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Abstract

This thesis explores Indigenization in the context of archaeology and Western education at the Tundra Science and Culture Camp (TSCC), a government-run summer camp in the Northwest Territories, Canada. By collaborating with Indigenous knowledge holders, it begins the process of re-designing the Human History session—a program within the TSCC that focuses on archaeology and the cultural sites around the camp—to incorporate more Indigenous pedagogies and knowledge. Drawing on semi-structured interviews and participant observation, this thesis outlines an attempt to Indigenize the Human History session at the 2022 TSCC, its successes and challenges, and diverse conceptions of what it would mean to Indigenize the camp. This thesis concludes that the camp’s current Western structure and hidden curriculum greatly limit the extent to which programming within it can be effectively Indigenized. It recommends that camp organizers including the Indigenous instructors step back and articulate the aims of Indigenizing the camp in order to chart future directions for achieving those aims.
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Summary for Lay Audience

This thesis attempts to integrate Indigenous knowledge and teaching methods into an archaeology curriculum delivered at the Tundra Science and Culture Camp (TSCC), a summer camp for high school students in the Northwest Territories, Canada. The TSCC has been undergoing an Indigenization process for many years. The inspiration for this research comes from previous efforts that have incorporated Indigenous elements into archaeology education through field schools. Integrating Indigenous knowledge and perspectives into non-Indigenous settings is becoming increasingly common. In North America, Indigenous activists have advocated for greater acknowledgement and consideration of the value of Indigenous knowledge in research and education. Incorporating Indigenous knowledge into non-Indigenous settings can increase diversity and holistic understandings (Archibald, 2008).

The following study collaborates with Indigenous knowledge holders from the Tłı̨chǫ First Nation to determine how to best weave Indigenous pedagogies into an existing archaeology curriculum titled Human History. Using semi-structured interviews and participant observation, I discuss the successes and challenges of beginning this process of Indigenization with participants at the TSCC in 2022. I interviewed nine (current and former) staff members and nine campers before and after the TSCC to get their insights on the changes made to the Human History session and their feelings towards Indigenization at the TSCC as a whole.

This thesis finds that there are barriers to attempting to Indigenize something within an existing Western structure. In the same way that bringing in different pieces of furniture will not renovate a house, incorporating Indigenous knowledge and pedagogies into a
Western framework will not change that framework. There were limitations to the Indigenous pedagogies which could be incorporated into the Human History session. Factors such as time constraints, scheduling issues, and the hidden curriculum (the unwritten and often unintentional lessons and values taught in learning environments) made it difficult to effectively bring these elements into the session. Future attempts to Indigenize elements within the TSCC should be aware of this and consider altering the framework of the TSCC to represent both Indigenous and Western knowledge and approaches to teaching and learning more equally. They should begin by agreeing on the overarching aims of Indigenizing the camp.
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Chapter 1

1 Setting the Stage: A Discussion of Context, Theoretical Frameworks, and Methodology

1.1 Aims and Research Questions

Colonization is an ongoing process around the world (Tuck & Yang, 2012) and in settler colonial states like Canada, education systems are a means through which colonialism is perpetuated (Battiste, 2013; Cote-Meek & Moeke-Pickering, 2020). Western approaches to education dominate in settler colonial contexts, prioritizing Western values and pedagogies. In Canada non-Western education is not recognized on an equal footing with Western education and credentials, if at all; a clear example of ongoing colonization and erasure of Indigenous cultures (Archibald, 2008; Battiste & Youngblood, 2009; Battiste, 2013; Cote-Meek & Moeke-Pickering, 2020; Groen & Kawalilak, 2019; Harp, 2021a; Harp, 2021b). Deliberately or not, dominant educational structures frame Western knowledge and education as superior to Indigenous ones and contribute to the racism faced by Indigenous groups across the country. Indigenous activists have highlighted these injustices over the years and, as a result, the Canadian government has been forced to acknowledge the damage it continues to do to Indigenous peoples. However, acknowledgement is not action. Performative statements and the adoption and misuse or words like decolonize and Indigenize have been used as a way to save face (Tuck and Yang, 2012), but little has actually been done to right these wrongs.

Indigenous scholars and activists are working to bring meaningful change to education systems. They are creating Indigenous run schools to educate Indigenous youths on their cultures and languages and lobbying to bring more Indigenous knowledge
into mainstream Western education as a way to combat harmful stereotypes and beliefs about Indigenous peoples perpetuated in Western education (Archibald, 2008; Battiste & Youngblood, 2009; Battiste, 2013; Cote-Meek & Moeke-Pickering, 2020; Harp, 2021a; Harp, 2021b). The goal of my research is to follow in their footsteps and work with members of the Tłı̨chǫ First Nation to begin changing how we educate youths on archaeology and human history in the Northwest Territories (NWT). Drawing on my own experience as a student and instructor, my project focuses on the archaeology component of the Tundra Science and Culture Camp—a ten-day educational summer camp for high-school aged students from the NWT.

As part of broader initiatives by the GNWT to Indigenize teaching and learning, the GNWT organizers have been working to bring more Indigenous elements into the TSCC programming for many years. Their goal is to increase the enrollment of Indigenous campers and build stronger relationships with the Indigenous Elders who attend as instructors. Initially, my project was solely focused on Indigenizing the Human History session at the camp—which currently centres around the archaeology of the surrounding area—by collaborating with Tłı̨chǫ Elders to design it. However, my project shifted as a result of logistical constraints which prevented me from having discussions with the Elders beforehand, my increasing recognition that “Indigenizing” the camp meant different things to different people, and my realization that the structure of the camp itself made “Indigenizing” challenging. Reflecting back on the entire experience, these are the research questions that I aim to answer in this thesis:

(1) What is the best way to incorporate more Tłı̨chǫ knowledge and implement Tłı̨chǫ pedagogies within the archaeology programming of the camp?
(2) How and to what degree does the overall structure of the camp reflect Western and Tłı̨chǫ ways of knowing and approaches to education? What implications does this have for Indigenizing a non-Indigenous archaeology curriculum? and

(3) How do people of differing identities currently experience the camp? What implications does this have for Indigenizing the camp program?

1.2 The Tundra Science and Culture Camp

As a student in high school, I attended a summer camp in the Canadian tundra called the Tundra Science Camp (TSC). There, I was able to learn about various topics from experts, including: Indigenous knowledge, animal biology, geoscience, and aquatic life. The one that stood out to me the most was human history, which had a strong focus on archaeology. Since attending the TSC as a student in 2012, I have been pursuing a career in archaeology and had the chance to return to the camp in 2019 and 2021 as a co-instructor of the same human history session that inspired me years ago.

As a non-Indigenous researcher who was born and raised in the Northwest Territories, I want to make my positionality within the context of my project clear. Throughout my youth, I have had the opportunity to learn from Tłı̨chǫ Elders who have shared their knowledge with Indigenous and non-Indigenous students alike. Tłı̨chǫ are a Dene Nation1 with lands located between Great Slave Lake and Great Bear Lake. In middle school I vividly remember learning how to skin and soften caribou and moose

---

1 “Also known as the Athapaskan peoples, the Dene Nation is a political organization in Denendeh, meaning “The Land of the People”, located in Northwest Territories, Canada. The Dene Nation covers a large geographical area — from present day Alaska to the southern-most tip of North America.” (Dene Nation, 2021).
hide with metatarsal bone tools. I attended a fish camp and made dry fish with the Elders. I remember hearing the creation stories and listening to the legends of Yamǫqǫzha who saved the Dene people from the giant wolverine and taught them how to live. In high school, I was taught how to properly stretch and attach caribou hide to the wooden frame of the Dene drum using sinew. As a student at the Tundra Science Camp in 2012, Tłı̨chǫ Elders taught me how to make a caribou hide rattle. They shared stories about the land, how the Dene would navigate within it, and how the land would provide everything they needed. They told us that we must respect the land—including the animals, because we all rely on each other for survival. I recognize that, as an outsider, my understanding of these Tłı̨chǫ teachings are incomplete, but nevertheless, they remain as powerful experiences for me.

The same year I attended as a student, a shift began within the camp. There was a desire from the camp staff to show their respect for the Indigenous aspects of the camp, which had included Indigenous Elders as instructors since its inception in 1995, and to reflect that more clearly for future student participants. For that reason, the TSC was officially renamed the Tundra Science and Culture Camp (TSCC) ahead of the 2013 season. This change began an ongoing process of Indigenization, with small changes

---

The term ‘Indigenize’ is complex and is used in different ways by different scholars. It is problematic in that it lumps together all Indigenous communities and therefore glosses the diversity between and within Indigenous nations and communities. Any attempt to Indigenize must be tailored to the specific group in question. Programs intended to serve multiple Indigenous communities must grapple with how to address the need for specificity. When I refer to ‘Indigenization,’ I’m speaking broadly about the incorporation of Indigenous practices and worldviews into areas that have typically been dominated by non-Indigenous influences. Any educational approaches, worldviews, and practices specific to the Tłı̨chǫ community are explicitly labeled as such within this thesis. While the TSCC serves students from multiple Indigenous communities, it takes place on Tłı̨chǫ lands and therefore focusses on Tłı̨chǫ knowledge, ways and language.
being implemented over the years to increase the representation of Indigenous knowledge and culture within the TSCC.

The TSCC is a ten-day summer camp that is put on by the Government of the Northwest Territories (GNWT) Environment and Climate Change (ECC) division. It is hosted at the Tundra Ecosystem Research Station (TERS) a remote research station on Daring Lake, NWT, which was built in 1994. The TSCC was established the following year when, according to Tom Andrews, a former instructor at the camp and Northwest Territories Territorial Archaeologist (now retired), a number of GNWT scientists came together to turn it into a teaching and learning environment for NWT youths.

The research station [TERS] was built to create a baseline against which they could measure the impact of the nearby diamond mines [Diavik and Ekati]. This was a place where scientists could congregate to undertake studies, and check the pulse of the tundra, and see how the diamond mines impacted the environment. I mean, it is such a stunning environment, that it just seemed silly that we didn't use it as a teaching environment as well. And it really was just as simple as that. We wanted to incorporate students in the conduct of science out on the tundra. That was really the goal. To show them how science is done, teach them about the methods, and give them an opportunity to participate in real science projects, while letting them test their own capacities by generating projects and collections and all those kinds of things, you know, as scientists. And right from the very beginning we knew that this was an Indigenous landscape. So, I used to teach the kids that every kind of ologists that you need to answer a question is here in this camp. There is a geologist, an archaeologist, a biologist, and Elder-ologists, I used to call them. No matter what question you had, whether it was science or cultural, there was somebody here to answer it. (Tom Andrews – Former TSCC Instructor, October 18th, 2022).

---

3 Use of names: Adult participants selected how they wished to be referred to. Those who consented to being identified by their first and last names will be consistently referred to as such throughout the thesis. Individuals who opted for anonymity during interviews have been anonymized when quoted directly. All direct quotes from camper participants have been anonymized.
Figure 1-1. Aerial View of the Tundra Ecosystem Research Station.

The TERS is located approximately 300km north of Yellowknife and can only be reached via float plane or helicopter. Figure 1-1 displays the TERS station as seen in satellite imagery along with a photo of the camp taken by me in 2022. The TERS station is situated within an electric fence that acts as a deterrent for large animals in the area. The camp consists of ten commercial Weatherhaven tents, which provide shelter for researchers and TSCC participants. During the TSCC, the high-school aged campers reside in the one of two Weatherhaven “bunkhouses”, one for girls and one for boys. The Indigenous Elders also reside in a Weatherhaven. GNWT instructors, teacher campers,
and current researchers at the camp reside in camping tents just behind the Weatherhavens.

**Figure 1-2.** Map of TERS during the TSCC. Drawn in 2023 by Annabella Churchill. Used with permission.
Figure 1-2 is a map of the TERS compound as illustrated by a camper from the 2023 Tundra Science and Culture Camp. In the bottom centre of this illustration is a grey circle titled ‘nimba’. Nimba is the Tłı̨chǫ word for tipi and is set up with the Elders on the first day of camp. Many of the Tłı̨chǫ activities are held within the nimba and it is often a social hub for the campers and Elders for the duration of the camp. Figures 1-3 through 1-6 are photos I took of the Tundra Ecosystem Research Station and its surrounding area, which I have included for additional context.

Figure 1-3. View from the back of the TERS facing Daring Lake, NWT. Eight Weatherhaven tents are visible along with the frame of the Nimba (centre left).
Figure 1-4. View from the front of the Lab Tent (see figure 1-2), facing Daring Lake. The electric bear fence and gate are visible along with the Fish Tent.
Figure 1-5. View of the float plane arriving with the campers on Daring Lake seen through the frame of the Nimba.
Figure 1-6. View of the TERS with Daring Lake visible on the left. An esker is visible on the right and extends past the camp.

Promotional material for the TSCC is sent across the NWT; to schools and Indigenous communities to be passed along to students between the ages of 14 and 18. Figure 1-7 displays the flyer used as the camp’s promotional material in 2022.
There are a number of participants who make up the TSCC each year, including GNWT employees who take on the role of instructors. At this point in the camp’s 20 plus year history, many have been passed the baton of ‘instructor’ by someone who helped create the camp initially. The instructors also include Tłı̨chǫ Elders and interpreters. Then there are the campers, including both high-school-aged campers and teacher campers who attend to gain experience and learn about the tundra. Table 1-1 shows how I will be referring to the TSCC participants throughout this thesis.

Table 1-1. Titles for TSCC participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Referring to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>All TSCC instructors (Elders, interpreters, and GNWT instructors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campers</td>
<td>High-school-aged campers, and teacher campers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Instructors and Campers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Indigenization at the TSCC: Conflicting Perspectives

The term Indigenization refers to the concept of incorporating Indigenous perspectives, values, practices, and knowledge into various aspects of society. There is no single, clear-cut way in which to Indigenize something because Indigenous communities are diverse, as are the contexts being Indigenized. The concept can be problematic when applied in superficial ways, as it can be a way to appear to be addressing Indigenous concerns without making meaningful change. As an archaeologist with a strong interest in archaeological education, my study draws on broader moves to “Indigenize” archaeology and education. Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars have called for shifts in archaeological practice which incorporate Indigenous ways of knowing into the discipline, such as Atalay’s call for bringing together archaeological and Indigenous ways of knowing in an approach she calls “braided knowledge” (2020). The goals of Indigenization in archaeology are to acknowledge and place value on Indigenous or descendant communities' culture, traditional ways of life, knowledge sharing, and interpretation of history (Atalay, 2019). For most of archaeology's history in the Americas and other colonized regions, there has been little to no interaction between archaeologists and descendant communities. Archaeologists trained in Western science would plan, excavate, and interpret histories that were not theirs, without any form of consultation with the Indigenous peoples being studied (Steeves, 2015; Atalay, 2019). Creating a more inclusive archaeological practice involves taking a step back from viewing Western science as the best way of collecting, preserving, and telling Indigenous histories (Tomaselli & Dyll-Myklebust, 2015; Schneider & Hayes, 2020). Indigenous consultation, incorporation of Indigenous knowledge, and increased control of cultural
heritage by descendant communities are all considered to be elements within a spectrum of Indigenization in archaeological practice.

There are differing opinions on the role Western science should play when discussing Indigenization in archaeology. Some argue that Western science and methodologies should be used alongside Indigenous perspectives and interpretations to Indigenize archaeological theory and practice (Smith, 1999). Others argue that Indigenization should involve the complete removal of Western science and perspectives from places with colonial histories to allow for exclusively Indigenous control over their cultural heritage (Schneider & Hayes, 2020). Colwell’s collaborative spectrum (2016) illustrates how archaeological work, research, and interpretation can range from colonial control to community control. Figure 1-8 displays a spectrum of Indigenization that I have adapted from Colwell’s collaborative spectrum, ranging from no Indigenous involvement (i.e., no Indigenization) to complete Indigenous sovereignty.

This change to archaeological practice has also led to the Indigenization of archaeological education in field schools. There have been moves to step away from the standard archaeological field school, which focuses mainly on artifact recovery, identification, and interpretation to field schools that include descendant community involvement and Indigenous pedogeological approaches to the teaching and research methods (Bendremer & Thomas, 2008; Cipolla & Quinn, 2016; Mills et al., 2008; Rahemtulla, 2020; Silliman & Sebastian Dring, 2008). These field schools aim to address the ways in which archaeology upholds colonial power structures and work to dismantle them. Building strong relationships with Indigenous communities is a key aspect of the Indigenization process in these field schools (Bendremer & Thomas, 2008; Cipolla &
These changes in archaeology and archaeological education are happening alongside efforts to Indigenize Western education more broadly (see Chapter 2.1).

Figure 1-8. Spectrum of Indigenization with examples, (adapted from Colwell’s, 2016 collaborative spectrum).

Since its inception, there has been an ongoing effort to represent Indigenous knowledge within the TSCC. Indigenization of the camp has involved including Indigenous Elders as instructors and inviting them to share stories, knowledge, and skills. GNWT staff have observed low participation rates by Indigenous campers and share a desire to ensure the camp is accessible to Indigenous youths across the territory and to increase their participation in the camp. They also recognize that there are opportunities
to incorporate more Indigenous content that are not currently being taken advantage of. While they share a desire to do more, limitations of time and funding have meant that Indigenization efforts to date have been opportunistic and piecemeal.

 GNWT education policy is committed to Indigenizing education, defined as “A pedagogical shift that centres Indigenous content and cultures, within which every subject at every level is examined to consider how and to what extent current content and pedagogy reflect Indigenous peoples and Indigenous knowledge. This is strengthened through teaching and learning practices that are holistic, spiral, experiential and relational” (Government of the Northwest Territories, 2018, p. 2). It calls for an examination and strengthening of the degree to which Indigenous peoples and knowledges are reflected in teaching. This policy was likely designed to be broad enough that it can cover all the different areas where education can be Indigenized in the Territory. It is notable that it says nothing about the degree to which Indigenous content and pedagogy should be strengthened. The TSCC’s Indigenization efforts to date could easily be considered to meet this definition of Indigenization, as could any effort, no matter how small, to incorporate Indigenous knowledges and approaches to teaching and learning. This definition lacks specificity regarding how educational bodies should go about Indigenizing education and does not even explicitly mention the involvement of Indigenous communities, which is often a crucial aspect of successful Indigenization efforts. A cynic might suggest that the GNWT definition allows them to claim that they are Indigenizing education across the territory while actually changing very little.

 In October of 2015, just four months after the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada released its Calls to Action, the GNWT released its initial
response. In this response, under *Youth Programs (TRC Recommendation 66)* they state “The GNWT provides support to community-based youth programs and facilities including Northern Youth Abroad and the Dechinta Centre for Research and Learning as well as the **Tundra Science Camp** [emphasis added] that focuses on language and heritage learning. The GNWT supports the establishment or continuation of multi-year community-based youth organization funding programs that promote leadership and healthy choices options for NWT youth” (Government of the Northwest Territories, 2015, p. 26). The TSCC is described by the GNWT as a program that focuses on “language and heritage learning” however, in my experience while these have been an aspect of the camp, ‘science’ has always been the focus. I also find it ironic that in this response the GNWT refers to the camp as the Tundra Science Camp instead of the Tundra Science and Culture Camp, despite the name change occurring three years prior, ignoring an obvious move to Indigenize it. In this response the GNWT is misleading people about the program, presenting it falsely as focused on Indigenous language and culture. They are also using this misrepresentation as a move to innocence—a strategy or action where individuals or entities attempt to distance themselves from guilt or criticism by presenting themselves as “innocent”, often used to deflect attention from underlying issues (Tuck & Yang, 2012).

The GNWT was clearly aware of changes that could be made to educational programming within the territory to better integrate and support Indigenous knowledge a decade prior to the release of the TRC’s Calls to Action. Their 2005 Traditional Knowledge policy included the following principles: “(3) Traditional knowledge should be considered in the design and delivery of government programs and services” and “(5)
Traditional knowledge is best preserved through continued use and practical application” (Government of the Northwest Territories, 2005, p. 1). Yet despite there being programs like the TSCC which are actively aiming to apply these principles they do not seem to be widely applied and lack adequate government funding. The policy also states that Traditional Knowledge Coordinators will “…Identify areas where traditional knowledge could successfully be incorporated into the design or delivery of government programs” (Government of the Northwest Territories, 2005, p. 4). Having a Traditional Knowledge Coordinator involved in the TSCC could assist greatly in helping the TSCC achieve the level of Indigenization that the GNWT claims it has already achieved.

The TSCC, as a camp that takes learners onto the land to place them directly within the physical context of what they are learning, could be considered as already being “Indigenized” in GNWT’s sense of the word. The GNWT defines “Indigenization” differently from the Tłı̨chǫ Elders and other Indigenous participants who attend the camp. The GNWT instructors at the TSCC define it differently again because they have direct experience of the camp, something that cannot be reflected within reports they provide to the GNWT. My thesis explores these different understandings of what it would mean to Indigenize the camp and suggests what meaningful Indigenization, which moves the camp from the lower end of the spectrum towards the higher end, could look like.

