.
- Dickerson, Mark O.  
 1992 Whose North? Political Change, Political Development, and Self-Government in the Northwest Territories. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Dogan, Hasan Zafer  
 1989 "Forms of Adjustment: Sociocultural Impacts of Tourism." Annals of Tourism Research 16(2):216-236.
- Dosman, Edgar J.  
 1975 The National Interest: The Politics of Northern Development 1968-1975. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd.
- Duffy, R.Quinn  
 1988 The Road to Nunavut: The Progress of the Eastern Arctic Inuit Since the Second World War. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Dumont, Jean-Paul  
 1984 "A Matter of Touristic 'Indifférence'." American Ethnologist 11(1):139-151.
- Eber, Dorothy  
 1989 When the Whalers Were Up North: Inuit Memories From the Eastern Arctic. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

- Edwards, Michael  
1989 "The Irrelevance of Development Studies." Third World Quarterly 11(1):116-135.
- Efrat, Barbara & Marjorie Mitchell  
1974 "The Indian and the Social Scientist: Contemporary Contractual Arrangements on the Pacific Northwest Coast." Human Organization 33(4):405-407.
- Ferrazi, Gabriele  
1989 "Forging Aboriginal / Non-Aboriginal Partnerships: The Joint Venture Model." The Canadian Journal of Native Studies 9(1):15-32.
- Freeman, Milton M.R. (Ed.)  
1969. Intermediate Adaptation in Newfoundland and the Arctic: A Strategy of Social and Economic Development. Newfoundland Social and Economic Papers, No. 4. St. John's: Memorial University.
- 1977 "Anthropologists and Policy-Relevant Research: The Case for Accountability." In J. Freedman (Ed.), Applied Anthropology in Canada. Canadian Ethnology Society Proceedings No.4 (139-166).
- Freire, Paulo  
1970 Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Continuum Publishing Company.
- Gallacher, Shawn  
1990 "Green Tourism and Development: Towards a Symbiotic Relationship?" Conference paper (Unpublished). Canadian Association for the Study of International Development, May 31, 1990.
- Gaventa, John & Billy D. Horton  
1981 "A Citizens' Research Project in Appalachia, USA." Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education 14(3):30-42.
- Goldring, Philip  
1986 "Inuit Economic Responses to Euro-American Contacts: South-East Baffin Island, 1824-1940." Historical Papers 1986 (146-172).

- Gondolf, Edward W.  
1988 "In Search of Viable Community-Based Economic Organization: Native Village Corporations (Southern Alaska) and Peasant Sugar Cooperatives (Central India)." Human Organization 47(2):151-158.
- Government of the Northwest Territories  
1989 The Scone Report: Building Our Economic Future. Special Committee on the Northern Economy, Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories.
- 1991 Strength At Two Levels. Report of the Project to Review the Operations and Structure of Northern Government. Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories.
- Gow, David  
1991 "Collaboration in Development Consulting: Stooges, Hired Guns, or Musketeers?" Human Organization 50(1):1-15.
- Gow, David & Jerry Vansant  
1983 "Beyond the Rhetoric of Rural Development Participation: How Can It Be Done?" World Development 11(5):427-446.
- Greene, Jennifer G.  
1988 "Stakeholder Participation and Utilization in Program Evaluation." Evaluation Review 12(2):91-116.
- Guba, Egon G. & Yvonna S. Lincoln  
1989 Fourth Generation Evaluation. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Gustavsen, Bjorn  
1986 "Social Research as Participative Dialogue." In Frank Heller (Ed.), The Use and Abuse of Social Science. London: Sage Publications (143-156).
- Hall, Budd L.  
1975 "Participatory Research: An Approach for Change." Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education 8(2):24-31.
- 1979 "Knowledge as a Commodity and Participatory Research." Prospects 9(4):393-408.

Hall, Budd L. (continued)

1981 "Participatory Research, Popular Knowledge, and Power: A Personal Reflection." Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education 14(3):6-17.

Hedley, M.J.

1986 "Community Based Research: The Dilemma of Contract." The Canadian Journal of Native Studies 6(1):91-103.

Heighton Jr., Robert H., & Christy Heighton

1987 "Applying the Anthropological Perspective to Social Policy." In Elizabeth M. Eddy and Wm. L. Partridge (Eds.), Applied Anthropology in America, Second Edition. New York: Columbia University Press (460-481).

