WAYPOINTS ON THE CONTINUUM

STAGES FROM SONYA ATALAY (2012:48)

- Legally mandated consultation – bare minimum of interaction between researchers/CRM practitioners and communities, as required by United States laws such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)
- Public archaeology or “outreach” – providing education for members of the public who show interest, primarily schoolchildren and teachers
- Multivocality – multiple interested parties or “stakeholders” are involved in the project and the interpretation of results
- Community-based consultant model – an outside researcher is hired to work on a tribally/community-driven project
- Community-based participatory research – both the community members and the researcher enter willingly into a partnership in which the needs of all parties are heard and addressed through the research process. Partners work together to design, execute and interpret research.

THE COLLABORATIVE CONTINUUM IN ARCHAEOLOGY

HOLLIS MILLER

THE CONTINUUM

The collaborative continuum categorizes researcher-community interaction in the hopes of encouraging more collaborative partnerships in which research is done with, by and for Indigenous and descendant communities (Atalay 2012), rather than on them.

The collaborative continuum is derived from Chip Colwell and TJ Ferguson’s (2008) work on collaboration and engagement with descendant communities. It was later modified by Sonya Atalay (2012) in her book on community-based participatory research (CBPR) in archaeology.
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Nested representation of the collaborative continuum from Atalay (2012: 48). Used with author permission.

MOVING FROM ARCHAEOLOGIST-CENTERED TO INDIGENOUS-CENTERED RESEARCH: Chip Colwell (2016) places the continuum in the context of control over research. While this has been an area of contention, many Indigenous scholars argue that research is made more rigorous when it engages with multiple perspectives. Additionally, by ceding power over research design and results, archaeologists show respect for communities’ right to self-determination and acknowledge the colonial trauma of which their discipline was a part.
DIFFERENTIATING FORMS OF COLLABORATION

There are many different terms used in the archaeological literature that seem to refer to collaboration, yet not all entail a CBPR methodology. What are these different forms of collaboration?

Here is a quick overview (Atalay 2012:49-50):

- **Collaborative archaeology** – usually refers to CBPR or a similar practice, emphasizes an approach that seeks to bring together different ways of seeing and understanding the world (see Colwell-Chanthaphonh & Ferguson 2008)

- **Community archaeology** – can be used to describe a range of practices, some of which include CBPR. Always involves the local community, but usually not in the planning or interpretation phases of a project (see Simpson 2010 for case studies)

- **Cooperative archaeology** – not explicitly community-driven or participatory but encourages projects that interest communities. Communities involved, but not typically making decisions

- **Public archaeology** – akin to public outreach, where community members self-select to participate in or learn about a project. This outreach usually occurs after interpretations have been made (see Shackel & Chambers 2004 for case studies)

GETTING TOWARDS CBPR

While terms like ‘community archaeology’ and ‘public archaeology’ do engage non-archaeologists, they often describe projects that are not community-driven. How do we get from there to CBPR?

- Collaborate with community members at all stages of the project
- Share power over the project and the knowledge and material that is produced from it – knowledge flows in and out of both the community and academy/discipline
- Recognize that to do CBPR is to have an active commitment to and relationship to the partner community

RESOURCES:


---

Elements of a Community-Based Research Protocol

1. Community works in partnership with researchers to set standards and protocols for research.
2. Research goals integrate community needs and perspectives alongside those of archaeologists.
3. Community members are compensated for their time and work at levels consistent with other paid research consultants.
4. Community has the right to determine how to share and/or disseminate the results of research.
5. Community has the right to determine the process of research on sensitive topics.
6. Collaboration is envisioned as a long-term commitment.
7. Research methods are developed in accordance with community perspectives and values.
8. Research contributes to the capacity of a community to manage its cultural resources.
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