1.4 Theoretical Framework

1.4.1 Anti-Colonial Approaches in Education and Archaeology

My thesis is informed by anti-colonial approaches in both education and archaeology. Dei and Asgharzadeh (2001) describe anti-colonialism as being “an
epistemology of the colonized” as it examines, questions, and resists colonial powers and ideologies (p. 300). This approach is one of the main themes of my research. I set out to resist the colonial nature of archaeology as well as how we teach others about archaeology and the past. Anti-colonialism serves as the base framework for this project, but I also apply it to myself. As a white researcher, I must be mindful and critical of my reasonings and interpretations when doing research with Indigenous peoples and cultures. I am an outsider trying to understand and incorporate Indigenous pedagogies and ways of knowing into the deeply colonial discipline of archaeology, which demands a recognition of the limits of my own knowledge and the risks of inadvertently causing harm. For the purpose of this thesis, I define anti-colonialism as a consistent resistance against the colonial power structures and mindsets and the subversion of conventional power relations which have been imposed and embedded into the collective consciousness (Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001; Nunn & Whetung, 2020; Tuck & Yang, 2012).

Education in Canada takes a Western approach, which frames learning as competitive, individualistic, and hierarchical (Kozlowski, 2021). Students are expected to compete against one another to achieve the highest grade (this is especially prevalent when applying to universities) and teachers are seen as authority figures who control knowledge (i.e., what is taught, how it is taught, and how well the students are learning). Anti-colonialism requires teachers to look beyond and question their typical curriculums and actively look for alternative lessons and knowledge assessments to transform the educational space (Dei and Kempf, 2006). Revising curriculums to challenge Western narratives and emphasise Indigenous understandings and knowledge while also changing the learning environment to remove the sense of power that teachers have over the
students is crucial to anti-colonial education (Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001; Dei and Kempf, 2006).

An anti-colonial approach to archaeology involves actively unlearning biases prioritizing Western science and interpretations over those of Indigenous peoples. Archaeologists, like myself, need to learn about Indigenous knowledge and the traditional ways that history was taught and kept alive prior to European contact (Tomaselli & Dyll-Myklebust, 2015). Building relationships based on mutual respect and trust is crucial for anti-colonial work, as this can lead to descendant communities gaining more sovereignty over the cultural record and how it is analysed, interpreted, and stored (Steeves, 2015). Different perspectives from descendant communities can contribute to a more holistic understanding of the archaeological record (Atalay, 2019). Anti-colonial work can also expand the definition of what is “valuable” in the archaeological record beyond just modified objects to include sacred or traditional use landscapes (Schneider & Hayes, 2020). Anti-colonial archaeology requires collaboration with Indigenous communities to determine how best to serve descendant communities and create a more welcoming environment for Indigenous and non-Western individuals interested in the field. This would change the dynamics between descendant communities and Western scientists through a shift of power towards the people whose history is being studied (Smith, 1999; Steeves, 2015; Tomaselli & Dyll-Myklebust, 2015).

This increase in control over their cultural heritage can help to address the political marginalization that Indigenous communities have faced and continue to face when dealing with colonial archaeologists (Bruchac, 2014). Anti-colonial approaches will significantly change political relations between descendant communities and researchers,
leading to more requirements for collaboration than what has been seen traditionally in archaeology (Bruchac, 2014). This shift is not only seen in archaeological practice, but it also extends to ideas of land and how traditional Indigenous landscapes are used to generate wealth in non-Indigenous communities (Tuck & Yang, 2012; Kauanui, 2016). Differing perspectives from outside archaeology, such as the Land-Back movement, are bound to alter the political relationships between descendant communities and governing structures (Atalay, 2019).

Decisions regarding how to approach anti-colonial research need to be made on a case-by-case basis as Indigenous communities are not monolithic; there will not be a ‘one size fits all’ method of anti-colonial archaeology because there is no way to create a system of operations that would apply to every situation (Atalay, 2019; Schneider & Hayes, 2020; Steeves, 2015). Anti-colonial approaches must be taught and continually updated as they will continue to change as descendant voices increase and provide new ideas of what anti-colonial research means for them. Indigenous activism should not be a requirement for change to occur in archaeology; non-Indigenous archaeologists must also be active.

The TSCC has been building this relationship with Indigenous knowledge holders for over 20 years; however, there is still work to be done to shift the colonial approach of the camp, as my thesis will demonstrate. My research relied on Indigenous knowledge holders’ willingness to collaborate with me to develop a new program at the camp. It demanded a significant amount of trust and willingness to communicate about any issues or tensions that arose. I worked to foster respectful, open communication, while recognizing that the structure of the camp and my own role within it might work against
the anti-colonial aims of this research. I recognized that Indigenous knowledge holders might be reluctant to voice criticisms about the program or the camp itself because of a history of Indigenous voices not being heard by the GNWT that operates the camp, and because I was an instructor at the camp. Nonetheless, I hoped that my project might be a step in moving the camp in an anti-colonial direction.

1.4.1.1 Why Anti-Colonialism rather than Decolonization?

Throughout this thesis I use the terms Indigenization and anti-colonialism rather than decolonization, because many Indigenous scholars are critical of the latter term. They argue that decolonization demands the full reclamation of Indigenous sovereignty including return of land and full control by descendant communities over their lives, hunting practices, and land use (Morgensen, 2011; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Tuck et al., 2014). Tuck and Yang (2012) argue that any other use of the term is metaphorical and problematic: “when metaphor invades decolonization, it kills the very possibility of decolonization; it recenters whiteness, it resettles theory, it extends innocence to the settler, it entertains a settler future. Decolonize (a verb) and decolonization (a noun) cannot easily be grafted onto pre-existing discourses/frameworks, even if they are critical, even if they are anti-racist, even if they are justice frameworks” (p. 3).

Archaeology and education therefore cannot be “decolonized” through the efforts of descendant community engagement, collaboration, or the incorporation of Indigenous pedagogies and knowledge. Decolonization of archaeology would include dismantling the colonial underpinnings that make up the field and would result in various new fields being created, which would likely differ depending on the wishes of the Indigenous communities in the area. “Archaeology” would likely no longer exist in areas of the
world affected by colonization; either something new would take its place, or it would simply disappear. Referring to archaeological work and education as “decolonized”, or “decolonizing” undermines the literal definition of the word and takes away from the seriousness of decolonization efforts. I therefore use the terms “anti-colonialism” and “Indigenizing” throughout my thesis to describe my project and the broader move towards centring Indigenous perspectives and pedagogies in archaeology and education, and returning control of archaeological collections, interpretation, and dissemination to Indigenous peoples.

1.4.2 Strong Like Two People

My research also draws on a Tłı̨chǫ approach to teaching and learning known as Strong Like Two People. This approach focuses on weaving together aspects of Indigenous and Western knowledge to create a more holistic understanding of topics from different points of view. The concept was developed by Chief Jimmy Bruneau in 1971 to ensure through bicultural education that Tłı̨chǫ youth could be strong in the Western world as well as strong in their own culture. Later, respected Bechokǫ́ Elder Elizabeth Mackenzie parsed his vision as “Strong Like Two People” (Tłı̨chǫ Government, 2017). In 1972 the Chief Jimmy Bruneau school was opened in Behchokǫ́ (formally Rae-Edzo), one of the first Indigenous controlled schools in Canada.

While it could be argued that the TSCC, a land-based program which works with Tłı̨chǫ Elders to incorporate Tłı̨chǫ culture and practices, already includes many elements of Strong Like Two People, I believe this vision is incompletely realized within the existing structure of the camp. Non-Indigenous people often leave the onus of the bringing Indigenous elements to educational programming solely to Indigenous people,
not bothering to examine or unlearn the colonial desires and practices present in their own work (Cote-Meek & Moeke-Pickering, 2020; Schmidt, 2019). While schools and training programs are increasingly providing timeslots for Indigenous programming, and hiring more Indigenous teachers, additional supports are rarely forthcoming (Cote-Meek & Moeke-Pickering, 2020; Schmidt, 2019). I believe the lack of support from non-Indigenous people stems partly from a fear of ‘overstepping’, such as speaking on Indigenous culture without having an adequate understanding. However, I also believe that many non-Indigenous educators use this as an excuse to avoid doing the work of educating themselves, building partnerships with Indigenous educators, and creating a curriculum that better intertwines Indigenous and Western knowledges. Working with my Tł̓ı̨chǫ collaborators, I wanted to help implement a Strong Like Two People approach within the TSCC.

1.4.3 Intersectionality

Conceived by Crenshaw (1989), intersectionality is a way of conceptualizing how the different aspects of the social identity of individuals or groups—race, gender, class, etc.—are interconnected and interact. Intersectionality describes how everyone has unique experiences, especially regarding discrimination, based on how these social categories ‘intersect’. The same activity can be and is experienced differently by different individuals or groups. The purpose of intersectional analysis is not to dissect a person's identity into discrete categories but instead to display how those identities cannot be separated when examining their experience. Crenshaw noted that discrimination can change based on a person’s gender, sex, race, physical ability, etc., and the combination
of these aspects create a unique form of discrimination as well as a unique experience for an individual.

The diversity of the TSCC participants in terms of race and age all play a role in how people experience the camp. There are also additional factors such as roles within the camp as GNWT instructor, Indigenous instructor, Elder, student camper and teacher camper, which become part of one’s identity while attending the TSCC. I aim to consider all these factors and how they interact with each other when looking at the experiences of the participants in the 2022 camp season. I also remain aware that my identity as an instructor, a white woman, and a researcher shaped the information participants shared with me, which must be factored into any interpretation.

1.5 Methodology

To address my first research question, “What is the best way to incorporate more Tłı́chǫ̥ knowledge and implement Tłı́chǫ̥ pedagogies within the archaeology programming of the camp?”, I initially hoped to co-create a new Human History curriculum with the Tłı́chǫ̥ Elders who participate in the camp. However, logistical challenges meant that we were unable to meet before the camp took place. Instead, I collaborated with Tłı́chǫ̥ knowledge holders by having a series of conversations about the Human History session and ways in which Indigenous knowledge and pedagogies could be included. They helped me think about ways I could bring in more Indigenous elements into the Human History session. Unfortunately, these knowledge holders did not possess the same knowledge of the camp as the Elders, and I had to take this into consideration when revising the plans for the session.
To determine the success of the revised session, and to address my other research questions about how the camp reflects Western and Tłı̨chǫ knowledges and pedagogies, and how people of differing identities experienced the camp, I conducted semi-structured interviews with consenting TSCC instructors and campers before and after camp. I interviewed nine Instructors and nine campers at a location of their choosing in Yellowknife, on Zoom, or at the camp. The pre-camp interviews for TSCC instructors focused on: the sessions they instructed at the camp, their observations of camper engagement in their sessions and in the camp, stresses and challenges they face as instructors, and changes they would like to see in the camp. The pre-camp interviews for the campers focused on: how they heard about the TSCC program, what made them interested in attending, what they were most exited for, and how prepared they felt for the camp. The post-camp interviews for the instructors focused on comparing their experience in 2022 with previous years that they have instructed at the camp and whether they felt that their session could benefit from the application of more Indigenous knowledge and pedagogies. The post-camp interviews for the campers focused on their experiences of the camp and whether they aligned with their expectations. I also asked about their experiences in the Human History session and how they compared to the other "science" sessions at the camp. I was only able to conduct one interview with the Elders near the end of the TSCC, because they unexpectedly had to leave early. I asked the Elders the same pre- and post-camp questions as the instructors, and also asked how they viewed themselves and their position at the TSCC, and how successful they felt the Human History session was in representing Indigenous knowledge.
I auto-transcribed the recorded interviews then corrected the transcripts myself. I then used NVivo to help me organize key themes: positive and negative experiences for campers and instructors, Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants’ reflections on Indigenous representation and knowledge in the camp, and the success and impact of the Human History session. During the camp, I conducted participant observation, taking note of how all the participants engaged with the different elements of the camp and with one another. Throughout, I kept a record of my observations and reflected on my own experiences and observations as part of the camp and in comparison to previous years in my field notes. I drew upon the interview transcripts and my field journal throughout my analysis.

1.6 Thesis Structure

The following chapters delve into the 2022 season at the TSCC in greater detail and the efforts, as part of this research project, to Indigenize the camp. They reflect critically on the new approach to teaching the Human History program at the camp that I led in 2022, the overall structure of the camp, and the ways the camp shapes the experiences of different participants. They also suggest potential ways forward for the camp in implementing Strong Like Two People principles.

The second chapter reviews the literature that informs the various aspects of this project. It examines the colonial history within Canada and its impact on education. It also surveys the colonial roots of archaeology and the harm it has caused to Indigenous communities and their ability to have sovereignty over their cultural heritage. Finally, it reviews attempts to braid Indigenous and Western knowledge together in teaching and
learning settings and explores the ways in which archaeology education has begun to move towards an anti-colonial approach.

Chapter three aims to answer my first research question; what is the best way to incorporate more Tłı̨chǫ knowledge and implement Tłı̨chǫ pedagogies within the archaeology programming of the camp? This chapter focuses on the conversations I had with Tłı̨chǫ knowledge holders regarding the initial aims of my project and the archaeology programming within the Human History session of the TSCC. It then explains the changes to the Human History session based on the knowledge holders’ guidance.

Chapter four addresses my second set of research questions. It examines how and to what degree does the overall structure of the camp reflect Western and Tłı̨chǫ ways of knowing and approaches to education. In this chapter I outline the format, schedule and overarching goals of the TSCC program as a whole. I then discus the unspoken lessons that are taught at the TSCC; its hidden curriculum. I outline how the hidden curriculum can impact Indigenous participants or participants from small communities differently than non-Indigenous participants or those from larger communities.

Chapter five focuses on answering my third key question: how do people of differing identities currently experience the camp? In this chapter I examine the intersections of identity and experience within the TSCC. Diverse identities are represented at the camp: Indigenous and non-Indigenous, instructors and campers, residents of small and large communities. The intersectionality of these factors creates unique identities and views of the self within the camp. I explore how individual
experiences of the camp are shaped by these intersections and the implications this has for Indigenizing the camp program.

Chapter six focuses on recommendations that would more meaningfully Indigenize the TSCC. I will also aim to provide potential paths forward that the TSCC can take to achieve its Indigenization goals.

In exploring efforts to Indigenize the Tundra Science and Culture camp, I aim to illustrate that these themes of Indigenization, intersectionality, relationships, and the Strong Like Two People approach are not separate entities but are all threads interwoven into the fabric of the camp. Each theme underscores the pivotal role that culture, the unspoken lessons, personal experiences, and diverse identities play in shaping the educational landscape of the TSCC. I hope that the work I have begun to Indigenize the Human History session within the camp, continues into the future and extends to other aspects of the TSCC.
Chapter 2

2 Reclaiming the Past, Transforming the Future: Indigenization in Western Education and Archaeology

As noted in Chapter 1, my research is part of broader movements in education and in the realm of cultural heritage to redress the harms Indigenous Peoples have experienced as a result of colonial structures. The following is a short overview of the impact of colonization on Indigenous education and the practice of archaeology in North America, and ongoing efforts to restore more equitable power relations in both realms.

2.1 Colonization’s influence on Indigenous Education in North America

Prior to colonization by European settlers, Indigenous peoples in the Americas were able to freely teach a land-based pedagogy centred around an Indigenous worldview (Battiste & Youngblood, 2009). Colonization focused on erasing Indigenous peoples and their history through genocide and forced assimilation (Battiste, 2013). In Canada, the most notable of these forced assimilation methods was the Residential School system, which removed children from their families and homes to teach them Western languages and values. Residential Schools were a vehicle of genocide that targeted Indigenous lifeways and languages with the goal to “kill the Indian in the child” (Minton, 2019). The impacts of Residential Schools are ongoing. Nonetheless, Indigenous pedagogies and ways of knowing remain prevalent within Indigenous communities (Battiste, 2013). They are also beginning to be acknowledged within Western school systems but implementing them has proven difficult, as settler and Indigenous ideologies are often viewed as
opposing (Karetak et al., 2017). Indigenous-run education also faces numerous barriers which can impede its operation (Harp, 2021).

Land-based education is fundamental to understanding Indigenous worldviews as much Indigenous teaching and learning is done on the land. The Residential School system operated to assimilate Indigenous peoples to a Western form of learning, which separated Indigenous children from the land (Battiste, 2013). Despite the long history of Residential Schools in Canada, Indigenous peoples still actively work to teach Indigenous pedagogy and move away from exclusively Western ideas of education. Wildcat et al. (2014) argue that “Land-based education, in re-surging and sustaining Indigenous life and knowledge, acts in direct contestation to settler colonialism and its drive to eliminate Indigenous life and Indigenous claims to land” (p. 3). Land-based learning includes aspects of storytelling, oral histories, hands-on learning, gatherings, etc., which help to create a social atmosphere for learning (Battiste & Youngblood, 2009). While diverse Indigenous communities share these broader approaches to teaching and learning, teachings themselves are often culturally specific and vary between the many distinct Indigenous cultures across North America. Indigenous Elders are typically the storytellers or teachers of oral histories and teach through the spoken word rather than through text (Archibald, 2008). Attempting to teach oral histories through written text has proven challenging. For example, students given a textual version of an oral history did not respond well or show respect for the story (Archibald 2008). Archibald (2008) believes that this is because the students were missing essential aspects of the story, such as tone or expression.
Not all Indigenous pedagogy is land-based; there is an increasing number of Indigenous-run schools in the United States, and there is work in the Canadian school system establishing Indigenous languages and epistemologies (Battiste, 2013; Harp, 2021a; Harp, 2021b). However, as a result of misinformation, racism, and colonial ideologies, there is still opposition to Indigenous-run schools. For example, in parts one and two of the audio podcast episodes of Media Indigena titled Education Exploration, Rick Harp (2021a; 2021b) discussed how a proposal for an Indigenous-run preschool was being strongly opposed in Saskatchewan. The preschool was proposed in a predominantly white neighbourhood, where other preschools were already in operation. Objectors cited reasons such as decreases in property values, suggesting that their objections were founded in racist beliefs. Such segregationist mentalities can prevent Indigenous youth from being able to effectively learn about Indigenous epistemologies in a space created for and by Indigenous peoples.

2.2 Indigenizing Curriculums

In recent years there has been an increasing desire to Indigenize Western educational curriculums. Educators and educational institutions have been making efforts to Indigenize curriculums to promote cultural diversity, move away from colonial education, and create more inclusive learning environments (Cote-Meek & Moeke-Pickering, 2020; Fellner, 2018; Ragoonaden & Mueller, 2017; Sammel et al., 2020). These attempts to create a more culturally diverse pedagogy stemmed from research illustrating that non-Western students can struggle or feel alienated in Western learning systems and institutions. Ragoonaden & Mueller focus on Indigenous communities in their work and state “students who are culturally diverse have a tenuous relationship with
schools whose educational practices emphasize traditional, Eurocentric, and normative approaches” (2017: 25). Ragoonaden & Mueller found that creating a Culturally Responsive Pedagogy focused on relationship building can help to address these issues of alienation and foster a sense of belonging in the classroom, making pedagogy more inclusive for everyone.

Attempting to Indigenize Western curriculums began with the incorporation of Indigenous knowledge, language, and history into existing curriculums. Doing so creates a more inclusive environment for Indigenous learners while also challenging the dominant narratives and providing learners with a more holistic understanding of the world (Cote-Meek & Moeke-Pickering, 2020). Initially, much of the Indigenous knowledge being used in this inclusive programming was removed from its original context, rendering it less effective. For example, Western knowledge categorizes learning material into distinct subjects, i.e., math, biology, history etc., with little overlap between them. However, Indigenous pedagogy does not make the same distinctions between subjects and instead sees them as interconnected and informing each other (Ragoonaden & Mueller, 2017). This difference highlights the need to Indigenize not just content but also learning environments as well.

Indigenizing curriculums now often coincides with the Indigenization of learning environments. Re-making learning environments can involve shifting the classroom layout from rows of students with the teacher at the front to a more circular structure where everyone can see each other (Ragoonaden & Mueller, 2017). It can also involve removing the classroom setting altogether and switching to an on-the-land model (Cote-Meek & Taima Moeke-Pickering, 2020). It can mean stepping away from the hierarchy
in education to a more relation-based model to encourage a sense of belonging (Fellner, 2018). These are just some of the ways in which learning environments have been Indigenized in the process of Indigenizing curriculums.

Indigenization involves making a place for Indigenous students in education. They need to see themselves in the things they are learning (Sammel et al., 2020). In attempting to dismantle colonial ways of thought in schooling we must be critical of “all the ways our disciplines have harmed and continue to harm Indigenous people, and how the intergenerational and collective impacts of this harm are felt by Indigenous people engaging with these disciplines” (Fellner 2018: 287). Not only acknowledging but creating a space of awareness and healing within these disciplines is essential to effectively Indigenize curriculums. Fostering good relationships and bringing ideas and feelings of relationality rather than hierarchy into learning environments has proven to be the most beneficial aspect of Indigenizing Western education. Many studies show that relationality leads to healing from the impacts of traditional Western schooling in Indigenous or culturally diverse students (Fellner, 2018; Ragoonaden & Mueller, 2017).