Henriksen, Georg

1985 "Anthropologists as Advocates - Promoters of Pluralism or Makers of Clients?" In Robert Paine (Ed.), Advocacy and Anthropology, First Encounters. St. John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland (119-129).

Hessler, Richard M., Peter Kong-Ming New, & J. Thomas May

1979 "Power, Exchange, and the Research-Development Link." Human Organization 38(4):334-342.

Higgins, Robert

1986 "The Inuit Tapirisat of Canada: 'Bridging the Gap, the Need for New Approaches to Northern Research and Education'," In: W.Peter Adams (Ed.), Education, Research, Information Systems and the North. ACUNS (36-38).

Hinshaw, Robert E.

1980 "Anthropology, Administration, and Public Policy." Annual Review of Anthropology 9:497-522.

Hoben, Allan

1982 "Anthropologists and Development." Annual Review of Anthropology 11:349-75.

Hsu, Francis L.

1983 Rugged Individualism Reconsidered: Essays in Psychological Anthropology. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.



- Hudson, Grace  
 1982 "Women's Participatory Research in the Kayahna Tribal Area: Collective Analysis of Employment Needs." In Ted Jackson, Don McCaskill and Budd L. Hall (Eds.), Learning for Self Determination: Community-Based Options for Native Training and Research. Canadian Journal of Native Studies 2(1):147-157.
- Ittinuar, Peter  
 1981 "Inuit Participation in Politics." In Morris Zaslow (Ed.), A Century of Canada's Arctic Islands, 1880-1980. 23rd Symposium. Canada: The Royal Society of Canada (291-298).
- Jackson, Ted, Don McCaskill, Budd L. Hall, Eds.  
 1982 Introduction to "Learning for Self Determination: Community-Based Options for Native Training and Research, Introduction." Special Issue; Canadian Journal of Native Studies 2(1):1-9.
- Jackson, Ted & Gerry McKay  
 1982 "Sanitation and Water Supply in Big Trout Lake: Participatory Research for Democratic Technical Solutions." Canadian Journal of Native Studies 2(1):129-145.
- Karapin, Roger S.  
 1986 "What's the Use of Social Science? A Review of the Literature." In Frank Heller (Ed.), The Use and Abuse of Social Science. London: Sage Publication (236-265).
- Kemp, William B.  
 1986 "Makivik Research Department and the Development of Inuit-Based Research and Scientific Education in Northern Quebec." In W.Peter Adams (Ed.), Education, Research, Information Systems and the North. ACUNS (39-42).
- Krefetz, Sharon P. & Allen E. Goodman  
 1973 "Participation For What or For Whom? Some Considerations For Research." Journal of Comparative Administration 5(3):367-380.
- Kurelek, Cathy  
 1992 "'When Are You Leaving?': Search for an Appropriate Research Methodology for Work with Aboriginal Peoples." M.A. Thesis (Unpublished). Department of Sociology and Anthropology. Ottawa: Carleton University.

Lange, Lynda

- 1987 A Report from the Native Groups of the Northwest Territories on Their Situation with Research: A Series of Individual Reports Based on Direct Consultation with Native Groups of the NWT. Yellowknife: Science Institute of the Northwest Territories.

Lawrence, John E.S.

- 1989 "Engaging Recipients in Development Evaluation." Evaluation Review 13(3):243-256.

Lee, Rebecca A. & J.C.M. Shute

- 1991 "An Approach to Naturalistic Evaluation: A Study of the Social Impact of and International Development Project." Evaluation Review 15(2):254-265.

Light, Linda & Nancy Kleiber

- 1981 "Interactive Research in a Feminist Setting: The Vancouver Women's Health Collective." In D.A. Messerschmidt (Ed.), Anthropologists at Home in North America. London: Cambridge University Press (167-182).

Lockhart, Alexander

- 1982 "The Insider-Outsider Dialectic in Native Socio-Economic Development: A Case Study in Process Understanding." Canadian Journal of Native Studies 2(1):159-168.

Lockhart, Alexander & Don McCaskill

- 1986 "Toward an Integrated, Community-Based Partnership Model of Native Development and Training: A Case Study in Process." The Canadian Journal of Native Studies 6(1):159-172.