2.3 Archaeology and Colonization

Western science, with its deep-rooted history in colonialism, shapes many of the beliefs and ideals that permeate not only academic institutions but also society at large. This influence is particularly notable in the social sciences; fields such as archaeology, anthropology, psychology, economics, and others that focus on understanding human phenomena. Within these disciplines, concepts like Eurocentrism and cultural superiority subtly underpin numerous scientific works, often perpetuating biased narratives and reinforcing existing power imbalances (Castro-Gomez, 2019). Until recently, and even
today many of these fields place European standards at the top of a hypothetical hierarchy, which influences their findings. Unfortunately, the general public, largely unaware of the intricacies of research methodology, may accept these findings as objective truths, inadvertently perpetuating the perception that Western science represents an unbiased source of factual information.

Within archaeology, the colonial influence on the research and representation of people and culture is clear. There is an obvious relationship between archaeology, nationalism, imperialism, and capitalism, as archaeology traditionally works alongside and supports colonial ideas of ‘othering’ (i.e., the categorization of groups of people as fundamentally different and inferior to the dominant group) via the control of historic and cultural property and interpretations of these groups (Bruchac, 2014). The idea of the archaeologist as a treasure hunter is prevalent in the minds of the general public through popular culture portrayals of archaeologists such as ‘Indiana Jones’ (Effros & Lai, 2018). While many archaeologists nowadays attempt to distance themselves from the popular culture version of the profession, these portrayals are based in truth and represent aspects of early archaeological work (Killgrove 2021). Archaeologists began as antiquarians who would “discover” sites or artifacts and remove them from their resting places to be held in personal or private collections. Eventually, these artifacts would find their way into museums, through motives of preservation and observation by a wider audience (Effros & Lai, 2018). This pathway served to separate Indigenous peoples from their material cultural heritage and gave control of these objects to non-Indigenous “experts.”
2.3.1 Disenfranchisement of Indigenous Peoples and Communities

Because of its colonial history, archaeology has for a long time excluded Indigenous communities from participating in the research and interpretation of their own material culture (Hill et al., 2020; Kerber, 2008; Mills et al., 2008; Schneider & Hayes, 2020). Much of archaeology’s early work was influenced by ideas of cultural superiority. “Native Americans were dehumanized and objectified when the remains of their ancestors were collected for craniology, which was undertaken to prove that Native Americans were racially inferior and naturally doomed to extinction” (Ferguson, 1996).

For example, Lewis Henry Morgan’s 1877 *Ancient Society, or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization* proposed that all cultures and societies progress on a linear scale towards what he deemed civilization (i.e., Western society and culture). With works such as this informing archaeological thinking, archeologists were not only complicit in the genocide of Indigenous peoples and their cultures but were active participants in it by peddling the belief that Indigenous cultures were ‘primitive’ and needed to progress along the aforementioned ‘timeline of cultural evolution’. These works have since been rightfully criticized for Eurocentrism and the oversimplification of cultural complexity into a series of evolutionary stages (Boas, 1920; Varto, 2018).

However, the ideas present in works like Morgan’s are still prevalent in society today. In my experience going though the Canadian public education system in the 2010’s, it was not uncommon for certain events and cultures to be placed on a timeline of ‘progress’ similar to Morgan’s. As a result of this, when I entered post-secondary education, I had to unlearn many of the ideas of ‘progress’ and ‘advancement’ that I was
taught in my youth. This is something that I have noticed in my work as a Teaching Assistant for introductory anthropology courses as well, with many of the students having to do the same unlearning as I did. Many settlers do not have the opportunity to unlearn these ideas. They may continue with these lines of thought throughout their lives, and form biases about Indigenous peoples and cultures because they cannot recognize the importance of understanding cultures within their specific historical, social, and ecological contexts.

Returning to archaeology, I will discuss the specific ways in which it has disenfranchised Indigenous communities by removing Indigenous control over their cultural heritage, by creating and reinforcing unequal power dynamics, and through a lack of collaboration between archaeologists and Indigenous communities. As a Western colonial discipline archaeology actively works, in many cases, against the wishes of the cultures it studies (Watkins, 2005). Archaeology’s fascination with ‘otherness’ that drove its creation as a science is still present today. Archaeologists frame themselves as experts and use this to justify the removal of materials, often belonging to other cultures, which they deem valuable. Archaeology focusses on material remains that display evidence of human modification. Indigenous activists have pointed out that this is problematic because there are material aspects of culture that do not include human modification, for example cultural places. Place is an important aspect of many Indigenous cultures; the land itself can be sacred. Because archaeologists rarely consulted with Indigenous communities in the past these aspects of culture were missed or deemed unimportant by Western standards and ignored altogether.
2.3.2 The Role of Museums in Colonization

Museums have worked hand in hand with archaeology as vehicles for colonialism. The two are undoubtedly connected as the museum works to portray archaeological information to the masses. In doing so, museums in Canada have traditionally presented Indigenous culture as an element of the nation’s past that it has since moved on from (Groen & Kawalilak, 2019). Museums often use linear timelines in order to easily portray information about Canada’s history to the general public. Indigenous cultures are frequently placed in the ‘pre-contact’ period before the arrival of Europeans and colonization. Timelines then tend to switch to a focus on settler history in Canada, suggesting that Indigenous culture is no longer of significance or even exists within the country (Groen & Kawalilak, 2019).

2.4 Applications of Indigenous Epistemology in Archaeology

Indigenous voices have a long history of being excluded from Western scientific research (Chilisa, 2012). Colonialism has oppressed Indigenous cultures and portrayed them as ‘less-than’ or ‘primitive’ when compared to Western societies and cultures (Wilson, 2008; Chilisa, 2012; Atalay, 2020). Indigenous epistemologies are often seen as illegitimate, inaccurate, and unreliable when compared to Western sciences (Wilson, 2008; Chilisa, 2012; Atalay, 2020). This belief that Indigenous ways of knowing are unscientific leads researchers and the general public to look down on them as primitive (Wilson, 2008). For this reason, Indigenous traditional knowledge and research methodologies are severely underrepresented in academia (Chilisa, 2012). Archaeology in colonized areas of the world focuses mainly on Indigenous cultural history, often ignoring Indigenous ways of knowing. However, Indigenous cultures thrived in the
Americas and elsewhere long before European colonization, using traditional knowledge based on observable and testable explanations of the world (Atalay, 2020).

As a result of these biases, until quite recently, it was the norm for archaeologists and archaeological companies to conduct research without consulting or even communicating with the Indigenous communities whose material culture they were investigating. Descendant communities had no say in their cultural heritage or its interpretation (Bruchac, 2014; Lyons & Supernant, 2020; Schneider & Hayes, 2020). What archaeologists deem ‘valuable’ or important often differs from that of Indigenous communities and can lead archaeologists to dismiss Indigenous community interpretations. This dismissal is even more prevalent in the Cultural Resource Management sector, where the vast majority of the archaeological work in the country is completed (Atalay, 2020).

As a result of efforts by Indigenous activists, recent decades have seen a shift away from this way of thinking, with increasingly collaborative efforts between archaeology and Indigenous peoples and other descendant communities (Atalay, 2006, 2019, 2020; Bruchac, 2014; Bruchac et al., 2010; Lyons & Supernant, 2020; Zimmerman, 2005). Indigenous scholars remind us that, like Western science, Indigenous science is based on careful observation, reasoning and logic, and a set of rules (Atalay, 2020) and should be recognized and valued as science within the Western scientific community (Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). Several research approaches welcome Indigenous knowledge and research methods, including community-based research, autoethnography, and storytelling. Storytelling, for example, ties into both oral histories and the dissemination of knowledge. It introduces alternative forms of data and can
assist greatly in the dissemination of information from a research project to Indigenous communities and also the general public (Drawson et al., 2017; Windchief & San Pedro, 2019). All of these approaches place Indigenous peoples in the driver’s seat for any research being conducted (Drawson et al., 2017). Indigenous knowledge is becoming increasingly integrated into archaeology through collaborative approaches that value Indigenous ways of knowing. One approach that Atalay (2020) refers to as “braided knowledge” (p. 6) brings together aspects of both Indigenous and Western knowledge to combine different perspectives, create a more holistic understanding, and give Indigenous peoples control over their own histories. When Indigenous and Western knowledge are used congruently, researchers can better understand why these knowledge systems complement or contradict each other (Atalay, 2006; Atalay, 2020; Bruchac et al., 2010; Lyons & Supernant, 2020; Zimmerman, 2005).

Braiding Indigenous and Western sciences together attempts to place both systems of knowledge on an equal footing, where both are seen as appropriate and necessary for generating knowledge (Jimmy et al., 2019; Kimmerer 2013). Atalay (2020) pioneered the use of braided knowledge approaches in archaeology. This requires archaeologists to learn and take part in Indigenous methodologies and frameworks to better understand and show support for the Indigenous communities they are working with (Atalay, 2020). Respecting Indigenous knowledge in archaeology also requires archaeologists to take collaboration and the wishes of the Indigenous communities seriously. For example, if the community refuses or opposes archaeological research, that decision must be respected (Atalay, 2020; Supernant & Warrick 2014). Respecting communities’ right to refuse exemplifies one of the most significant shifts from colonial archaeology which
would ignore Indigenous input altogether, to an archaeology which builds trust with Indigenous communities (Atalay, 2020).

2.4.1 Indigenous Pedagogies in Archaeological Field Schools

Archaeological field schools have also begun to incorporate Indigenous pedagogies, which aim to teach the upcoming generation of archaeologists about sovereignty, relationality, and meaningful engagement with descendant communities. Examples include the University of Arizona’s Field School Without Trowels (Mills et al., 2008), the Mohegan Archaeological Field School (Bendremer & Thomas, 2008; Cipolla & Quinn, 2016), the Eastern Pequot Archaeological Field School (Silliman & Sebastian Dring, 2008) and the 13 field schools delivered by the University of Northern British Columbia through their partnership with a number of Indigenous communities on the coast and in the interior of British Columbia (Rahemtulla, 2020). This push towards anti-colonial field education is intended to make archaeology a more welcoming space for Indigenous persons interested in the field (Mills et al., 2008). There are a number of ways which field schools have begun to Indigenize. According to Cipolla & Quinn (2016), Gonzalez and Edwards (2020), Mills et al. (2008), Rahemtulla (2020), and Silliman (2008) some of these methods include:

1. Placing equal importance on Indigenous and Western knowledge in course content and research methods.
2. The employment of Indigenous knowledge holders (i.e., Elders, teachers, etc.) as instructors.
3. Shifting from academic to community-based research and research questions.
(4) Community member enrolment in the field school which does not require them to have an academic background.

(5) Community outreach and education which allow for community members not enrolled or involved with the field school to participate (i.e., youth field trips, public lectures, workshops).

(6) Indigenous led initiatives such as opening and closing ceremonies for the field school.

(7) Community ownership of intellectual and physical property.

(8) Utilizing digital and multimedia tools to document and share archaeological findings in ways that are accessible for Indigenous communities.

(9) Residing within communities, when possible, for the duration of the field school to fully immerse learners in the cultural context.

Participants in these field schools learn to consider the whole context of the site they are observing. Instead of just being taught how to shovel test, excavate, and map a site, they are taught to explore the ethics of the site, and approach problem solving with not just their heads but their hearts (Gonzalez and Edwards, 2020; Kerber, 2008; Mills et al., 2008; Rossen, 2008). Anti-colonial work in archaeological field schools is a significant step in Indigenizing different areas within the field. However, it is easy for complacency in archaeological practice to re-emerge. Cipolla and Quinn (2016) argue that if archaeology becomes “business-as-usual” the “colonial overtones will continue to haunt the discipline if we fail to challenge our epistemologies and our ontologies by transforming ‘traditional’ power structures.” (p. 131).
Figure 2-1. Illustration of “archaeology as a rubber band” metaphor.

The field of archaeology is like a rubber band, that exists comfortably and un-moving under a colonial mindset. Archaeologists undertaking anti-colonial work push on the rubber band from the inside so that it stretches enough to reach areas outside of its colonial roots. The more archaeologists engaged in anti-colonial work, the more the rubber band can stretch. Moreover, the rubber band does not have to be stretched only from within, non-archaeologists have been voicing the need for archaeology to change as well, which stretches the band further. However, if people become complacent, this rubber band will constrict once more. Therefore, this work must be active and continuous because archaeology, at its core, is still tied to its colonial underpinnings.

2.5 Conclusions

Colonization has always affected and often specifically targets education. Residential schools are a clear example of how education can and has been used to undermine Indigenous knowledges and harm Indigenous ways of life (Battiste, 2013).
Colonialism is also present in Western school systems; not only in what is taught, but how it is taught. The categorization of knowledge into different subjects, the hierarchical distinction between teachers and students, and the classroom setting can all lead to the disenfranchisement of non-Western learners (Ragoonaden & Mueller, 2017). The push from Indigenous scholars and communities to Indigenize curriculum and classrooms has been met with barriers. These barriers may be in the form of pushback from individuals or institutions who believe in the superiority of Western education over Indigenous education (Ragoonaden & Mueller, 2017). Indigenizing Western education, in many cases, involves changes to the teaching and learning environment in such a way that Indigenous knowledge can be delivered without being required to warp itself to fit within the confines of classroom learning (Cote-Meek & Moeke-Pickering, 2020; Fellner, 2018; Ragoonaden & Mueller, 2017; Sammel et al., 2020).

The process of Indigenizing archaeology education is met with many of the same issues faced when attempting to incorporate Indigenous perspectives into more general educational contexts. Because archaeology is a colonial science and has been used to actively oppress Indigenous peoples and communities (Watkins, 2005), the Indigenization process for archaeology education must address its past (Hill et al., 2020; Kerber, 2008; Mills et al., 2008; Schneider & Hayes, 2020). Indigenization of archaeology education is seen within the classroom setting of post-secondary institutions through the reorganization of the curriculum and learning space itself, as well as within field schools, which can allow for a more land-based approach (Atalay, 2020; Bendremer & Thomas, 2008; Bruchac et al., 2010; Cipolla & Quinn, 2016; Lyons & Supernant, 2020; Mills et al., 2008; Silliman & Sebastian Dring, 2008). However, archaeology
education tends to be restricted to post-secondary learning, and is rarely, if ever, part of the primary and secondary curriculum within Canada. This restriction of archaeology education to post-secondary institutions can act as a disservice to its Indigenization process, as it requires learners to complete a number of preliminary steps, which may include:

1. Participating in Western schooling throughout their youth and graduating successfully.
2. Choosing to attend a post-secondary institution.
3. Acquiring funding to attend post-secondary, typically through student loans.
4. Leaving their home communities to attend post-secondary.

All of this can be exponentially more difficult for Indigenous learners who have been disenfranchised by the colonization of their lands. On top of this, an Indigenous student entering a post-secondary institution to major in archaeology will likely be met with racism either within the curriculum, or from their non-Indigenous peers who may be in the process of confronting and critically analysing their colonial beliefs for the first time.

There is no easy solution to these challenges, as primary and secondary education tend to focus on broad topics and rarely delve into more specialized fields such as archaeology. The TSCC offers a unique opportunity to teach archaeology to both Indigenous and non-Indigenous high-school aged learners. The only post-secondary institution in the Territory, Aurora Collage, does not offer an archaeology degree as an option for learners. Therefore, for individuals who do not wish to or do not have the means to leave the territory to attend a post-secondary institution, the programing at the TSCC is the only consistently offered opportunity for archaeology education in the territory. The
archaeology curriculum at the TSCC must recognize the field’s colonial past and it must be responsible for educating people who attend about anti-colonial approaches to archaeological research and interpretation. The program must be equipped to effectively handle confusion and push-back from learners who have been taught a Westernized version of history and what constitutes “good science”. Learners should leave the program understanding the importance of Indigenous knowledge and how a colonial science, like archaeology, is not necessarily complete. They should recognize how the incorporation of Indigenous knowledge can fundamentally change the field of archaeological science through the expansion of concepts such as what makes something valuable, what constitutes an “artifact”, and subjective versus objective understandings of the past.
Chapter 3

3 Indigenizing the Archaeology Curriculum: An Incomplete Attempt

My project began as an exploration of possible ways to implement Indigenous pedagogy within the Human History session at the TSCC. I hoped to create a session that placed both Indigenous and Western knowledge on an equal footing through the incorporation of Indigenous pedagogies. My aim was to make something that could be delivered by a non-Indigenous archaeologist or an Indigenous person who is not a knowledge holder, since it may not always be possible for Elders to attend the session, and it is important to avoid overburdening Indigenous Elders who are already highly sought-after for Indigenizing work in other areas. Elders and other Indigenous knowledge holders cannot be solely responsible for the Indigenization process long-term. The onus is also on non-Indigenous researchers and teachers to do this work.

However, my experience of approaching the camp more critically through an Indigenizing lens shifted the focus of my project to reveal the ways a hidden curriculum of Western ideals and practices can permeate the whole camp and impede the Indigenization process. This chapter will explore the initial intention of my project; the discussions I had with Tłı̨chǫ knowledge holders regarding the Human History session, the alterations I made to it based on the suggestions I received through these discussions, and the delivery of the updated Human History session at the TSCC in 2022. I will begin by providing some background on the TSCC and why I chose it for this project, followed by additional background on the Human History session itself.
3.1 Why the Tundra Science and Culture Camp?

The Tundra Science and Culture Camp (TSCC) is a ten-day long educational summer camp program offered annually by the Government of the Northwest Territories’ (GNWT) Department of Natural Resources. The camp is based at the Tundra Ecosystem Research Station (TERS) located approximately 300km Northwest of Yellowknife, Northwest Territories, Canada. The program is offered to high school students throughout the Territory, with opportunities for teachers in the NWT to attend as teacher participants as well. Campers pay approximately $300 to attend, though subsidies are available for campers who cannot afford the fee. A maximum of 18 participants can attend each year. The TSCC is described on their website as a program “delivered by leaders in Indigenous culture and environmental science who collaborate to provide a unique, on-the-tundra cultural and multidisciplinary learning experience. These leaders include Tłı̨chǫ Elders, GNWT experts and educators in their fields, environmental stewards, and on-site graduate student researchers. Participants learn about Indigenous knowledge, the Tłı̨chǫ language, human history, along with other science-based disciplines such as archaeology, geology, wildlife biology, and aquatic ecology through engaging land-based sessions. Participants also learn about decision-making, resource management, and environmental impact using real-life examples in this diamond mining region” (Government of the Northwest Territories, 2023). I chose the TSCC as my research setting for four reasons:

1. The pre-existing archaeology education session (i.e., the Human History session).
2. The remote, on-the land location.
3. The longstanding history of including Indigenous Elders and the incorporation of Indigenous knowledge.
4. My personal history and experience at the TSCC.

The TSCC takes place on traditional Tłı̨chǫ lands and there are numerous cultural sites located around the TERS. Because of this, the Human History session was created to educate campers about the cultural sites in the area as a way to both mitigate against accidental disturbances from participants unknowingly picking up artifacts, as well as teach them about the history of land use in the area. My aim was to attempt to Indigenize the Human History session following a Strong Like Two People approach, using both Indigenous and Western pedagogies and sharing both forms of knowledge equally with the participants, rather than focussing on archaeological science alone. The remote on-the-land location of the camp was beneficial to the goals of my research as on-the-land learning is often an aspect of Indigenous pedagogies. I hoped that having this aspect already in place would smooth the process of Indigenizing the Human History session for me and my Indigenous collaborators.

I also chose the TSCC because of its longstanding history of including Tłı̨chǫ Elders and other Tłı̨chǫ knowledge holders as part of the teaching team. Establishing strong relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous experts is a vital aspect of anti-colonial work and the existing relationships at the TSCC mean that the program is already set up for conversations about further Indigenization and what that might look like. I also have a personal history with the TSCC which influenced my decision. I attended the TSCC as a student participant in 2012 and later returned to the camp as one of the Human History session instructors in 2019 and 2021. The TSCC and the Human History session were pivotal in my pursuit of a career in archaeology. Not only do I have
a deep emotional connection to the TSCC, but my previous experiences at the camp are what motivated me to conduct my research there.

3.1.1 The Human History Session

The Human History session has been running as part of the TSCC since its inception in 1995 and was originally led by Tom Andrews when he was the GNWT’s Territorial Archaeologist. The Human History program has incorporated Indigenous knowledge and storytelling through the contributions of Elders who have attended the camp over the years. In my conversation with Tom, he mentioned how one of these Elders, Harry Simpson—a beloved and respected Tłı̨chǫ Elder—would accompany him on the sessions and tell animated stories to the participants at the camp.

When Harry would go there [the TSCC], he would tell the story from the perspective of the hunter. And he would bring the kids around the Daring lakeside; there's a bit of a cut bluff there. And he kind of crouched and he explained that they [Indigenous hunters] would hide in their canoes, and they would listen, and somebody would be just at the top of the banks or peeking over the bank to watch the caribou. And when they entered the water, the men would paddle quickly around against the current into the end of the Narrows, and they had little short spears, you know about, I don't know, 24 inches, 30 inches long. And they would jab the caribou in the kidneys as they were swimming in the water. And that would kill them, they bleed to death almost instantly. And the current would take them and flow them out into Daring Lake, but they would float because they hadn’t been punctured underneath. And they could kill as many caribou as they needed that way. And then they would simply, once the caribou crossed and had run off, they would go back and pull all those caribou into that spot [referring to the archaeological site this story would be told at]. And Harry did love telling that story, and of course, the kids would just be, you know [engaged], the expectation, the eyes, the stories, and the questions, always so rich, you know, after Harry would tell the story. (Tom Andrews – Former TSCC Instructor, October 18\textsuperscript{th}, 2022).

There’s a big, beautiful teepee ring with a hearth right in the middle, Harry loved going there and telling stories. Everybody was told to stand on or stand beside one of the teepee rocks, so they can get a really good
sense of how big the ring was, you know, it’s about five meters across. And if you search, you can find quartz flakes [debitage as a result of stone tool production] at the center of the teepee near the hearth. And Harry loved talking about that place. (Tom Andrews – Former TSCC Instructor, October 18th, 2022).

Having an Elder who can attend the Human History session as a co-instructor, as was the case with Tom and Harry would be ideal, because it creates a space for Indigenous people to directly represent themselves at cultural sites and see themselves represented. Unfortunately, Elders are not always able to attend full sessions, especially when they involve hiking which is difficult for some Elders. I wanted to explore ways to incorporate Indigenous knowledge, perspectives and pedagogies when Elders could not be present for part or all of a session.

The Human History session at the TSCC runs on the first day that sessions are introduced every year. This session has always taken place early in the camp because several visible Dene, Inuit, and Tunnit (Paleo-Inuit) cultural sites are located immediately around the camp. To ensure camp participants do not accidentally disturb these sites, they are taught how to identify cultural belongings (typically flakes, stone tools, and tent rings), cultural sites, and how to avoid damaging them. This logic is grounded in the Western ideals of archaeology and the importance of “preserving” material culture. In a traditional archaeological approach, to preserve something means to protect its physical integrity and prevent deterioration, damage, or loss. But for many Indigenous communities, preservation of cultural belongings may include the cultural, spiritual, and historical significance of the item that ties it to Traditional Knowledge. Preservation in the Indigenous sense also demands continued maintenance of cultural and spiritual ties through ongoing culturally appropriate engagement with the objects (Atalay, 2006;
Bruchac, 2014). Before the changes to the session in 2022, the Human History session would focus on introducing the participants to the broad concepts of what archaeology is at the base camp, followed by an exploration of the cultural sites in the area. The program would shift from larger, more overarching concepts, such as migration to the Americas, to more site-specific concepts, like stone tool production and hunting sites.

The lack of soil formation on the tundra means that cultural sites in this area are located on the surface rather than buried. Therefore, these sites are more prone to disturbance from humans and animals than in-situ cultural sites further south. The land between Daring and Yamba Lake is traversed by eskers—long, winding ridges of sediment deposited from rivers that flowed beneath retreating glaciers. The eskers

Figure 3-1. Satellite imagery of Esker locations around the Tundra Ecosystem Research Station. Red lines in second image outline the eskers.
around the TERS (Figures 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3) are hundreds of kilometers long and have provided well drained, elevated travel routes and hunting locations for people and animals for millennia.

Many cultural sites are therefore located along them. Indigenous peoples would travel to this area to hunt caribou in the fall and arctic foxes in the winter. Many of the other sessions at the camp such as Tundra Plants, Geoscience, and Wildlife Biology, as well as the hikes, take place along these eskers, which is why the Human History session aims to teach the participants how to identify Indigenous material culture and how to behave respectfully, as an archaeologist would understand it, around these sites.
Figure 3-2. View of three campers walking along the top of an esker.
In 2019, prior to the changes to the Human History session as part of my thesis project, I began instructing the Human History session at the TSCC along with Naomi Smethurst—Assessment Archaeologist at the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre (PWNHC). Naomi had been instructing the Human History session for a few years before inviting me to assist while I was working in a summer student position as an archaeology technician. Naomi and I followed a lesson plan originally devised by Tom Andrews. This lesson plan had undergone slight changes over the years, but the bulk of the content and the cultural sites and order in which they were visited remained unchanged. The plan outlined talking points to share at each of the cultural sites visited, focusing on scientific ‘facts’ about each site. The lesson plan included Indigenous knowledge as it pertains to archaeology, incorporating storytelling by the Elders at one of the sites, and asking them to explain why people would travel into the barrenlands. They were also invited to explain the importance of caribou for food, clothing, and shelter to help participants.

Figure 3-3. View of the Tundra as seen from the top of an esker.
understand the sites they were visiting. My goal was to change how this session taught
Human History, moving away from presenting cultural sites through the lens of scientific
‘facts’ toward a session equally representative of both the Western and Indigenous views
of human history. I wanted to achieve this through my discussions with the Tłı̨chǫ
knowledge holders, seeking their guidance on how best to go about it.

3.2 Changing the Human History Session

3.2.1 Guidance from Tłı̨chǫ Knowledge Holders

Originally, my goal for this project was to rework the archaeology curriculum at
the TSCC along with the Cultural Team at the camp. The Cultural Team consists of two
Tłı̨chǫ Elders, Louis Zoe and Therese Zoe—well respected Elders and a married couple
from the community of Gamètì—and their interpreter and adopted granddaughter Janelle
Nitsiza—a Research Coordinator in the Gamètì Office of the Tłı̨chǫ Government.
However, the Elders’ busy summer schedules and the short timeframe of an MA made it
impossible to schedule these discussions about the camp and the archaeology curriculum.
Instead, I reached out to various Tłı̨chǫ knowledge holders to ask if they would be willing
to help me in the process of Indigenizing the curriculum. I got responses from two Tłı̨chǫ
knowledge holders, Tammy Steinwand—Director of Culture and Lands Protection for the
Tłı̨chǫ Government and a former schoolteacher—and John B. Zoe—senior advisor to the
Tłı̨chǫ Government, Chairperson of Hotì ts’eeda, and the Chief Land Claims Negotiator
for the former Treaty 11 Council of the NWT. I met with Tammy and John in one-on-one
meetings over Zoom to discuss the Human History session, how to incorporate Tłı̨chǫ
knowledge/pedagogy into the sessions in a culturally appropriate manner as a non-Tłı̨chǫ
person, and what they thought should be included or removed to make it more accessible.
and interesting for campers. Ideally, I would have met with them more often over a longer period, but we were unfortunately not able to fit that in before the camp. I began these discussions by giving Tammy and John some background on the Tundra Science and Culture Camp and why I was aiming to Indigenize the Human History session. I went through the version of the Human History session that we had used in recent years with them to give them an idea of the sites we visit, including lithic scatters (i.e., stone tool production sites) and stone tent rings.

In my first discussion with John, he helped me to recalibrate my expectations. He said:

*The things that you talked about in your paper [referring to my project proposal] are how people are kind of separated, and they're not really engaged because the model they're following there is old [this refers to the camp and how it is taught]. So, there might be some sensitive people like yourself, you can see it, but for the ones that don't see it, they've continued their usual practices. And so, the only way to make that change in the Tundra Science Camp is how do we individualize that project [referring to the process of incorporating Indigenous pedagogy into the TSCC] so that the implementation is actually piece by piece by piece. It's going to take a long time.* (John B. Zoe, June 17th, 2022).

I knew a project like this would take time when I began forming the idea, but I over-estimated the contribution of revising the Human History session towards the Indigenization of the TSCC as a whole. John helped me see that many people (myself included) do not see the full extent of Western influence on programs like this. Here, John is alluding to something that I did not fully realize until I was attempting to implement changes to the Human History session—the restrictions set by the very nature of the camp. The TSCC is Western in how it is structured, from the physical construction of the camp to the scheduling, the camp follows the Western ideals of day-to-day life and
education. He made me aware that my attempt to Indigenize the Human History program would have a smaller impact than I had initially hoped and helped me become more aware of what to look for more generally during the 2022 camp, namely the ways in which Western values and approaches permeate its structure.

Both John and Tammy attempted to help me make connections between Western and Indigenous knowledge and guide me to areas within the existing session that could be viewed from an Indigenous perspective. Because they had never visited the cultural sites at the TSCC in person, their suggestions were more general in nature, rather than being site-specific. They both suggested that I include the strength of Tłı̨chǫ peoples’ connections to animals and the land. These connections would help camp participants understand why people travelled to the tundra.

When we are talking about archaeology, and now looking at the animals, I think it is important to make the connections that those animals like the rabbits, the caribou are why people were in that area. They're there for that food, so the animals attract the people to that area. (Tammy Steinwand, July 8th, 2022).

One of them [a Tłı̨chǫ perspective] is your relationship to the land. For any kids or young people, their grandfathers or grandmothers, and their families were probably in that area [the Tundra] before. Because, pre-contact, everybody stayed together. It's not like today. In the old days, there was no real place to stay. Your home is where you are at. And your home is when you travel together with your dogs and everything that you need. You're going to the barren lands together. They want to get there before the ice starts to form so that they're not landlocked anywhere. But they're as close as possible to the wintering area. And they have drymeat to sustain them during that period. And so, by the time the ice forms and the caribou start to come into the area to winter, then that's when they can start harvesting for fresh meat until the caribou go back north in the springtime. And then from there, they are preparing their birch bark canoes, they're planning where they're going and where they're going to be gathering in the summer. People start to gather in places for the summer in large groups, because the fishing can sustain them. And they can relax for the summer because they've been working, right from the
fall time, all the way to the spring. Work, work, work, work, and trying to etch out a living, and the summer is like a holiday. You know, you relax, tell stories, and you make plans for the next winter, who’s going to go with who. And there’ll be marriages, there’ll be all kinds of things that are being done. Then, they decide amongst themselves that “for the fall time, we’re going to go this way for caribou.” So, it’s lots of planning in the summer to sustain them for the winter. (John B. Zoe, June 17th, 2022).

The area around Daring Lake was a seasonal hunting and trapping ground. Dene travelled here in the fall to hunt caribou to provide for their families and communities.

Tammy and John felt it was important for the TSCC participants to understand that for the Tłı̨chǫ, the connections between humans and animals are cultural and differ from Western relationships with animals.

*I think another big thing we were talking about was the behaviour of the people and the very close connections to the land and the environment, because it provided for all our needs. Like the food, the hides from the caribou for clothing and shelter, you know, the water is clean, it [the land] provided for the people, it was important; still is today. The people take care of it, like that respect and dependency. You’re dependent on these things to survive and to live because in the past there was no real store that you can go to and pick up everything you need. You had to go and get it; in some cases, it was hundreds of kilometers away in harsh conditions.* (Tammy Steinwand, July 8th, 2022).

When I was discussing the Human History session with Tammy, I mentioned that when teaching archaeology to students, it is sometimes common to refer to archaeology as a study of trash or garbage, as well as to teach students about garbology. Garbology as an archaeological experiment involves analysing the contents of a person’s garbage, to learn about their daily habits, practices, and diet. Archaeologists tend to use this as an analogy because the majority of what we find has been broken, lost, too heavy to transport, or deemed unnecessary to travel with. Archaeologists may also think of “artifacts” as being things that have been thrown away, which suggests that they no
longer have value for the people who made them, which is often far from the truth.

Below, Tammy mentions that I should be careful when referring to archaeological science as the study of “garbage”, as it can undervalue artifacts. Instead, Tammy refers to artifacts as belongings and suggested that I explain why the objects we found on the tundra would have been left behind, to avoid potentially offending the Elders at the camp.

When we’re learning about the history of our people, they couldn't always carry everything with them. That's why when they got out there, they made a lot of their tools. Then once they're done with it, you know it's heavy it's extra weight for the dogs and the sleds so they would leave some of these things that they no longer need behind. So that's why to some of these things are found around the camp spots. Maybe garbage is not the right word to use. Belongings of people or valuable tools of people or something like that or things that people no longer need. That might be a better way to say it. I don't want to offend the Elders if we say garbage. (Tammy Steinwand, July 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2022).

The term cultural belonging also introduces an element of relationality, as a belonging is automatically associated with an individual or group of people. Artifact is an archaeological term that objectifies an item and places it in the past. It implies an object of study for archaeologists with specialized Western training, a colonial label that serves to separate Indigenous peoples from their own histories. Belonging implies not just a relationship between these objects and the people who made and used them in the past, but also their descendants.

John engages even more directly with the colonial history of archaeology:

As long as the sun rises, and the rivers of dialogue flow, and this thing doesn't take over, we will not be restricted from our way of life into the future. It means that we need to share that information with the young people so that they can carry on that work because where we are now took 150 years, it's got to take almost an equal time to unravel it. And it just doesn't mean going back and cancelling it out. But going back to talk about it and redirect it as to what belongs to the Western and what
doesn't belong to the Western and how we can make sure that things that are common interest to each we put into the Strong Like Two People River and have those discussions and how they will continue to apply on both sides without having to destroy each other. (John B. Zoe, June 17th, 2022).

Referencing the quote from Chief Monfwi, “as long as the sun rises, the river flows, and the land does not move, we will not be restricted from our way of life,” John is stating that sharing of information is vital to the survival of the Tłı̨chǫ way of life (Tłı̨chǫ Government, 2014). He interprets the river in Chief Monfwi’s quote as a metaphor for dialogue and the exchange of information. Strong Like Two People is one approach to this knowledge sharing, as it aims to combine both Indigenous and Western knowledge to better prepare Tłı̨chǫ youth for life in Canada, while also working to keep the connections to their culture, history, and language alive.

John implies that it is important to not simply expose camp participants to these two different conceptions of artifacts/belongings, but to talk about how they are different, and how framing belongings as artifacts removes Indigenous peoples from their past. He sees these conversations as central to helping both Indigenous and non-Indigenous students move together towards a better future. He recognizes that there is no quick solution to ‘Indigenizing’ or ‘decolonizing’ as the colonial system has been in place for over 150 years and will take just as long to dismantle.

I attempted to incorporate this teaching from John into my project in two ways: (1) Adding a discussion of the history of archaeology and its interactions with Indigenous peoples to the Human History session, and (2) Extending the timeline for Indigenizing the Human History program and the TSCC as a whole, recognizing that it will be a slow incremental process.
John also provided some guidance on ways to work respectfully with Elders when inviting them to contribute to on-the-land educational programming, so that all participants get the most out of the experience.

Archaeology, for a long time, would recruit [Indigenous] people by saying, “well, we need somebody to go to the barren lands and teach young people,” but they’re not prepared. What’s it about? How many kids? How many speak English? How many don’t speak English? Who else is going to be there? Do I need an interpreter? And if there’s somebody else there, then I need to know who it is so that we can have a dialogue with our Elders before we refresh our memories for that area. One of the things I noticed is that when you’re Indigenous in a camp, you’re expected to be there from nine to five, but you don’t have time to prepare. So, you become more like an interpreter if you’re a young person, and for an older person, you’re downloading to this young person. And you may not be quite sure who it is or their background. There’ll be some engagements in the evening, too. We never got time to prepare for it. We’re just thrown into it. And we have to kind of figure out something. And then, when the evening comes around, a lot of the interpreters will be burnt out; they prefer to stay in their tent. You know, and so that’s what happens. And I’ve experienced that before. One of the things that we also need to prepare for that area is the place names. And things that are in relation to the stories of the animals and the people’s legends. And the stories of Yamǫǫḥa, the lawmaker, and the place names that have to do with the habitat of the animals in the area, even the features of the land, the features tell you a lot about the harvesting and harvesting methods. (John B. Zoe, June 17th, 2022).

John highlights the challenges faced by Indigenous youth and knowledge holders who are invited to participate as teachers during on the land learning experiences. Often, they have little time to prepare and do not know the other Indigenous teachers, so are unsure how much they know about the history of the area. John sees the lack of communication between archaeologists and Indigenous peoples before and during these kinds of projects as problematic. He indicates that Indigenous teachers require time to prepare, which demands engagement before the program so they fully understand the context and expectations.
I recognize that I have done something similar to what John is discussing above. Reaching out with little time before the start of the TSCC to Tłı̨chǫ individuals who are unfamiliar with the cultural sites of the area and asking them to help me revise the Human History curriculum linked to those sites repeats the mistakes that John highlighted. It is my hope that Indigenizing the Human History session will be a process that continues over multiple years and that the archaeologists, whether me or someone else, teaching the session in the future will be able to further develop the relationships with Tłı̨chǫ knowledge holders that I have started to build through this project.

3.2.2 Teaching and learning the Tłı̨chǫ Way

My discussions with the Tłı̨chǫ knowledge holders before the camp and my conversations with the Tłı̨chǫ Elders during the camp gave me more insight into Tłı̨chǫ pedagogies. The exchanging of information or knowledge is not just a delivery system for education in Tłı̨chǫ culture. It is fundamental to the culture itself and a person’s place within it. The more knowledgeable you become, the more you share, the more you teach. This sharing, learning, and teaching is all encompassed in your relationship with the land. For the Tłı̨chǫ and other Indigenous groups in the NWT the land “is a living entity and is in contact flux as a result of the lives and interactions of all beings—including humans” (Legat 2012, p. 2). It is of utmost importance and is held in great respect. I personally tie all my feelings and understandings of the land to the stories and knowledge that have been shared with me throughout my youth by Indigenous Elders and teachers. My understanding is that sharing is at the heart of the Tłı̨chǫ cultural identity; sharing important information through storytelling for someone who will be going out of the land for the first time, sharing practical knowledge such as making bògǫǫ (drymeat) or
ehgwâa (dryfish), or sharing a cup of sugar with a neighbor. Sharing is done without the expectation that something be done for you in return. There is no unspoken rule that you must “pay someone back”. You share when someone is in need, that is all.

I myself am still learning about these concepts as an outsider to Tłı̨chǫ culture. Sharing in the sense that I mentioned above is particularly new to me. There is of course nuance within the concept of sharing, especially for a community healing from colonial trauma within an existing capitalist structure. There are limitations to how much one can share, as well as what can be shared. Money, for example, is typically shared less readily, due to the potential for people to be taken advantage of and is not something that would have been part of Tłı̨chǫ life prior to European contact.

In talking with the Elders, it seems to me that their goal is to share; knowledge, skills, stories—with people who want to learn. The Elders often mentioned that they want the campers to learn what the other instructors at camp are teaching because they see value in that, so they see the camp as a place to share all kinds of knowledge. Teaching and learning the Tłı̨chǫ way relies on the transition from being given information to truly knowing something through personal experience (Legat, 2012). Tłı̨chǫ Elders and knowledge holders take issue with primary and secondary Western education, which focuses on acquiring information through lectures without giving learners the opportunity to connect that information to the land (Legat, 2012). The physical context of the information is missing, and for the Tłı̨chǫ that context is vital to one’s ability to truly know something. Considering the TSCC takes place on the land, the campers are given the opportunity to turn information into personal experience. A shift towards a more deliberate application of this Tłı̨chǫ pedagogy within the camp could assist in placing
Indigenous and Western teaching and learning practices on a more equal footing, thus fostering a more inclusive and well-rounded learning environment.

3.2.3 Changes to the Human History Session

The main takeaway’s I received from my discussions with Tammy and John were the need to:

1. Emphasize the importance of connections between Tłı̨chǫ and the land (including animals and plants).
2. Engage with the colonial history of archaeology which separated Tłı̨chǫ and other Indigenous peoples from telling stories of their history.
3. Discuss the current efforts to Indigenize archaeology.

Moving away from a lecturing style of teaching, allowing the participants and their interests to drive discussions about archaeology and the history of land use, incorporating storytelling as a significant form of knowledge dissemination, and switching from terms like “artifacts” and “archaeological sites” to “belongings” and “cultural sites” to emphasize cultural continuity from past to present are all ways in which Tłı̨chǫ knowledge can be implemented within the Human History session without leading to drastic changes in the content.

When re-working the Human History program, I attempted to incorporate these aspects of Indigenous pedagogy within the session outline. I had originally planned to do a complete overhaul of the existing Human History session and rebuild it from the ground up in collaboration with the Elders attending the TSCC. However, when it became clear that I would be unable to meet with them until the TSCC began, I settled on revising
rather than remaking the session. Tammy and John helped me to realize that given the limited timeframe, my revisions to the Human History session would be limited as well. I had to learn to manage my expectations for what I could realistically do in the timespan of a month, and to approach this as the beginning of a project that, as John said, will take many years to realize.