Long, Norman

- 1975 "Structural Dependency, Modes of Production and Economic Brokerage in Rural Peru." In I. Oxaal, T. Barnett & D. Booth (Eds.), Beyond the Sociology of Development: Economy and Society in Latin America and Africa. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul (253-282).

MacCall, Brian

- 1981 "Popular Participation, Research and New Alliances." Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education 14(3):65-73.

- Maguire, Patricia  
 1987 Doing Participatory Research: A Feminist Approach.  
 Amherst, Massachusetts: The Centre for International  
 Education School, of Education, University of  
 Massachusetts.
- Mair, Lucy  
 1984 Anthropology and Development. London: MacMillan Press.
- Mallon, Mick  
 1991 Introductory Inuktitut. Montreal: Arctic College -  
 McGill University Press.
- Mark, Melvin M. & R. Lance Shotland  
 1985 "Stakeholder-Based Evaluation and Value Judgements."  
Evaluation Review 9(5):605-626.
- Maybury-Lewis, David  
 1985 "A Special Sort of Pleading -- Anthropology at the  
 Service of Ethnic Groups." In Robert Paine (Ed.),  
Advocacy and Anthropology, First Encounters. St.  
 John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research,  
 Memorial University of Newfoundland (130-148).
- Mayes, R.G.  
 1978 "The Creation of a Dependent People: The Inuit of  
 Cumberland Sound, NWT." Ph.D. Thesis (Unpublished).  
 Department of Geography. Montreal: McGill University.
- Milne, Simon  
 1992 "Tourism and Development in South Pacific  
 Microstates." Annals of Tourism Research 19(2):191-  
 212.
- Muller-Wille, Ludger  
 1987 "Indigenous Peoples, Land-Use Conflicts, and Economic  
 Development in Circumpolar Lands." Arctic and Alpine  
 Research 19(4):351-356.
- Myers, Marybelle  
 1982 "Beyond the Fur Trade: The Rise and Fall of the Eskimo  
 Co-operative." Alternative Routes 5:27-66.
- Nalven, Joseph  
 1987 "Measuring the Unmeasurable: A Microregional Study of  
 an Undocumented Population." In Robert M. Wulff &  
 Shirley J. Fiske (Eds.), Anthropological Praxis:  
 Translating Knowledge into Action. Boulder: Westview  
 Press (26-38).

- Nas, P.J.M., W.J.M. Prins, and W.A. Shadid  
 1987 "A Plea for Praxeology." In G.Clare Wenger (Ed.), The Research Relationship: Practice and Politics in Social Science Policy Research. London: Allen & Unwin (18-42).
- Nickels, Scott, Simon Milne and George Wenzel  
 1991 "Inuit Perceptions of Tourism Development: The Case of Clyde River, Baffin Island, N.W.T." Etudes/Inuit/Studies 15(1):157-169.
- Nuttal, Mark  
 1992 Arctic Homeland: Community and Development in Northwest Greenland. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Oliver-Smith, A., F.J. Arrones, & J.L. Arcal  
 1989 "Tourist Development and the Struggle for Local Resource Control." Human Organization 8(4):345-350.
- Paine, Robert (Editor)  
 1985 Advocacy and Anthropology, First Encounters. St. John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Parlett, Malcolm  
 1981 "Illuminative Evaluation." In P. Reason & J. Rowan (Eds.), Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons (219-226).
- Partridge, William L.  
 1987 "Toward a Theory of Practice." In Elizabeth M. Eddy and Wm. L. Partridge (Eds.), Applied Anthropology in America, Second Edition. New York: Columbia University Press (211-233).
- Pauktuutit: Inuit Women's Association of Canada  
 1991 The Inuit Way: A Guide to Inuit Culture. Ed., by David Boulton. Ottawa: Pauktuttit.
- Pigozzi, Mary Joy  
 1982 "Participation in Non-Formal Education Projects: Some Possible Negative Outcomes." Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education 15(3):6-17.
- Pinel, David  
 1992 "Questioning Participatory Community Development in the Third World." Nexus: The Canadian Student Journal of Anthropology 10:1-14.