The version of the Human History session that Naomi and I delivered prior to 2022 discussed three main themes. Figure 3-4 displays the Human History session prior to the 2022 revisions. These themes include: (1) archaeological methods and theory, (2) life on the tundra, and (3) peopling of the Americas. Given the limited timeframe, rather than revising the main themes, which would likely take time away from learning how to teach the new session, Naomi and I decided to revise the content instead. As much as I wanted to interweave Indigenous pedagogical approaches with Western ones in the Human History session, I instead opted to incorporate as much Indigenous knowledge as possible about the sites we visit and the topics we cover, without risking going over our teaching time. Looking back now, I find this ironic. Despite trying to create a session with Indigenous pedagogies built in, the existing Western framework of the camp, with which we were familiar, made this impossible.
Figure 3-4. The pre-revised Human History session.

Figure 3-5. The Revised Human History session.

Figure 3-5 illustrates where we made these revisions. Under ‘archaeology methods and theory’ we removed one of the cultural sites from the session to ensure that
there would be enough time touch on everything in the lesson plan, given the two-and-a-half-hour timeframe. We also added additional context for the learners in the form of projectile points which were previously collected from the cultural sites around the TSCC. These cultural belongings are stored in the collections at the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre in Yellowknife. They were collected due to their perceived archaeological value. 2022 was the first year since their collection that they were brought to the camp as a teaching tool. I aimed to bring in an element of ongoing engagement with these belongings, at the locations that they had originally been collected, while also providing additional context for the learners (Atalay, 2006; Bruchac, 2014). The revision to the theme ‘life on the tundra’ involved changing an existing aspect of the session where the Elders were invited to tell a story about living on the tundra. While Elders have always been invited to join us at the first site to tell a story, they sometimes prefer not to make the walk because of mobility challenges. In 2022 we formally included a story from the Elders in the program. If the Elders wished to join us at the first site, they could tell a story there as before. If they preferred not to walk, they could share their stories in camp before we visited the first site. This ensured that the Elders could speak directly with the campers about Tłı̨chǫ history on the tundra. Within the theme of ‘peopling of the Americas’ we added Dene oral histories and legends that refer to megafauna to the program. We told students about one of the best-known stories of Cultural Hero Yamǫ̀zha, which involves him protecting the Dene from dangerous giant beavers, a species of extinct megafauna that has been found throughout the Northwest Territories. My goal in including this story was to show participants that careful observation and knowledge of giant beavers is contained in the oral histories of Indigenous peoples in the
NWT. In Western society, science and culture are viewed as distinct and separate, which ignores the fact that science is an aspect of culture and is therefore directly influenced by it. It is important for students at the camp to recognize that science and culture are mutually influential and both Western science and Indigenous knowledge are forms of science grounded in careful observation. In sharing this story, I wanted to help students see the manufactured divide between science and culture. Western science and Indigenous knowledge are both framed in particular cultural ideas about how we construct knowledge.

Changing the content of the Human History session as we did to include more Indigenous knowledge is not a shift towards Indigenous pedagogy. To address this, I attempted to bring two aspects of Indigenous pedagogy into the instruction of the Human History session. First, I tried to deconstruct the hierarchical power dynamics between teacher and student and archaeologist and non-archaeologist by allowing campers to pick up and handling the cultural belongings found near the TERS. In the past, campers would be asked not to touch anything within the cultural sites we would visit to avoid disturbing the sites. In 2022, we instead told the campers to either place a pencil down or keep the toe of their shoe directly where they picked up the belonging or suspected belonging and place it back down in the same spot after they finished examining it. This adds an element of trust between the instructor and camper, an element of added responsibility for the camper, and a reduction of the colonial idea of the teacher being ‘in charge’ of knowledge and the instruction of the program (Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001; Dei and Kempf, 2006). I also tried to incorporate the Tłı̨chǫ pedagogy of listening, watching, then doing. Tammy informed me of this approach during a phone call we had prior to our
conversation on Zoom. According to Tammy, this approach involves learning a new task or skill with this progression of steps in mind. The learners would first listen to how an expert preforms the task, and once the expert feels that the learners are ready, they move onto watching the expert. Finally, once the expert feels the learners are ready, they begin to preform the task themselves with supervision and guidance, until they eventually no longer need it. I applied this pedagogy to an evening flintknapping (stone tool making) activity to give the campers a better understanding of the types of cultural belongings that they may see throughout the camp (see Section 3.3).

### 3.3 Session Delivery: Successes and Challenges

Given that I was unable to meet with the camp Elders and their interpreter Janelle before arriving at the TSCC it was imperative that I find time to talk with them one-on-one before delivering the Human History session. On July 27th, 2022, I spoke with the Cultural Team—which consisted of the two Elders, Louis and Therese, and Janelle—about the new session. I asked whether there was anything they wished to add or change, and if they would be willing to repeat their roles as storytellers from the previous year; the Cultural Team approved the human History session and its changes. This approval of session plans made without them is far from the meaningful, collaborative Indigenization approach I aspired to for this project, but nonetheless the Elders and Janelle seemed to be happy with the changes made to the session. In my notes following this meeting I wrote that “they [the Elders] were happy with the changes I made, and they liked that I brought in stories about Yamǫ̀zha and oral histories to a greater degree…Louis will tell stories about his life as a hunter at Daring [Lake] to the students at the first archaeological site during our session tomorrow…they [the Cultural Team] seem excited and so am I.”
I delivered the revised session along with Naomi on July 28th, 2022, in two, two and a half hour sessions with eight campers in each. In the first session, The Elders met with our group at the first archaeological site and told a story about life on the tundra. However, the first session exceeded the time allotted to us by 30 minutes and we had to remove a planned section of the session—a hands-on activity in which the campers would choose a tool from a replica of a 4000-year-old toolkit and tell us what they think it is. Despite this, the first session was well received. The second session ended on time, and we completed all program sections. In the second session, the Elders told stories at camp rather than at the site, because they were too tired to visit the sites again.

We also brought, or more accurately brought back, hands-on learning in the form of flintknapping to the TSCC in 2022. Flintknapping, or stone tool production, was offered as an evening activity when I attended the camp as a camper in 2012. Being able to attempt to create stone tools gave me a better understanding of the cultural sites we saw around camp. Flintknapping was removed as a camp activity due to the risk of injury and the potential for introducing stone flakes that might be mistakenly interpreted as the result of past Indigenous use of the region. In reintroducing flintknapping, we brought obsidian from a source in Oregon, a distinctive black, shiny stone that is relatively easy to knap. This material has not been found in cultural sites in the immediate area and is easy to distinguish from stone used by past Indigenous occupants of the region. Any material inadvertently left behind after our session could be easily recognized as produced by the camp. We brought leather as leg protection, along with safety glasses and work gloves. Participants were informed that all safety gear must be worn when flintknapping, as well as long pants, long-sleeve shirts, and closed-toe shoes to avoid injuries. A maximum of
four participants could flintknap at a time to ensure that the supervisor, either myself or Naomi, could observe and assist when needed. The Tłı̨chǫ pedagogy of listening, watching, then doing, was applied for this activity. First, I explained what I was about to do, including all the safety instructions. Next, I demonstrated how to begin flintknapping and what tools I was using. After demonstrating, I asked the participants to try, and assisted them where needed.

While flintknapping was an excellent supplement to the participants’ understanding of lithic archaeological material, there were problems finding adequate time for this activity in the camp schedule. Participants only have free time twice each day (see Figure 4-1). They have one 30-minute block directly following the second session of the day, and one 90-minute period in the evening. Many sessions run over their allotted time, which cuts into the free time in the afternoon and evening. This is something that cannot be planned for, and I was only able to find the time to teach flintknapping to the participants during one of the free time slots throughout the ten-day camp. One of the participants mentioned that they would have liked to try flintknapping but were unable to because of this.

*If there was more time, I think that could have been really neat to incorporate more, like, flake-making sessions into the actual session, and I know, like, man, we could have done all day just as the Human History session, right, like instead of half a day. And that is what that is. But I do think it could have been interesting, and this would need a bigger rejig, but to have two human history sessions during the week, and one may be more focused on evidence in the landscape like evidence, like material culture, and then maybe one more focused on how are these tools created? And what are they used for? (TSCC Camper, August 12th, 2022).*
There is still much work to do in terms of Indigenizing the Human History session. Further discussions are needed with Tłı̨chǫ knowledge holders and Elders to ensure that the session follows an anti-colonial framework and is accessible for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants at the TSCC. Changes to the session will have to occur over multiple years on a trial-and-error basis to determine what aspects of the session work well and areas that could be improved, while taking into consideration that the diversity of the participants will influence the results. This process of Indigenization may also result in the changes made to the TSCC structure itself in an attempt to remedy the dominance of Western frameworks throughout the TSCC. Indigenizing just one ‘scientific’ session within the camp is not possible as the camp itself is framed in Western ideals and understandings of education, which will inevitably shape students’ experiences of the camp, no matter how much work has been done to incorporate Indigenous pedagogies. The steps taken in my project can guide this future work, not just for the Human History session but all sessions at the camp.
Chapter 4

4 Uncovering the Hidden Curriculum: Perspectives from the TSCC

In this chapter I will examine the hidden curriculum and other assumptions built into the TSCC. These unwritten aspects of the camp reveal the ways in which Western knowledge, worldviews, and teaching practices form the ideological framework of the camp. While there is nothing inherently wrong with the Western structure of the camp, it works against the ongoing efforts from within the TSCC to Indigenize what is taught and the physical space of the TERS. I will explore how the camp structure and schedule, activities, and the ways in which Indigenous pedagogies and knowledge are incorporated assert and reinforce Western ways of knowing. I then suggest structural changes that could better align with the TSCC leadership’s desire to value both Indigenous and Western knowledges and pedagogies within the camp.

4.1 What is the Hidden Curriculum?

Scholars of education have long recognized that students do not only learn what they are explicitly taught. The process of how they are taught also has implications, conveying unspoken messages about what is valued, what is appropriate, when to ask questions, where to sit, and other social behaviours (Dreeben, 1968). This hidden curriculum “includes everything which is not academic but has important influences on the academic outcomes of the schools” (Sari & Doganay, 2009, p. 926). The hidden curriculum in Western schools teaches students that teachers are authority figures that must be obeyed, much like employers and employees when entering the workforce (Kozlowski, 2021). The structure of education settings, such as schools, plays a crucial
role in the delivery of the hidden curriculum. From the layout of the Western school itself—a building with multiple rooms designated for learning various topics, to the layout of the classrooms—with the teacher situated at the front of the room and all students oriented towards them, themes of behavioural appropriateness and authority based on location are prevalent. The hidden curriculum is based on societal norms and therefore benefits socially advantaged students while hindering socially disadvantaged students (Kozlowski, 2021). Students brought up in a different culture with different societal norms than the education system they are entering will have a harder time navigating the system. Instructors should be aware of the hidden curriculum and the assumptions that may stem from it. Without this acknowledgement from the instructors, any deviation from the learners may be interpreted as disrespectful. The hidden curriculum also makes assumptions about how people learn. The hidden curriculum in Western education may result in the instructional language being ambiguous and reliant on the learner’s knowledge of social norms to decipher what is being asked of them (Kozlowski, 2021). Not only can this negatively impact learners who grew up in non-Western cultures, but it can also negatively impact Western learners who are non-white, of lower socioeconomic status, and/or neurodivergent, who may not be as aware of the social norms that the hidden curriculum is based in.

4.2 What is Hidden in the TSCC

Indigenizing the TSCC has been an ongoing process for many years, beginning with the name change from the Tundra Science Camp to the Tundra Science and Culture Camp and the incorporation of more Indigenous activities. During our interview, Karin
Clark—Chair of the TSCC Coordinating Committee expressed a clear desire to continue to increase the representation of Indigenous knowledge within the camp.

*We are always striving to interweave the science programs with the cultural programs and bring Indigenous knowledge and science knowledge together. So, we're making steps in that area, and I really am excited about making more progress there. I think we're really fortunate to have Janelle, Therese, and Louis as a very interested and dedicated Cultural Team. We can then work with that team to make improvements, and our relationship is growing and building. So, I think that's really exciting. We are always reviewing the different disciplines and the programs that we're delivering.* (Karin Clark – TSCC Instructor, July 19th, 2022).

However, despite the efforts to Indigenize the material delivered at the TSCC, there are no formal goals or plans in place to revise the curriculum. Consequently, these attempts are not centrally coordinated, and changes are not always implemented consistently from year to year. The Human History session and the changes made to it followed this same piecemeal trend. Naomi and I felt the session was not equally representative of both Indigenous and Western knowledge, and I attempted to ‘Indigenize’ the session by incorporating some more Indigenous elements and epistemologies. While I did consider time constraints in the extent to which these elements could effectively be incorporated into this session, I did not consider the Western structure of the camp as a whole and how that affects the Indigenization process.

The TSCC follows a Western camp structure—meaning that there are scheduled activity periods for different subjects, typical of a Western school and a Western knowledge system that divides knowledge into discrete disciplines and separates science from culture. Any elements of Indigenous pedagogy that are introduced are confined within the limits of this framework. The Indigenous ‘Cultural Team’ is distinguished
from the ‘science’ instructors who are almost exclusively non-Indigenous. This categorization reinforces the perception that “science is not Indigenous” and that “culture is not science.” This discrepancy in the cultural backgrounds of instructors may inadvertently contribute to the perceived divide between ‘science’ and ‘culture’. Indigenous knowledge systems are more holistic seeing ‘subjects’ as interconnected and informing one another (Ragoonaden & Mueller, 2017). The hidden curriculum of the TSCC reflects and reinforces the compartmentalization of Western knowledge systems. This hidden curriculum is why the changes I made to the Human History session fell short. The camp as a whole still values Western science over Indigenous science, and making what I now see were surface-level changes to the Human History session actually did little in the way of Indigenizing the camp in any meaningful way.

4.2.1 What’s in a Name?

The Tundra Science and Culture Camp has been running for over 20 years, and its structure has remained relatively unchanged since it began in 1995. While Indigenous knowledge is important within the camp, it feels like an afterthought, as the camp structure clearly prioritizes Western science and academic preparation. This lack of integration is particularly evident in the name change from Tundra Science Camp to Tundra Science and Culture Camp. To address this, there needs to be a reframing of how Indigenous knowledge is viewed at the TSCC. This reframing could involve presenting ‘Indigenous knowledge’ as ‘Indigenous science’ and highlighting that it represents another way of conducting science based on experience and observation. While Western science focuses on objectivity, Indigenous science focuses on relationality. Sessions
could highlight both similarities and differences between Western and Indigenous science, and the campers should be free to gravitate toward one or both methods.

The separation between ‘science’ and ‘culture’ in the camp title displays the positivist interpretation that science is not culture and vice versa, that culture and cultural knowledge are inherently separate from scientific knowledge. ‘Culture’ here refers to Indigenous culture, implying that ‘culture’ is Indigenous, while ‘science’ is not. This attempt to include Indigenous perspectives in the camp unintentionally devalues Indigenous knowledge. This kind of subdividing is a characteristic of Western thought which involves categorizing the world and binary thinking. This categorization continues within Western science through the separation of science into different disciplines. These disciplines are also often split into sub-disciplines for individuals to specialize in.

The prioritizing of Western cultural understandings throughout the TSCC can also be found in its conception of what ‘a camp’ is. For me as a settler student coming to the camp for the first time, I envisaged an environment where campers of the same age would gather and participate in structured daily activities like hiking and swimming. When I attended in 2012, I was fully prepared for the experience and the camp lived up to my expectations. However, a camp may mean something different to an Indigenous participant, particularly one from one of the smaller communities in the NWT. My conversations with Indigenous participants at the TSCC suggest that camps in Indigenous communities often have less explicit scheduling of activities throughout the day. Instead, there seems to be a greater focus on knowledge transfer through time spent together. For an Indigenous youth from the NWT, the notion of “camp” might conjure images of preparing bògǫ̨̀ and ehgwàa (drymeat and dryfish), connecting with Elders, tending to a
fire in a nimba, and on-the-land survival skills. Their expectations of the camp would be quite different than those of a non-Indigenous student from Yellowknife like me. These differing expectations impact the accessibility of the TSCC for campers. Where students’ expectations differ from the reality, they will have to adjust in a way that others whose expectations are met will not.

The hidden curriculum can also impact campers’ experiences through the unspoken expectations regarding appropriate clothing and equipment for the camp. In 2022 many of the students from smaller communities attended the camp with only one pair of running shoes, which did not provide adequate support given the amount of walking they were expected to do. While the TSCC provides a packing list to all campers, participants only receive this list a few weeks before the camp start date. Campers who do not already own, for example, hiking shoes, may not be able to purchase them before they leave for camp because of limited store stock, shipping times for online purchases, or cost. There is an assumption by the TSCC that students will already own or be able to access hiking boots, which can disadvantage campers from smaller communities where access is more difficult, and campers from lower income backgrounds.

The hidden curriculum can also pose challenges for many of the campers. Camp participants who are Indigenous or come from a non-Western cultural and educational background may struggle with some of the hidden expectations of the TSCC. Kumari Karunaratne, an instructor of the geoscience and tundra plants session at the TSCC, noted that reading was an aspect of some of these programs. Assuming, as Western-educated instructors, that all campers can read, can lead participants who cannot read to disengage.
Because many of the instructors have limited teaching experience, they may struggle to pinpoint the underlying causes of this behaviour. This year we had more teacher involvement than in the previous years I have taught at the camp, which I and the other instructors found very helpful.

There were a lot of Indigenous students this year compared to other years. I think the engagement with the Indigenous students is lower, especially with the science activities. And I think that probably partially stems from our need to make it more accessible you know. Like, day one, I gave them an activity that they needed to read a word and find, you know, a little name tag. I gave them like pairs of words like cat and dog. And didn't realize that, oh, this is reading right off the bat! So, yeah, I think it's going to be another paradigm shift. Because the kids that can read, it's, “oh, we're doing an activity that doesn't have reading”, they don't even notice. But for the kids that struggle with reading, it's a big deal. (Kumari Karunaratne – TSCC Instructor, September 23rd, 2022).

There is one thing I think that I would pinpoint that really does help a lot is having the two teachers with us. We had two teachers this year, we had one participating as a student teacher, and then we had another teacher as part of the staff. And having those two teachers was really helpful, just in terms of how to communicate things to students, how to organize the camp, helping with all the day-to-day activities, helping corral students, and getting everybody organized. It’s really helpful. (Naomi Smethurst – TSCC Instructor, August 15th, 2022).

The teachers helped us recognize the subtle cues that the campers gave regarding their reading levels. They also made suggestions on how to mitigate these issues in the future. For example, instead of giving the campers something to read or write, having them work as a group or having instructors read to the students so they can follow along.

4.2.2 Scheduling Conflicts

Attempting to introduce Indigenous pedagogies and knowledge into Western education systems is challenging, given the many differences between Indigenous and
Western knowledge. While there have been attempts to incorporate Indigenous knowledge into Western education (Battiste, 2013; Bartmes & Shukla, 2020), they are often restricted by the confines of a learning schedule. During the TSCC specific blocks of time are reserved for teaching a particular topic, meaning that, in many cases, if we are attempting to bring in Indigenous knowledge, it must fit within a block of time that has been designated for one of the ‘science’ subjects. It is Indigenous knowledge and knowledge holders who are expected to be flexible. While this expectation may not be intentional, it still insinuates that Western education systems are the standard.

Land-based learning is a common approach in efforts to Indigenize Western education. Land-based learning is an educational approach incorporating the land and its resources into the learning process. It is a way of teaching and learning rooted in Indigenous communities’ cultural and traditional practices, which often have a profound spiritual and philosophical connection to the land. Land-based learning and Indigenous pedagogy can take many forms, including traditional teachings and practices, such as storytelling, hunting, fishing, etc. (Bowra et al., 2020; Johnson-Jennings et al., 2020). It can also involve more formal educational activities, such as field trips, science experiments, and language learning. One of the key principles of land-based learning and Indigenous pedagogy is the recognition of the interconnectedness of all living things (Styres & Zinga, 2011). This is reflected in the belief that the land is a living being with its own stories, history, and lessons to teach us. By engaging with the land respectfully and reciprocally, we can learn to understand and appreciate its gifts and resources and our place in the world. Another important aspect of land-based learning is the emphasis on experiential and hands-on learning. This approach recognizes that hands-on experiences
and direct engagement with the natural world can be powerful sources of learning and understanding. It also acknowledges that different people learn in different ways and that experiential learning can be especially effective for those who may not thrive in more traditional classroom settings. Land-based learning and Indigenous pedagogy also strongly emphasize community and relationships (Styres & Zinga, 2011).

In many Indigenous cultures, knowledge is shared and passed down through the generations through oral tradition and practical experience. This approach values the wisdom and experiences of Elders and other community members. It recognizes that learning is a collective process that involves sharing and building upon the knowledge and experiences of others. Land-based learning and Indigenous pedagogy offer a rich and meaningful approach to education grounded in Indigenous communities’ cultural and traditional practices. By incorporating the land and its resources into the learning process and valuing the interconnectedness of all living things, this approach offers a holistic and experiential approach to education that can be enriching for students and educators. It involves learning directly from the land, often as a way of reclaiming and restoring cultural practices and knowledge that have been suppressed or erased by colonialism.
Figure 4-1. 2022 Tundra Science and Culture Camp schedule.

The TSCC has taken place in an on-the-land setting since its inception. However, its structure is reminiscent of a typical Western school schedule, with blocks of time allotted for different activities throughout the day, beginning at 7:30am and ending at 11:00pm. Printouts of these schedules are placed around the Tundra Ecosystem Research Station (TERS) so that the campers know what to expect for that day and can prepare accordingly. Figure 4-1 displays the TSCC schedule from the 2022 season. Most of the days spent at the camp have specific activities scheduled from approximately 8am to 8:30pm. This type of schedule was likely chosen because it is what the instructors, the people who designed the camp, were the most familiar and comfortable with. Only two out of the seven sessions delivered at the camp are “cultural” sessions focussing on Indigenous knowledge and pedagogies. That is less than 30% of the sessions delivered. In
an interview with one of the original TSCC instructors, Tom Andrews informed me that
the TSCC schedule has remained largely unchanged over its 20-plus-year existence.

*It was pretty much the same model from the beginning to the end of the days when I was there. The first half of the camp would be instruction, you know, so there would be an in-camp, short lecture, we tried to really minimize the amount of time spent lecturing, and then we would take the students out onto the land to, you know, demonstrate or show them things or let them find their own things. And we ran two sessions a day. So, you would usually teach twice a day, once or twice during the 10 days, and then you would just help out the other instructors for the rest of the time. Students were required to help with all the, you know, chores. They were given the full experience. So, in running a research station, you have to worry about outhouses, and cooking and food prep, running the boats, gassing the boats, all that kind of stuff. So, students were expected to help with all those necessary chores because, they're all part of field methodology, too. So, it was kind of a full-on experience for the students. And then in terms of activities, of course, you probably participated in these, there were specific things that were run by the Elders, and these vary from year to year, depending on which Elders were involved.* (Tom Andrews – Former TSCC Instructor, October 18th, 2022).

The roots of the TSCC are deeply entwined with Western science and knowledge creation and dissemination. As noted in Chapter 1, the TSCC was created as a direct result of the construction and operation of the TERS. The lodgings at the camp are Western scientific lodgings, built for the sole purpose of housing researchers and research specimens. Indigenous research and ways of knowing and being were excluded from the blueprint when constructing the TERS. However, this is not to say there has been no effort to Indigenize the TERS space. A nimba platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Thursday July 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Rise and Shine!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Chores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Group Gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Group 1 Geoscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Group 2 Geoscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Group 1 Geoscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Group 2 Human History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Free Time / Staff Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Supper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Dishes and Trampoline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Tundra Challenge!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Lights Out!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4-2. TSCC Schedule for July 28th, 2022.*
was set up in the early years of the camp where the Elders and campers can commune, make tea, and dry meat/fish. However, with many camp sessions taking place outside of the TERS base, there are only a few times aside from scheduled meals and free time when the campers can make use of the nimba. Scheduled sessions going overtime can also cut into the time spent in the nimba.

The school-like schedule which organizes the program adds a limitation when attempting to bring Indigenous pedagogies into an existing camp session. Figure 4-2 displays a partial camp schedule from the 2022 TSCC, showing the activities on Thursday July 28. Two sessions run for approximately two and a half hours each day. The campers are split into two groups, with each group attending one session in the morning and the other in the afternoon. When redesigning the Human History program, I found it challenging to incorporate Indigenous pedagogical approaches such as storytelling due to the time constraints of the two-and-a-half-hour sessions.

4.2.3 Representation Matters

The overall goal of the TSCC is to expose campers to the subjects taught at camp to give them a sense of disciplines and careers they might not otherwise be aware of. The creators of the camp hoped to inspire some students to pursue higher education in some of the subjects taught at the camp. In many cases this it is exactly what happened. Naomi and I are examples of campers who pursued degrees in archaeology after attending the camp. In fact, seven out of the eleven instructors that attended the camp in 2022 previously attended the TSCC as campers themselves, including first time instructor Sophie Clark. During my interviews with Naomi and Sophie both looked back fondly on their time as TSCC campers.
Yeah, I just remember it [the TSCC] being like, pretty much everything that I wanted it to be. Everything was great. This summer I did a bunch of work on traditional knowledge and Indigenous knowledge, and I just declared a minor in Indigenous ecological knowledge now. I think, the camp played a role in that. Just the way that I am not focused on one thing when I look out in nature. (Sophie Clark – TSCC Instructor, October 7th, 2022)

Sophie has had the opportunity to attend the TSCC multiple times throughout her life. Her mother, Karin Clark, is one of the camp instructors and would bring her along when she was a child (2009, 2011, and 2012). Sophie has a unique outlook on the camp due to her multiple visits over the years. During my discussions with her, she mentioned that although she took part in the camp as a child and already attended and participated in all camp sessions, she was particularly excited to participate as a registered high-school camp participant in 2016. She was looking forward to going through the program herself and had high expectations because of her previous experiences at the camp. The access to Indigenous knowledge she had at the camp influenced her choice of minor at university.

Naomi, who in 2019, 2021, and 2022 co-instructed the archaeology sessions at the camp with me, also previously attended as a student participant in the early years of the camp:

As a student, like, as I’m sure you’ll attest to, it’s friggin awesome, right? It’s like nothing you’ve ever seen, because I think the big appeal, at least for me, was like, “oh, my God, this could be a career, right?” And you’re not exposed to that kind of thing. I grew up in Hay River and you don’t see archaeologists in Hay River. You know, you don’t even think it’s a career. All you see is the careers around you. And that [archaeologists] definitely didn’t exist, or even geologists or other stuff like that. It was kind of a totally eye-opening experience of what your life could be like after a teenager. So, I think, as a student I never felt bored. It was just the most amazing thing. Because all we did was do fun stuff. Right? All we did was do hikes, learn about the different kinds of ologies that you could do. And I was interested in all of them. And I thought, oh, my God, and all these instructors were real ologists. And this was their career.
And I said, “well, if they can do that, maybe I can do it too.” (Naomi Smethurst – TSCC Instructor, July 10th, 2022)

Seeing archaeology done in the north at the TSCC inspired Naomi to pursue a career in archaeology, and, like me, she began attending the TSCC as an instructor. Being able to see oneself in what is being taught is of the utmost importance in academic pursuits (Solomon, 1997). Indigenous representation is currently lacking among the science instructors. Janelle Nitsiza is the only Indigenous Instructor to previously attend as a camper—and has been an Instructor of Tłı̨chǫ Activities multiple times, including in 2022. In our interactions, I noticed that she takes great care in creating a space for Indigenous campers to feel welcome and to teach the importance of Tłı̨chǫ history, language, and culture. She mentioned to me that her grandmother had also attended the TSCC as a Tłı̨chǫ instructor. Janelle was able to see herself in this role and has been working to provide this same experience for the Indigenous participants at camp.

Representation within the camp matters. Students tend to see Indigenous instructors only for the Indigenous-centred (“cultural”) session that focusses on Indigenous knowledge through Indigenous pedagogy. They see almost exclusively non-Indigenous instructors for all of the “science” sessions. Those representations have shaped the pathways of several current instructors and are likely affecting campers’ ability to imagine themselves in these different roles and careers. The “science” sessions at the camp should also be approached with the same level of care, ensuring that Indigenous campers feel a sense of belonging in what they are learning and see themselves represented there.
4.3 Incorporation of Indigenous Pedagogies and Knowledge Within the TSCC

The shift to incorporating Indigenous pedagogies and knowledge into the TSCC has been an ongoing process since the early years of the camp. Elders were brought in to share their knowledge with the campers. Slowly, more elements of Indigenous culture have been incorporated, including constructing a wooden platform for the nimba that remains on site year-round. The extent to which Indigenous pedagogies have been part of the camp has fluctuated over the years due to changes in the Elders and instructors who attend and regulations surrounding activities such as hunting. Tom told me that a caribou hunt—performed by the Elders—was an aspect of the camp at one point. However, due to the declining population of the Bathurst herd—the main caribou herd in the area—restrictions have been placed on caribou hunting in the area. As a result, the Elders and the TSCC had to make alterations to this aspect of the programming. The Tłı̨chǫ activities at the camp still involve aspects of caribou butchering and the preparation of drymeat, but instead of doing this with the entire animal, it is limited to the legs and head, as that is all the Cultural Team is able to bring with them.

In terms of activities that were run by the Elders—and these vary from year to year—depending on which Elders were involved. But usually, when Harry was involved, it almost always included a caribou hunt, and then the processing of a caribou hide into drymeat and included various toolmaking. (Tom Andrews – Former TSCC Instructor, October 18th, 2022)

I can remember the first camp. At the end of the camp, we were sitting in the kitchen tent. And there's that little square window in the back. And I had a view out to the esker from the back. And I couldn't pay attention to the debriefing, because I was watching the caribou stream along the top of that esker, you know, and in the first few years, we had thousands of caribou. And students interacted with thousands of caribou. And as the years went on, the number of caribou got fewer and fewer. And I
would say by about year 12 to 15 was the first time that we were skunked. We saw no caribou in the ten days. And that’s why I say it was really remarkable to be able to watch that single place [referring to the area around the TERS], at the same moment in time, over 20 years to see that decline in caribou, like it became really, really evident. And then after that, it was only rarely that we saw caribou. But in the first year, the students came out of there with their eyes and their brains exploded because they had seen thousands of caribou. (Tom Andrews – Former TSCC Instructor, October 18th, 2022)

The TSCC has recently, circa 2021, begun incorporating a new element titled Grandchild for the Day. This role assigns two campers per day to act as ‘grandchildren’ for the Elders Therese and Louis. While in this role, the campers will eat all their meals with the Elders, help to prepare their tea, and accompany them to any sessions they are a part of. This program is meant to provide the campers quality time with the Elders and give them the opportunity to ask questions and learn from them. Janelle, translating for Louis, informed me that passing along knowledge was the most important aspect of the camp to him, and the Grandchild for the Day program allows the Elders to develop better connections with the campers and share this knowledge.

He said it's very vital to teach the next generation, so that's why it's very positive to be an instructor here. Also just like in his upbringing, like when his dad was teaching him things, he'd be on the land one to two weeks at a time on his own, just based on his father's teaching of things like trapping and hunting and doing things like that. He said he really enjoys passing on the knowledge to the next generation of people. And he really appreciates all the different lessons that they get in the camp, not just from us, but from all the other instructors. (Janelle Nitsiza translating for Louis Zoe – TSCC Instructors, July 31st, 2022).

In the mornings, directly following breakfast, the Elders and Janelle would also lead the campers and instructors in a morning prayer. Louis, Therese and Janelle would pray in Tłı̨chǫ while the campers and instructors would sit with their heads bowed. Following the prayer, Janelle would then tell the campers a Dene Law along with the
Tł̱ı̨chǫ Word of the Day. The Dene Laws are a list of nine lessons to follow in everyday life established by the Dene cultural hero Yamǫ́rıa/Yamǫ́ɂza (Yamǫ́rıa Virtual Companion Exhibit | Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre, 2015), and the Tł̱ı̨chǫ Word of the Day provides an introduction to the Tł̱ı̨chǫ language to ensure that campers are able to speak to the Elders in their own language. This is especially important for Louis, who has very limited English, to be able to connect with the campers.

Table 4-1. Dene Laws and Tł̱ı̨chǫ Words of the Day, in both Tł̱ı̨chǫ and English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENE LAWS</th>
<th>TŁỊCHỌ</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>TŁỊCHỌ</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ası̨̀ı naxı̨ Fortress, wet͑̀a done ts̨̱ahđi</td>
<td>K’omǫ́q̨̱q̨̱ hozį̨̨̨</td>
<td>Share what you have.</td>
<td>Hoǫ̨̨̀</td>
<td>Let’s go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elets’àdi</td>
<td>Si _____ siyeh, ni daniyeh?</td>
<td>Help each other.</td>
<td>Sagja dant’e?</td>
<td>How are you, my friend?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ats’ǫ̨́ łeghǫ̣ mətañǫ̨</td>
<td>Dzęę̨́ tanį̨ k’ee hozį̨̨̨</td>
<td>Love each other as much as possible</td>
<td>Nezį̨ – Nezį̨ –le</td>
<td>Good – Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qhdaaw wenaets’eêt’į eyixixi su asit hazhǫ̨</td>
<td>Hoow̱</td>
<td>Be respectful of Elders and everything around you.</td>
<td>Ayi wi</td>
<td>Whatever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzęę̨́ eghałæde eyiits’ǫ too whahte</td>
<td>Hoow̱</td>
<td>Sleep at night and work during the day.</td>
<td>Heze – İle</td>
<td>Yes – No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dǫ̣ wenaets’eêt’į eyiits’ǫ̨̨̨ done ch’ai gą̨̨de-le</td>
<td>He泽 – İle</td>
<td>Be polite and do not argue with anyone.</td>
<td>Masi cho</td>
<td>Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T’ę̀ ñaas’setting of dą́äh gį́hëg̨̱s’ehtǫ̨ k’ę̨ k’ehogeza ha</td>
<td>He泽 – İle</td>
<td>Youth should behave respectfully.</td>
<td>Masi cho</td>
<td>Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ası̨̀ı k’eëts’ezhǫ̣ wet’à done hōgáhets’ehtǫ̨</td>
<td>Heze – İle</td>
<td>Pass on the teachings.</td>
<td>Heze – İle</td>
<td>Yes – No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ats’ǫ̨́ naxiná naxixę̨ hoozį̨ dę nezįą</td>
<td>Heze – İle</td>
<td>Be as happy as possible at all times.</td>
<td>Heze – İle</td>
<td>Yes – No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These aspects of Tł̱ı̨chǫ language and culture work in tandem to bring the campers and the Elders closer while at the camp. During an interview with one of the campers, they shared that the combination of the Tł̱ı̨chǫ Word of the Day and the Grandchild for the Day greatly assisted their ability to effectively engage with the Elders.
Hand games was fun, you know, especially playing with Louie. And just like, basically the overall vibe. It was just so fun. You know? And then I liked being a Grandchild because I could like, talk to them. I would ask Janelle and Therese questions and stuff. And then I use the little bit of knowledge I had from the Word of the Day to like, start a conversation with Louie. (TSCC Camper, August 10th, 2022).

As discussed in Chapter 3.2.3, we modelled the evening flintknapping activity on the Tłı̨chǫ approach of listening, watching, then doing that Tammy Steinwand shared with me. In this approach, learners listen to Elders or other knowledge holders explain why something is done and the best way to do it, usually through stories. Making bògǫ̀ and ehgwàa (drymeat and dryfish) or butchering an animal are examples of on-the-land tasks where this approach would be used. This approach encourages that teaching and learning be done organically, with knowledge passed when deemed appropriate, unlike the traditional Western classroom structure, which involves preconstructed lesson plans and curriculums for various subjects. Learning in a Western sense is done in a specific place, school. While Western learners’ parents and grandparents pass on their knowledge in things such as family recipes, good manners, and cleanliness, these are not widely considered part of education in Western societies. However, in many Indigenous communities, ethics and morality play a large part in all aspects of their pedagogical approaches (Archibald, 2008). Opportunistic teaching, passing on knowledge when it is valuable and meaningful to do so, is a significant aspect of Indigenous pedagogies—an aspect which is difficult to incorporate into an existing Western education structure.

4.4 Suggestions for Addressing the Hidden Curriculum

It is essential to recognize that assumptions and underlying biases which stem from the hidden curriculum can significantly influence the success of attempts to
Indigenize the TSCC. If our goal is to Indigenize the TSCC in a meaningful way, then we need to make the time for the Elders and camp instructors to have conversations about the goals of the camp and how they want to present them to the campers. This task is not easy as the TSCC instructors all have other primary roles at the GNWT. TSCC planning is often sidelined as their other work takes priority. The Elders who attend the camp are also often busy with other work and commitments in the time leading up to the camp. This means that finding time when all camp instructors are available to have meetings and discussions is challenging and may need to be booked far in advance of the camp start date to ensure that everyone can attend.

As the TSCC continues to work towards further Indigenization, assumptions of the hidden curriculum will become more transparent, and action will need to be taken to mitigate them. Effective Indigenization will require the support of Indigenous knowledge holders and Indigenous teachers. It will be important to evaluate the promotional materials because that is students’ first point of contact with the camp. Does this material effectively describe what the TSCC and its goals are? Are the expectations for campers clearly explained? Are the support options for potential campers who reside outside of Yellowknife presented in these materials? Including additional clarifying language in the promotional material may benefit campers who are not well-versed in Western ideas of summer camps. As the camp continues incorporating more Indigenous pedagogies, the promotional materials must be updated accordingly to reflect this.

The hidden curriculum of the TSCC has many parallels with that found in the Western schools it draws its structure from. Four key aspects include:

1. An emphasis on written language
2. The importance of punctuality
3. Hierarchical power structures
4. The separation of scientific disciplines.

Some of the camp sessions, such as Tundra Plants, involve using field guides for identification. This year, however, one of the Indigenous campers informed the instructors that they had difficulty reading and writing in English. This highlighted for instructors that we were making assumptions about the campers’ abilities and that steps would need to be taken in the future to ensure that campers do not feel disadvantaged during the camp sessions. This could include having campers work in groups for reading activities or having instructors read any necessary passages to the campers, and using visuals where possible as an alternative method of engaging with the content.

The school-like schedule of the TSCC creates an unspoken expectation that the campers be punctual and prepared for the day’s activities. Campers are expected to look at the schedule for the day and prepare for the activity they will be doing. This means packing the appropriate clothing (raincoats, bug jackets, etc.), wearing proper footwear, and ensuring they have enough water. Punctuality was an issue for the 2022 campers, with many of them having to be told multiple times to get ready for the day’s activities. At the time I found this frustrating because, as someone who grew up in the Western school system, the lack of punctuality from some of the Indigenous campers felt disrespectful to me as an instructor. However, it is clear to me in hindsight that the campers were not acting out of disrespect; that is just how I perceived the situation in the moment because I have internalized the hidden curriculum. Ensuring that instructors are aware of this aspect of the hidden curriculum could help them rethink their expectations.
Explaining what campers will need for each activity or reducing the number of activities campers are expected to do each day could also help mitigate against these tensions.

The feeling of disrespect I felt from the campers’ lack of punctuality also reflects the camp’s hierarchical power structure. This aspect of the hidden curriculum gives instructors authority over campers. While this structure is necessary in many ways, as the instructors need to be responsible for the safety of the campers while at the TSCC, one suggestion for stepping away from this aspect of the hidden curriculum is to create a more egalitarian atmosphere with the campers. One way this could be achieved is through student-centred learning, which operates on the interests and needs of the student rather than a pre-determined curriculum. To address the hierarchical power structures at the camp the instructors must reflect on their biases regarding who is “in charge” of knowledge and its transmission and allow the campers to have more control over what they are learning. Doing so would foster an element of mutual respect that is not based on one person's level of authority or power over another (Dei & Kempf, 2006).

A radical reorganization of the TSCC schedule, which reduces the separation between some of the subjects taught at the camp, could help make the camp more student-centred, as could bringing an aspect of relationality into discussions of interdisciplinarity. For example, we could illustrate how all the subjects discussed at the camp relate to each other through the overarching theme of the ‘tundra’, rather than presenting them as distinct and separate. In my interviews with Karin and Kumari, when asked about which aspects of the TSCC they most enjoyed, both instructors pointed to the interdisciplinarity of the camp.
I really like when the instructors are together, and we're out on hikes. And we're interpreting what we see from the different disciplines and perspectives. So that to me is the most enriching, I guess. And so, finding this balance between introducing a topic area and providing some instruction in that area balanced with the opportunities to be out with all the instructors so that you’re interpreting the landscape from all those different knowledge sources—that, to me is the key sort of dilemma—finding that balance. So do you go all one way and just hike every day with, you know, all the instructors and the students and just interpret what we see or have all individual subjects. There's a sweet spot there, and I'm not sure we've hit it (Karin Clark – TSCC Instructor, September 30\textsuperscript{th}, 2022).

The real juicy points of this camp are when interdisciplinary stuff happens, and you have people looking at things from different lenses and offering different perspectives on the same process or the same feature on the landscape. And I think that we can try to do that a little bit more intentionally. I think that there are ways that we could make the program a bit more hands on, and less sort of academic. It’s come a long way since I first started about eight years ago. But I think there's still a ways for it to go (Kumari Karunaratne – TSCC Instructor, July 29\textsuperscript{th}, 2022).