- Place, Susan E.  
1991 "Nature Tourism and Rural Development in Tortugeuro." Annals of Tourism Research 18(2):186-201.
- Price, Richard T.  
1991 "A Community-Based Approach to Indian Self-Government." In F. Cassidy (Ed.), Aboriginal Self-Determination. Proceedings of a conference held September 30-October 3, 1990. Montreal & Lantzville: The Institute for Research on Public Policy & Oolichan Books (51-60).
- Quigley, N.C. and N.J McBride  
1987 "The Structure of an Arctic Microeconomy: The Traditional Sector in Community Economic Development." Arctic 40(3):204-210.
- Rahnema, Majid  
1990 "Participatory Action Research: The 'Last Temptation of Saint' Development." Alternatives: Social Transformation and Humane Governance 15:199-226.
- Reason, Peter & John Rowan  
1981 "Forward"; "On Making Sense"; "Issues of Validity in New Paradigm Research." In P. Reason & J. Rowan (Eds.), Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons (xi-xxiv; 113-137; 239-250).
- Rees, William  
1986 "The Genesis and Structure of the 'Dene Gondie' Study: What the People Say About the Norman Wells Project." The Canadian Journal of Native Studies 6(1):141-157.
- Reimer, Gwen  
1992 "Applied Dissertation Research: Self-Determination for Whom?" Nexus: The Canadian Student Journal of Anthropology 10:91-102.
- Richards, Howard C.  
1982 "The Evaluation of Cultural Action." Ph.D. Dissertation (Unpublished). Toronto: Department of Educational Theory, University of Toronto.
- Richer, Stephen  
1988 "Fieldwork and the Commodification of Culture: Why the Natives are Restless." The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 25(3):406-420.

- Rigby, Bruce & Douglas Stenton  
1992 "Renewing the Cultural Spirit: Inuit Study Their Past Alongside Southern Archaeologists." Arctic Circle 2(5):34-36.
- Robinson, Michael & Elmer Ghostkeeper  
1987 "Native and Local Economies: A Consideration of Economic Evolution and the Next Economy." Arctic 40(2):138-144.
- 1988 "Implementing the Next Economy in a Unified Context: A Case Study of the Paddle Prairie Mall Corporation." Arctic 41(3):173-182.
- Robitaille, Norbert & Robert Choinière  
1985 An Overview of Demographic and Socio-Economic Conditions of the Inuit in Canada. Prepared for the Research Branch, Corporate Policy, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Ottawa: Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.
- Rodman, Margaret C.  
1989 Deep Water: Development and Change in Pacific Village Fisheries. Boulder & London: Westview Press.
- Ross, W. Gillies  
1981 "Whaling, Inuit & the Arctic Islands." In Morris Zaslow (Ed.), A Century of Canada's Arctic Islands, 1880-1980. 23rd Symposium. Canada: The Royal Society of Canada (33-50).
- Rossi, Peter H. & Richard A. Berk  
1981 "An Overview of Evaluation Strategies and Procedures." Human Organization 40(4):287-299.
- Salisbury, Richard F.  
1986 A Homeland for the Cree: Regional Development in James Bay, 1971-1981. Kingston & Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Salmen, Lawrence F.  
1987 Listen to the People: Participant-Observer Evaluation of Development Projects. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Sansom, Basil  
1985 "Canons of Anthropology?" In Robert Paine (Ed.), Advocacy and Anthropology, First Encounters. St. John's: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland (3-12).
- Sathiendrakumar, R. & C. Tisdell  
1989 "Tourism and the Economic Development of the Maldives." Annals of Tourism Research 16(2):254-269.
- Schulte-Tenckhoff, Isabelle  
1988 "Potlatch and Totem: the Attraction of America's Northwest Coast." In Pierre Rosssel (Ed.), IWGIA Document 61, Tourism: Manufacturing the Exotic. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (117-145).
- Sherraden, Margaret Sherrard  
1991 "Policy Impacts of Community Participation: Health Services in Rural Mexico." Human Organization 50(3):256-262.
- Social Sciences & Humanities Research Council, Canada [SSHRC]  
1983 Community-Based Research: Report of the SSHRC Task Force on Native Issues. Ottawa:SSHRC.
- Souchette, Sandra  
1985 "Tourism: The Number Two Income Generating Enterprise in the NWT." Northwest Explorer 4(2):7-15.
- Stabler, Jack C.  
1985 "Development Planning North of 60: Requirements and Prospects." In M.S.Whittington (Ed.), The North. (Series Volume of the Royal Commission on the Economic and Development Prospects for Canada) Toronto: University of Toronto Press (23-52).
- Stavenhagen, Rudolfo  
1971 "Decolonizing Applied Social Sciences." Human Organization 30(4):333-357.
- Stone, Linda  
1989 "Cultural Crossroads of Community Participation in Development: A Case from Nepal." Human Organization 48(3):206-213.