Karin and Kumari both value moments where multiple different instructors come together with the campers and share their knowledge. This most commonly happens on the day of the Tundra Trek, an all-day, 15km hike that takes the campers along one of the eskers around the TERS. Because of the lack of a formal lesson plan for this day, the instructors often share knowledge when it is pertinent to do so (i.e., determining what animal made a set of tracks seen in the sand, discussing what plants grow in specific areas, identifying animal bones, and how different geological features came to be).

Interdisciplinarity is often present on these hikes as campers ask about something they found, and multiple instructors assist in the answer. For example, a camper may inquire about a rock they spotted, and both Kumari (geologist) and Naomi and I (archaeologists) would provide our, oftentimes very different, answers. Naomi and I share information on whether the rock the camper has found has evidence of human alteration, and Kumari
provides information about the type of material and how to identify it. Interdisciplinarity, in this way, is not unlike the Indigenous pedagogical approach of interconnectedness. While interdisciplinarity still maintains a distinction between the sciences taught at the camp, it does offer an opportunity for the instructors to learn from one another and for the campers to gain a more holistic understanding, which, in the regular camp sessions, would be lost.

More explicitly highlighting this interconnectedness could help both Indigenize the camp and promote interdisciplinary learning. Bringing relationality into the structure of the TSCC in this way will require more preparation time for the instructors, as they will need to have discussions about the best way to bring together their sessions. One suggestion I heard from some of the instructors during our interviews was the implementation of “theme days”.

_We’ve talked about having different themes, so instead of having the disciplines split up we’d focus on having a bit of a theme for the day. So, the theme could be the esker and focus on what’s going on with it in terms of geology and what’s going on with human history and what’s going on with, you know, the caribou and what other animals are using it, and what does the esker mean for water. And then doing that for different features._ (Kumari Karunaratne – TSCC Instructor, July 29th, 2022).

Incorporating, to some extent, a theme day or days may be a good next step if the TSCC wishes to Indigenize. Although interdisciplinarity is not in itself an Indigenous pedagogy, it does share some similarities and may be beneficial in easing into the transition to interconnectedness as it will give the instructors a better sense of how their various fields are connected. Incorporating a guiding theme for the day may also help change the unspoken implication that scientific fields are distinct and disconnected.
There will always be aspects of the hidden curriculum in education settings as they are set through cultural norms and ideals regarding teaching and learning. It is essential, however, to be cognizant of the hidden curriculum from an educator’s standpoint. Instructors must be conscious of these aspects of the hidden curriculum and what the campers are learning at the TSCC. If Indigenous knowledge and culture is an important element of the camp, the instructors must work to ensure that it is clearly reflected in what is being taught, in both the spoken and unspoken elements.
Chapter 5

5 Indigenous and non-Indigenous experiences and approaches at the TSCC

Individuals may perceive the same experience differently, based on their life experiences, background, and perspectives. Intersectionality is a contextual tool for examining how one social category (i.e., race) can intersect with another (i.e., gender) (Rosette et al., 2018). The intersection of these two identities creates different social categories and perceptions for individuals and groups (Rosette et al., 2018). These intersections are not only limited to categories of race and gender but extend to all social categories including ethnicity, sexuality and socio-economic status. This intersection also provides individuals with a sense of identity within society.

Identity, in this context, refers to how individuals perceive themselves and others. It is associated not only with the broad social categories noted above but also exists to different extents within microcosms of society and culture. An individual's social roles can shape their experiences and interactions within these microcosms (Fowler, 2004). For example, a participant’s identity within the TSCC is shaped and reflected, in large part, by their role (instructor, Indigenous Elder, camper, teacher camper, or cook), with elements such as years of experience (for instructors) and age (for campers) further shaping how a participant views themselves and interacts with others within the context of the camp. The microcosm of the TSCC and the various identities found within it will be the focus of this chapter as I attempt to outline how individuals’ identities shape their experiences within the camp. This chapter will examine the ways in which experiences
differed between the campers and instructors and the Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants.

5.1 Demographics and Context

Before examining how identity influences a person’s experience at the camp, it is important to first explore the different identities present within the TSCC. This discussion will cover the various roles and responsibilities within the camp, as well as how cultural background, age, and years of experience shape an individual’s identity at the TSCC. Examining these aspects is crucial to understanding the context of the TSCC and the ways in which the various participants situate themselves within it.

Table 5-1. List of roles for 2022 Tundra Science and Culture Camp, adapted from 2022 TSCC Annual Report. N/A indicates data that was withheld to protect the identity of staff who wished to remain anonymous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>TSCC Responsibilities</th>
<th>TSCC Instruction Experience (Years)</th>
<th>Indigenous?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karin Clark</td>
<td>Chair, TSCC Coordinating Committee</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager, TERS Facility Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumari Karunaratne</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janelle Nitsiza</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi Smethurst</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Zoe</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therese Zoe</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaylee Woldum</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Clark</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous Staff (5)</td>
<td>Cooks, Instructors,</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers, TERS Facility Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Camper Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NWT Communities</th>
<th>Number of Campers</th>
<th>Indigenous</th>
<th>Non-Indigenous</th>
<th>Camper Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large Communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Inuvik, Yellowknife)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 fourteen-year-olds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 fifteen-year-olds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aklavik, Behchokǫ̨̀, Fort Good Hope, Fort Simpson)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 sixteen-year-olds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 seventeen-year-old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 eighteen-year-old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 adult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-1 outlines some elements of the identities of TSCC staff, including their role and the number of years they have been an instructor. Camp staff roles include instructors, cooks, and Tundra Ecological Research Station (TERS) managers. A person’s role determines their level of responsibility and authority while at the camp. The TERS managers have the highest levels of authority, as they are the most knowledgeable about the operation of the research station where the camp is based. Individuals in the Instructor role are responsible for their camp sessions and the campers’ safety and have a level of authority over the campers. Lastly, the cooks are responsible for food preparation and have authority over the kitchen tent and how it is run during the camp.
The campers’ role as learners at the TSCC comes with its own expectations and responsibilities. The campers’ responsibilities include:

1) Performing daily rotating chores
   a) Cleaning dishes
   b) Latrine maintenance
   c) Recording weather measurements
   d) Checking and recording a small mammal trapline
2) Attending camp sessions
   a) Human History
   b) Geoscience
   c) Caribou and Friends
   d) Tłı̨chǫ Activities
   e) Tundra Plants and Permafrost
   f) Aquatic Life
3) Participating in treks along the nearby eskers
4) Participating in the Grandchild for a Day program
5) Participating in Tundra Challenges—A series of evening challenges where the campers compete in groups against one another.
6) Completing a collection activity with the help of the instructors
7) Completing an exploration activity with the help of the instructors

Figure 5-1 displays the hierarchy of roles at the TSCC. For the Instructors, the number of years that they have attended the TSCC as an instructor may also shape their identity while at the camp. Instructors with more experience are typically much more comfortable in their positions and teaching their sessions than instructors with fewer years of experience. The newer instructors will also typically direct any of their questions towards those with more seniority at the camp, looking to people with more experience for guidance.
5.2 Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Experiences and Approaches

5.2.1 Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Instructors

In my interviews with the Cultural Team (Janelle Nitsiza, Louis Zoe, and Therese Zoe), they told me that they felt there were some issues with the camp and their involvement in it. Janelle informed me that when they first began attending the camp as the Cultural Team, they felt underutilized. She said that in that first year, despite being instructors, the Cultural Team did not feel as though they were a part of the staff and did not have the same obligations or expectations as the instructors from the GNWT.

*I felt like when we first came, it was just like filler for two days. And that was it. And for myself, I wasn't really part of the staff team at first. But now we're part of that, we're more open with the staff and [are] considered staff too. So, I like that. And I like the prayer and the Word of the Day.* (Janelle Nitsiza– TSCC Instructor, July 31st, 2022)
According to Janelle, the TSCC has been working through some of these issues with the Cultural Team to make the TSCC more encompassing of Tłı̨chǫ Culture. However, there is still work that needs to be done. She feels that the Cultural Team’s role is tangential to the rest of the camp, and that they are often under or overutilized. A middle ground, which would consist of the Cultural Team being more involved in the day-to-day practices of the camp has not yet been reached.

*I think I get bored sometimes though, like, restless. There’re days where we’re not doing anything and then there’s days where we’re doing too much. Today was a lot, with the fish and the prayers and stuff like that. I like doing it, but then tomorrow’s our Culture Day so it’s like back-to-back sessions. And for me when we have a culture session, we’ve gotta be mindful that they [the Elders] need time to rest.* (Janelle Nitsiza – TSCC Instructor, July 31st, 2022)

For GNWT instructors, during days where their sessions were not running those who are able attend each others’ sessions to help manage the campers and assist with carrying additional gear. However, because many of these sessions are run outside of the base camp and can be physically strenuous, it is difficult for the Elders to attend when their sessions are not running.

The TSCC instructors from the GNWT are aware of these feelings of disconnect and underutilization from the Cultural Team and are working to improve these aspects of the camp. When comparing 2022 to previous years one of the instructors mentioned seeing an increased visibility of cultural programming at the TSCC.

*I thought it was a great camp. I thought that the cultural elements in programming were kind of more visible at camp as well, like just having that as something that students could come explore when it was available made a big difference.* (TSCC Instructor, August 29th, 2022).
The non-Indigenous instructors I interviewed expressed a strong interest in integrating more Indigenous knowledge into the camp in the future and involving the Elders in their camp sessions. However, they also recognize the demands on the Elders and want to avoid overburdening them.

I think it [incorporating more Indigenous knowledge into the camp] would be interesting. Like, I don’t know how this would work. But if we had an Elder or like, a knowledge holder come with us for more of the sessions, then they could tell stories that kind of were related to the topic, if that makes sense? For example, with the caribou session, if we had an Elder, come and tell stories that were about caribou, and Indigenous knowledge around caribou, or even like plants, and the medicinal uses of plants. But I know that would be a lot of work for the Elders. Oh! maybe if somehow there was an opportunity for them to share those stories, but they didn’t have to come with us on the sessions, but just after the sessions, have them tell stories related to the things that we’ve been learning that day? (Sophie Clark – TSCC Instructor, October 7th, 2022)

Yeah, Indigenous knowledge is really useful for archaeology. Louis kind of caters those stories to him being on the tundra. So, the kids can imagine how it's related to archaeology, right? Because he talks about how he travels on the tundra and stuff. And I suppose that kind of thing would be useful for the other sessions. I think they do incorporate it. The caribou session does. Aquatics did it this year, too, because we got Janelle to show the kids how to fillet fish in a Tłı̨chǫ way. So, I think we are kind of incorporating it into different sessions… But yes, I do think it would help. But you know, the Elders have only so much time. And we can’t ask them to be involved in every single session every single day, because that’ll be crazy. I think they're actually involved as much as they possibly can be. Their time’s pretty well maxed out at the camp, we’ve always got them doing something. (Naomi Smethurst – TSCC Instructor, August 15th, 2022)

It is evident that both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous camp leaders are attuned to the rift between them and desire closer relationships. However, it is also clear that there is a lack of communication between the Indigenous and non-Indigenous instructors. I observed Janelle taking on the unspoken role of intermediary between the Elders and the GNWT staff throughout the camp. When the Elders had concerns or issues
with how the camp was running, they would often not voice them directly. This may have been due to cultural differences in conflict resolution, or worries, based on lived experiences working with Western programming, of an unpleasant response to criticism. Janelle, however, would often bring the concerns that the Elders were having to the nightly staff meetings. I observed one of the GNWT staff members going directly to the Elders to ask if there was anything that could be improved, however, it is unclear whether the Elders would have told this staff member about their concerns.

The non-Indigenous instructors feel as though they are already asking too much of the Indigenous instructors, while the Indigenous instructors feel undervalued and underutilized at times during the camp, and often for entire days. Strengthening the relationships between the Indigenous and non-Indigenous instructors requires time that the TSCC does not currently provide. With proper time to prepare, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous instructors could collaborate to discuss the most effective ways to integrate the Cultural Team. This might involve incorporating stories from the Elders that can be applied to the different camp sessions or having the Cultural Team participate in additional sessions whenever possible.

5.2.2 Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Campers

The intensive nature of the TSCC can simultaneously work for and against camper engagement as there are multiple opportunities for hands-on and experiential learning through full days of activities. According to the instructors, the campers were engaged throughout the camp. They participated in the activities that the instructors introduced; and all campers kept positive attitudes throughout. Kumari felt that the
Campers this year were more engaged with one another than with the cultural or scientific aspects of the camp.

_I think with this [participant engagement], I think usually it increases [over the course of the camp]. And with this group, I think they were saturated. And they were such a nice group that really enjoyed each other's company. That provided another element that people were really engaged in, they were engaged with their peers, having fun, and meeting new people. And it was such a positive group. That's too bad that they [the campers] weren't as engaged with the science and the culture. They were engaged with each other._ (Kumari Karunaratne – Instructor, July 29th, 2022).

I also found this to be the case, as the campers became very close to one another very quickly, which led to them talking to one another during the sessions, often while the instructors were trying to teach. But their desire to talk and work with one another was also beneficial in the activity-based aspects of the sessions and the tundra challenges as they were able to communicate and solve problems together.

During the camp I noticed that the overall engagement, in “science” centred sessions was lower among the Indigenous students. However, it is important to recognize that the ways we signal and read “engagement” are culturally determined, something recognized by one of the instructors in our interview:

_The students were super engaged. Even those who weren't always looking as engaged as we thought, they ended up being super absorbed in it [the TSCC]. Sometimes some of the students didn't always look like they were listening, but they were always listening and always learning._ (TSCC Instructor, August 29th, 2022)

How we, as Western educated staff members tend to recognize “engagement” from campers is through a Western lens. Elements of Western engagement include looking at the instructor when they are speaking, asking questions, completion of
assignments/projects, and punctuality and attendance. However, engagement may look different from an Indigenous lens and could include demonstrating a strong connection to culture, participation in community events and projects, placing value on spiritual and emotional knowledge, showing respect for Elders and tradition, and valuing oral tradition and storytelling. Indigenous campers who are not as familiar with Western expectations of engagement may find it difficult to signal “engagement” in some of the more “science” centric programs at the TSCC in ways that the non-Indigenous instructors expect.

When asked if they had any recommendations for improving upon the camp material or the TSCC itself, very few campers made suggestions. It is possible that they were very satisfied with their experience at the TSCC and did not feel that any improvements were necessary. Alternatively, they may have been hesitant to offer suggestions for fear of offending the instructors or disrupting the positive atmosphere of the camp. When asked, the non-Indigenous campers felt that Indigenous knowledge was well represented and that the Elders already play a large role at the TSCC.

*I don't know what I would change. So, I guess not. Like it would be interesting. But I don't know. Maybe in the human history part, to add stories a little bit more, but they did do that a little bit.* (TSCC Camper, August 3rd, 2022)

*I think their [the Elders] role is pretty big already.* (TSCC Camper, August 4th, 2022)

*No, because they [Western and Indigenous knowledge] were equally representative to each other. Because if you just mentioned one part of something but not the other, then there's gonna be like, bias, you know? And it's, it's not like, you're not respecting them [Indigenous peoples] and not sharing, like, what they did, and whatever knowledge to have passed on to generations.* (TSCC Camper, August 4th, 2022)

Quite a few of the non-Indigenous campers mentioned the Tlı́chǫ Activities sessions as being some of their favourite aspects of the TSCC.
Well, I liked when I was a Grandchild for the Day. Hanging out with the Elders. Oh, and I don’t think hand games counts, but I guess it counts as the culture part. It was very fun. (TSCC Camper, August 10th, 2022)

I would say [my favourite part of camp was when I was] with the Elders. Yeah. I liked when we were doing the Tłı̨chǫ Activities, that was my favourite... I liked listening to the stories that Louie told us and also seeing the Elders smile and yeah, I really liked that part. (TSCC Camper, August 4th, 2022).

I liked hearing the stories of his [Louis’] own experience, and some of the more traditional stories of the [Tłı̨chǫ] community. I felt like that was like something that I found incredibly valuable and really interesting. I’ve only been in the Tłı̨chǫ region for a year, but I like getting the opportunity to hear those stories because its a really valuable experience. (TSCC Teacher Camper, August 12th, 2022).

In contrast, the only suggestion for improvement came from an Indigenous camper. They could add more Indigenous people here. Because there’s people who are like from other countries but there should be more Tłı̨chǫ. (TSCC Camper, August 4th, 2022)

Although instructors, like myself, who have attended the camp multiple times thought the number of Indigenous campers (six) who attended in 2022 was high relative to previous years, this camper felt that Indigenous people were under-represented. This statement suggests a feeling of disappointment or isolation as part of the Indigenous minority among camp participants. It also shows a stark difference between how non-Indigenous and Indigenous participants view Indigenous representation within the camp.

The experiences of these non-Indigenous students contrast with those of the one Indigenous student who consented to an interview with me. We first chatted about the camp informally after a hike to a peregrine falcon’s nest on one of the camp’s final days. I asked him about his experience of the camp so far, and he reluctantly said that he was not enjoying it. When I asked why, he was hesitant to respond, perhaps because of his cultural teachings. The Dene Laws guide people to be polite and not argue with anyone,
and to be as happy as possible at all times. Any discomfort might be amplified because I am a white scientist asking these questions, and there is a history of Western scientists looking down on Indigenous peoples and communities. Or, he may have thought I would be disappointed to hear negative feedback as one of the instructors, or that criticizing the camp might somehow negatively impact my research project.

When I reassured him that I was very interested in his thoughts, positive or negative, about the camp, he told me that it felt very busy and that he felt as though he had to work every day, whether through the hikes, walks, or chores he was expected to complete. He also told me that he thought there should be more aspects of Tłı̨chǫ culture at the camp, more time spent with the Elders, and also that the camp’s scientific aspects were not challenging enough. When I interviewed him a few days later, he was again reluctant to be negative and tried to focus on the aspects of the camp he enjoyed:

_It was fun meeting new people, I made like two best friends here...I learned how to play Crazy 8's, they [the other campers] were cheating, but it was fun._ (TSCC Camper, August 4th, 2022)

However, he did reiterate:

_I don’t like the long walks, every day you have to walk. I don’t know why. We should just do more activities in the camp. Like staying in the camp, not like always on a walk or something._ (TSCC Camper, August 4th, 2022)

The positives in the first quote are concentrated on the unscheduled time spent with the other campers, while the negative comments in the second quote focus on the camp programming itself.

When observing the interactions between the Indigenous and non-Indigenous students I noticed that the Indigenous campers interacted mainly with other Indigenous
campers. The first point is not an unusual outcome at the camp. Campers naturally group up based on things they have in common, for example, if they go to the same school, are from the same community, or are friends before they entered the camp. Indigenous students in a traditionally non-Indigenous setting would often group together as well. These groupings early on are not the be-all end-all for camper friendships. After a couple of days at the camp, these early connections usually branch out with the help of the assigned chore groups, assigned Tundra Challenge teams, and session groups, which change daily. Eventually, all campers get to know one another. However, these initial groupings can be seen in mealtime seating arrangements. In 2022, as in other years, campers typically chose to sit with those they had known the longest or felt the most comfortable around. Once people have found the group and table they eat at, that rarely changes. When campers who usually eat at the same table are in the same group for the sessions that day, they tend to interact with each other more than the other campers in the group.

Kids are big on clique. So sometimes kids would stick together. But, you know, we would intentionally mix the groups up every day. Cliques are natural for kids. Even within fully Indigenous school settings or fully non-Indigenous school settings. Kids develop cliques, right? So, we tried to break those. We tried to make sure that there was proper mixing of everybody. (Tom Andrews – Former TSCC Instructor, October 18th, 2022)

During discussions about the positive aspects of the camp, some instructors specifically highlighted the diversity among the 2022 campers:

I feel like because this camp was so diverse. And we had a lot of Indigenous students, I think they felt more comfortable and got comfortable a little bit faster than if there had just been a few and they were the minority. (Sophie Clark– TSCC Instructor, October 7th, 2022).
We had the most diverse group that we’ve ever had since I’ve started. And I think my first summer was in 2014. It was diverse in terms of where the participants were coming from, with different learning abilities, ethnicities, and sexualities. It was great. (Kumari Karunaratne – TSCC Instructor, September 23rd, 2022).

This increase in the number of Indigenous campers and increased camper diversity more generally in 2022 proved beneficial for relationship building between campers. In previous years when I worked as an instructor at the camp, a lower proportion of Indigenous campers often meant that Indigenous campers were slower to build relationships with the rest of the group. With more Indigenous campers in attendance, there was a greater opportunity for shared cultural experiences and perspectives, leading to a more cohesive and connected group dynamic among all the campers.

5.2.2.1 The Cultural Team’s Early Departure from Camp

On August 2nd, 2022, the eighth day of the camp, the Cultural Team—consisting of Janelle Nitsiza, Louis Zoe, and Therese Zoe—departed the TSCC early due to the passing of an important Tłı̨chǫ Elder from their home community. The Cultural Team’s early departure from the camp had a significant impact on the experiences of both campers and instructors alike.