- Stull, Donald D. & Jean J. Schensul (Eds.)  
1987 Collaborative Research and Social Change: Applied Anthropology in Action. Boulder & London: Westview Press.
- Swantz, Marja Liisa  
1975 "Research as an Educational Tool for Development." Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education 8(2):44-53.
- Thomas, Jim  
1993 Doing Critical Ethnography. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Tandon, Rajesh  
1981 "Participatory Research in the Empowerment of People." Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education 14(3):20-27.
- Tickner, J. Ann  
1986 "Local Self-Reliance Versus Power Politics: Conflicting Priorities of National Development." Alternatives 11(4):461-483.
- Tungavik Federation of Nunavut & Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development [TFN & DIAND]  
1992 Agreement Between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty in Right of Canada. Yellowknife: Inuit Ratification Committee.
- Turner, Allen C.  
1987 "Activating Community Participation in a Southern Paiute Reservation Development Program." In Robert M. Wulff & Shirley J. Fiske (Eds.), Anthropological Praxis: Translating Knowledge into Action. Boulder: Westview Press (118-132).
- Uphoff, Norman  
1985 "Fitting Projects to People." In Michael M. Cernea (Ed.), Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development. New York: Oxford University Press (359-395).
- Uphoff, Norman T, and Milton J. Esman  
1984 Local Organizations: Intermediaries in Rural Development. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.



- Usher, Peter J.  
1986 Property, The Basis the Inuit Hunting Rights - A New Approach. Ottawa: Inuit Committee on National Issues.
- Vallee, Frank G.  
1967 Povungnituk and Its Cooperative: A Case Study in Community Change. Ottawa: Northern Co-Ordination and Research Centre, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.
- Van Willigen, John  
1986 "Community Development." In Applied Anthropology: An Introduction. New York: Bergin & Garvey (93-109).
- Van Willigen, John, Barbara Rylko-Bauer, and Ann McElroy (Eds.)  
1989 Making Our Research Useful: Case Studies in the Utilization of Anthropological Knowledge. Boulder, San Francisco, & London: Westview Press.
- Vio Grossi, Francisco  
1981 "Socio-Political Implications of Participatory Research." Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education 14(3):43-51.
- Warry, Wayne  
1990 "Doing Unto Others: Applied Anthropology, Collaborative Research and Native Self-determination." Culture 10(1):61-73.
- 1992 "The Eleventh Thesis: Applied Anthropology as Praxis." Human Organization 51(2):155-163.
- Weaver, Thomas  
1985 "Anthropology as a Policy Science: Part I, A Critique." Human Organization 44(2):97-105.
- 1985 "Anthropology as a Policy Science: Part II, Development and Training." Human Organization 44(3):197-205.
- Weick, Edward R.  
1988 "Northern Native People and the Larger Canadian Society: Emerging Economic Relations." American Review of Canadian Studies 18(3):317-329.

- Wenzel, George W.  
1991 Animal Rights, Human Rights: Ecology, Economy and Ideology in the Canadian Arctic. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Whyte, W.F., Ed.  
1991 Participatory Action Research. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Wilkinson, Paul F.  
1989 "Strategies for Tourism in Island Microstates." Annals of Tourism Research 16(2):153-177.
- Wulff, Robert M. and Shirley J. Fiske (Eds.)  
1987 Anthropological Praxis: Translating Knowledge into Action. Boulder & London: Westview Press.
- Young, Oran R.  
1982 Resource Regimes: Natural Resources and Social Institutions. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Young, Ruth C.  
1977 "The Structural Context of the Caribbean Tourist Industry: A Comparative Study." Economic Development and Cultural Change 25:657-672.