I think they [the campers] really missed their [the Cultural Team’s] presence and really missed what they added to each day. It was nice to see them being emotional when they were leaving, because that just speaks to the impact of the work that Louis and Therese and Janelle do. What they do is so important and so essential to the camp. I think it was so unfortunate that they had to leave early, but it was so nice for them to be able to see that very sincere response and that sadness that they were leaving. I think it was probably valuable for the Cultural Team as well. Yeah, because in just over a week, they had forged deep bonds with some of these students, right? So, it was nice in that way. I think it demonstrated the importance of their impact. And I think for the students
where the cultural piece was their main passion at the camp, that may have waned a little bit after that in terms of demonstrated enthusiasm, perhaps, but not necessarily in terms of willingness to participate and engage... It really showed, despite those very valid feelings of disappointment, what a kind and compassionate group it was, where they [the campers] fully understood that this is something that had to be done. It was important for them [the Cultural Team] to leave. We were sad to see them go, but it was the right move. And I think that they [the campers] understood that. I don’t think anyone was like angry about it or felt ripped off. They were disappointed, but they didn’t have those negative emotions around it. (TSCC Instructor, August 29th, 2022)

This quote from an anonymous TSCC instructor illustrates how much this early departure from camp affected the campers. I can recall most of the campers sending off the Cultural Team with hugs and thanks, with many teary eyes watching their helicopter take off. However, the group most affected by the Cultural Team leaving the TSCC was the Indigenous campers. The Elders’ presence likely brought with them a sense of familiarity and community that the TSCC otherwise does not possess. In my interviews with the instructors after the camp I asked them if they thought the Cultural Team’s early departure from the camp had an impact on the campers and their engagement in the camp programming. The responses I got pointed to the Indigenous campers being the most impacted by the absence of the Cultural Team, though not all to the same degree.

Some of the Indigenous kids’ attitude changed once the Elders and the Cultural Team left. They weren’t listening as well, I guess. And yeah, they just kind of acted differently towards the instructors after that, but I think the majority of people did. But I definitely think that everybody was sad that they left. And obviously, we all wanted them to not have to leave and stay there till the end. But I think like everyone understood why they had to go and kind of respected that. (Sophie Clark – TSCC Instructor, October 7th, 2022)

They [Indigenous campers] were more interested in staying engaged and doing what was expected of them when the Elders were there. And I felt like when the Elders left, and that’s not for everyone, but definitely for a few participants, I could see that change in behavior that that level of authority that those Elders held was gone. And then the behavior
changed as a result in a way that led to them not being as interested and engaged in the camp. (Kumari Karunaratne – TSCC Instructor, September 30th, 2022)

Non-Indigenous campers also felt this loss:

*I found it [the TSCC] pretty good except when they [the Cultural Team] had to leave early which just kind of sucked for everyone.* (TSCC Camper, August 13th, 2022)

The absence of the Cultural Team for the remainder of the TSCC did affect some campers’ ability to learn more about Tłı̨chǫ and Dene cultural knowledge. Instead, campers interested in these aspects were supported to the best of the other instructors’ abilities when researching cultural projects. As a result, six campers, one Indigenous and five non-Indigenous, chose a cultural project to focus on at the end of camp. Three chose to make a ring and pin game (Figure 5-2), which is similar to games like kendama and cup-and-ball. The game’s goal is to hook one or more rings constructed of caribou phalanxes and caribou hide with holes cut into it, with varying point values. Two campers focused on Dene Hand Games, a competitive event where teams take turns hiding a small object in their hands while the other team uses hand signals to guess which hand the object is hidden in. One camper conducted a statistical analysis of the game, and the other created a handbook comprising some of the hand signals one could play. The last camper hand-made a deck of playing cards with different Tłı̨chǫ words for each number. When working on these projects, some campers voiced their disappointment in not having the Elders around to give them insight, answer questions, or tell stories about the focus of their projects. Nonetheless, all the campers left the camp happy with their projects and proud of what they were able to create/learn.
Other changes occurred in the camp immediately following the Cultural Team’s departure, including slight changes to the structure of the mealtimes. When the Elders were at the camp, they would always get their food first, followed by everyone sitting with them at their table, and then the following tables counterclockwise. However, after their departure, the table which would get their food first was decided according to who could answer a trivia question. I wondered about whether this might favour some students over others. “Since they [the Cultural Team] left we now are asking a tundra trivia question to decide which table eats first. I wonder how accessible this method is for the students with a more cultural background rather than ‘science’” (My fieldnotes, August 3rd, 2022). The trivia questions asked were primarily science focused and based on what was learned in the science sessions at the camp. This is just an example of how the camp’s cultural aspects rely on the Elders for depth. The other instructors know little
about Tłı̨chǫ cultural activities and how to implement them in the day-to-day life at camp. Reflecting on my field notes, I can see that during the camp I made the same distinction between science and culture that I have been problematizing in previous chapters. In hindsight, and through the process of writing this thesis, I have come to see my own biases shaped by my Western education and non-Indigenous identity.

5.3 Differences in Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Teaching Approaches

In my observations of the campers at the “science” sessions I attended I saw the majority of questions being asked by non-Indigenous campers. I also saw the Indigenous campers keeping at the back of the group, distancing themselves from the instructors. However, one instructor, Kumari, formed a strong relationship with one of the Indigenous campers who would stick close to her during the sessions they attended together. I also noticed a difference in engagement from both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous campers during the Tłı̨chǫ Activities (“cultural”) sessions at the camp, which were more open and freeform than the other sessions. This spontaneity makes them less like a formal lesson and more like a conversation. When I attended these sessions, I noticed the campers, Indigenous or not, being more open and asking questions. My sense is that the Indigenous campers, especially those from smaller communities, may feel alienated in the “science” sessions, and forming connections with these students, like Kumari did, could help improve what we see as “engagement”.

I have noticed over the years that I have been an instructor that the Cultural Team is far less repetitive in their sessions from year to year compared to the ‘science’ instructors. The activities from year to year are similar, setting up the nimba, discussing
historic Dene objects, and preparing bògǫ̨̀ and ehgwâa (drymeat and dryfish). However, the discussions that occur during these sessions differ each year. What is taught is planned, but the content can change depending on the interests of campers involved, as well as the interests of the Elders. Despite the similarities of listening to somebody talk and share information, I think the cultural sessions feel different from the “science” ones because they are guided by a different set of unspoken expectations. The Elders do not teach the campers ‘facts’ in the Western sense; they give them knowledge. In my mind, a ‘fact’ is a specific piece of information, for example the scientific name of a flower. Indigenous knowledge or teachings can be applied to other aspects of your life—to increase your understanding, for example a moral derived from a story (Archibald, 2008).

The Tłı̨chǫ Activities sessions allowed campers engage at their own pace; there was no one way to engage during these sessions. This stands in contrast to many of the ‘science’ sessions at the camp, which expect campers to participate in all activities presented to them. During the Tłı̨chǫ Activities campers could engage by watching and listening, by doing, by talking and asking questions, or a combination of these things. For example, one of the sessions of Tłı̨chǫ Activities involved making bògǫ̨̀. Some campers engaged with this activity by getting their hands dirty, literally, by cutting the raw meat into thin strips and placing them on the drying rack. Other campers would only engage in making the bògǫ̨̀ using gloves, and others did not want to participate in making bògǫ̨̀ at all, choosing instead to watch their peers, take pictures, talk with the Elders, and/or ask questions. Whether or not they were actively making bògǫ̨̀, they all participated in the session in meaningful ways.
The Tłı̨chǫ Activities sessions also differ from the ‘science’ sessions at the camp because they have a much more specific focus, like bògǫǫ̨̀ preparation, or hand games. While the ‘scientific’ sessions at the camp tend to try to summarize a broad spectrum of information, the Tłı̨chǫ Activities present an opportunity to learn in-depth about a specific subject. In terms of engagement, my observations of the campers in 2022 suggest that the specific focus in the Tłı̨chǫ Activities sessions assisted in honing the campers’ focus as well. Keeping focus was an issue I ran into during the Human History session. There was so much information to get through that sometimes a camper’s question would be about something mentioned 15 minutes ago, like hunting practices, and would distract from the new focus, which could be something like the migration into the New World. Attempting to cover such a wide range of topics in such a short time likely took away from the potential camper engagement in my session. In the Tłı̨chǫ Activities sessions, focussing on a particular activity that engaged their bodies as well as their minds opened a space for students to ask questions and for instructors to be guided by student interests rather than a lesson plan.

5.4 What do the Experiences/Perspectives of Different Participants say about Indigenization of the TSCC?

The experiences of both instructors and campers for the 2022 camp season were very positive overall. Many campers expressed sadness at the prospect of leaving. However, for some campers, their motivation and enthusiasm began to dwindle near the end of the camp. My interviews with the campers suggest that this was mainly due to one or two factors: (1) the busy schedule at the camp leading to fatigue and (2) the early departure of the Cultural Team. With the TSCC’s packed schedule, campers are expected
to be relatively active, participating in multiple sessions a day, going on hikes on difficult terrain, and completing their own small projects. For this reason, it is possible that some campers’ energy began to taper off near the end of the camp.

The Cultural Team’s early departure from the camp, right around the time campers were expected to come up with an exploration project, a small project where they can pursue a topic from the camp in more depth, left some campers who felt strongly about doing a project focussed on Tłı̨chǫ culture feeling dejected. The loss of the Cultural Team from the day-to-day life at the camp was likely another reason why some campers’ attitudes shifted, as a critical element of the camp was no longer present. For the Indigenous campers, especially those from smaller communities, the Cultural Team’s departure might have taken with them a sense of familiarity and community. This could explain the shift in attitude that several instructors observed in many of the Indigenous campers near the end of the camp. When comparing the experiences of Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants, the two groups clearly perceived Indigenous representation at the camp differently. At least one Indigenous camper felt that the camp was lacking in Indigenous representation, while the non-Indigenous campers experienced the TSCC as having a significant Indigenous component.

Both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous campers participate in Western schooling, however, the non-Indigenous campers, especially those from larger communities (see table 5-1), are used to education with limited Indigenous representation. Because of this, the Indigenous representation at the TSCC may have been more than what the non-Indigenous campers were accustomed to, which is reflected in their responses above. The novelty of having time with the Elders may have been part
of why they singled it out as a highlight. The Indigenous campers, however, all came from smaller Indigenous communities where they were accustomed to being in the majority and spending time with Elders, so it was less of a novelty for them. For the Indigenous campers, the TSCC may feel far removed from their ideas and previous experiences at knowledge sharing camps, while for the non-Indigenous campers, the TSCC may seem saturated with Indigenous knowledge and culture. The TSCC must ensure that they listen to the voices of the Indigenous campers regarding questions of Indigenization because the non-Indigenous campers may not have the knowledge and experiences necessary to effectively offer suggestions for improvement.

The Indigenous instructors also experience the TSCC differently than the non-Indigenous instructors. The Indigenous instructors see their role in the camp as being a place filler some of the time, as beyond the Tłı̨chǫ Activities sessions, there is not much that actively requires their attention at the camp. However, the non-Indigenous instructors experience the role of the Cultural Team differently. The non-Indigenous instructors experience of the camp can be stressful, and in my discussions with them, many worried that bringing more Indigenous elements into the TSCC would overwork the Indigenous instructors. Communication between Indigenous and non-Indigenous staff needs improvement. From my observations, both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous instructors are making assumptions about the other. The Indigenous and non-Indigenous instructors are working alongside each other and collaborate with each other, but they are not yet working together. Janelle is putting in a lot of work to create an environment with more open communication, but the camp is not quite there yet. Indigenization at the TSCC is still in its beginning stages. There is a clear desire among all the instructors to Indigenize
the camp for the benefit of not only the Indigenous campers and staff, but the non-
Indigenous participants as well. However, work needs to be done to determine what
Indigenization at the TSCC will ultimately look like. More conscious and explicit goal
setting will be required to ensure that there is less miscommunication between the camp
instructors going forward.
Chapter 6

6 A Step Forward: Lessons Learned and Broader Implications for Indigenizing the TSCC

While initially intending only to explore processes of Indigenization within the archaeology component of the TSCC, this thesis became an exploration of the challenges of making such changes within a broader camp structure that, largely unconsciously, centres Western ways of knowing and being. My attempts to Indigenize the archaeology education within the Human History session at the TSCC were met with resistance, but not the resistance of people opposed to this kind of change. The TSCC staff had been working to bring more Indigenous elements of knowledge and culture into the program for years and desired further Indigenization at the camp. The resistance was from the camp itself. The familiarity of how it was initially constructed, the unspoken expectations and rules that all TSCC participants are expected to follow as part of the hidden curriculum, and the intersectional differences in experiences between individuals are all ways in which the Western/colonial structure of the TSCC works against Indigenization processes. The focus of my project changed from just the Human History session to the TSCC as a whole and the need to shift away from the hidden curriculum of Western education in order to Indigenize. This final chapter aims to summarize the findings from this case study and offer recommendations for future Indigenization at the TSCC.

6.1 Key Findings

While the TSCC staff desire further Indigenization of the camp, they must first address the hidden curriculum affecting all camp participants. The TSCC teaches that science and culture are dichotomous. The name Tundra Science and Culture Camp
suggests that they are separate and puts up a barrier between Indigenous and Western
knowledge, which is unintentionally upheld by the separation of cultural and scientific
activities at the camp. I am not arguing that for the camp to effectively become
“Indigenized” these two ways of knowing must become entirely intermingled. The Strong
Like Two People approach would suggest keeping them separate, but balanced.
Currently, “science” programming is a much greater focus of the camp than “cultural”
programming. Five out of the seven sessions delivered at the camp are ‘scientific’ ones,
meaning that the ‘cultural’ sessions make up less than 30% of the scheduled curriculum
at the camp. Whatever the path forward, meaningful Indigenization of the camp demands
a collaborative process among everyone involved in running it.

The structure of the TSCC also made it difficult for me to incorporate Indigenous
pedagogy and knowledge into the Human History session because Indigenous pedagogies
do not fit nicely within colonial education structures and schedules (Cote-Meek &
Moeke-Pickering, 2020). The TSCC is Western and works in tandem with traditional
Western schooling. If the goal is to make the camp more representative of Indigenous
pedagogies, then the entire overarching structure, including the staff’s perceptions of the
camp, will have to change. As it stands now, the camp is limited in its ability to
effectively incorporate Indigenous pedagogical approaches because it demands that they
are adapted to a Western framework.

It is also worth noting that in its response to the Truth and Reconciliation
Commission (TRC) Calls to Action, the GNWT states that the “Tundra Science
Camp…focuses on language and heritage learning,” which, while it may be a goal, is not
the current reality of the camp (Government of the Northwest Territories, 2015, p. 26).
There are typically few Indigenous campers in attendance. In 2022, 6 of 16 campers were Indigenous, much higher representation than usual, but Indigenous campers were still in the minority. Indigenous staff are always considerably outnumbered by non-Indigenous staff. At least one Indigenous camper was disappointed with the camp activities and wanted to see more activities at the base camp and more time spent with the Elders. There is a lot of work that needs to be done within and outside of the camp to reach the goal that the GNWT set out in its response to the TRC.

6.1.1 Challenges to Indigenizing TSCC Programming

There are challenges to Indigenization at the TSCC beyond the limitations that the Western structure of the camp presents. The most significant of these challenges is the lack of time devoted to TSCC preparation. Because the TSCC has always been led by GNWT employees on top of their regular duties, GNWT staff have very little time to devote to it outside of the ten days spent at the TERS, as their other work is usually expected to take priority. Finding time when all GNWT staff members and the Cultural Team are available to meet and discuss the camp is difficult. In my conversation with Karin, I mentioned the difficulty I had when attempting to find time where the Elders would be available to meet with me prior to the camp because of their already busy schedule. Karin responded by expressing how the TSCC often faces the same difficulty because of the lack of devoted camp preparation time.

You know, how overwhelming it is, and the fatigue at the community level [referring to Indigenous communities] of being involved in many, many different things at one time. And I think that your experience is not unique, right? It's the same thing that we face in the TSCC but also in our work in other areas. I would love to have the time to schedule meetings every two weeks with the Cultural Team. And to just make this [incorporating more Indigenous knowledge into the camp] a priority,
and whether that's meeting in Behchokǫ or going to Gamètì sometimes or whatever it is, I think that more time is needed and just being persistent and very deliberate. And that's hard right. I don't know if we could achieve that. Is that realistic to think that we could meet with them that often? But it would provide the opportunity to really dive into each of our program areas and try to make real change. I think with the frequency that we need it's too difficult to make significant changes. So yeah, I think your experience is really indicative of the challenges that we all face in doing this work. Maybe it's setting out a longer timeframe, and frequent meetings? And knowing that, you know, we're not going to be able to achieve this in six to eight or 10 months. But we're going to say, “Okay, over the next two years, this is what we're gonna do” and set up your schedule, and just make sure you stick to it. (Karin Clark – TSCC Instructor, September 30th, 2022)

There is also the challenge of addressing the hidden curriculum of the TSCC. The hidden curriculum of the TSCC includes the unspoken expectation that campers should approach this camp as they would their Western schooling: planning and preparing for upcoming sessions, prioritizing punctuality, and thinking about their end of camp projects. There is also the unintentional lesson that “scientific” and “cultural” knowledge are separate and inapplicable to one another. And finally, the hidden curriculum values Western understandings over Indigenous ones due to the frequency of Western-centric elements within the camp. These aspects of the camp are so foundational to the way it operates that it is difficult to imagine what the camp would look like without them. What would it mean to implement at Strong Like Two People approach if that is a direction the Tłı̨chǫ community would like to pursue? Discussions and workshops would allow the TSCC staff members and the Tłı̨chǫ community—perhaps even other Indigenous communities who have history in the area—to determine what the camp should look like and how it should run. They could think together about consciously creating a camp structure that sends the messages they intend. A balanced representation of Western and Indigenous knowledge and pedagogy within the camp is impossible without looking at
and changing the fundamental unspoken ideals that frame the TSCC. However, to address
the hidden curriculum in this way, the GNWT would need to provide enough funding and
time to make these workshops possible.

6.2 Future Directions: Potential Ways Forward for the TSCC

To conclude, I provide potential ways forward for Indigenizing the TSCC based
on my experiences of the program and my observations and conversations with the TSCC
staff and campers. They aim to address the problems I faced when attempting to
Indigenize the Human History session. I hope these recommendations can also be
directed to programs outside the TSCC as a starting point for those interested in anti-
colonial education. I outline the key recommendation of collectively determining the
objectives of Indigenization within the TSCC and suggest two potential paths forward
that fall increasingly further along the spectrum of Indigenization. The first is to reframe
the camp to address the hidden curriculum. This involves discussions,
recontextualizations, and revisions to the existing TSCC sessions to incorporate more
Indigenous pedagogies and knowledge into its framework. The second is to change the
entire structure of the camp to weave Indigenous knowledge into its framework and
rebuild the program from the ground up to address and avoid the colonial limitations of
Indigenizing a Western program.

6.2.1 Recommendation: Define Indigenization and Clarify Goals and
Learning Outcomes

The goals of the TSCC are in constant conflict. On the one hand, the TSCC aims
to encourage high-school-aged campers to pursue a university degree, a Western form of
education. Conversely, there is a push to Indigenize the camp. This begs the question, can
the TSCC effectively introduce and incorporate more Indigenous elements while simultaneously promoting Western ideals in education? How much of this work is performative? If the TSCC wishes to move forward in their efforts to Indigenize the camp, it needs to examine what it is explicitly teaching versus what it is implicitly communicating to Indigenous campers who attend. Therefore, I recommend that the TSCC leaders take the time to answer these questions as a group and define Indigenization for the TSCC. Given my experience at the camp, I would define Indigenization at the TSCC as a transformative process aimed at achieving a shared responsibility among the camp staff. It would involve a collaborative effort to ensure that Indigenous and Western pedagogies are more equitably represented and emphasizing mutual respect for each other’s perspectives and ways of knowing. This would include a commitment to examining and revising all aspects of the camp’s educational practices, from curriculum development to teaching methods though collaboration with the Tłı̨chǫ and potentially other Indigenous communities. However, Indigenization is fluid, and is defined differently depending on the context. The definition I have provided above is only representative of my own interpretations of the discussions I had with the instructors at the camp. Meaning there is no agreed upon understanding of Indigenization at the camp.

From my conversations with the Elders suggest that their goal is to share knowledge and they enjoy that aspect of the camp. Louis shared that he “really enjoys passing on the knowledge to the next generation of people… [and] appreciates all the different lessons that they get in the camp, not just from us [the Cultural Team], but from all the other instructors” (Chapter 4.3). This suggests that the Elders would like to see
Indigenization at the camp take the path of Strong Like Two People. Allotting more time for the yearly TSCC preparations and starting them earlier would allow staff to discuss and come to an agreement about the camp’s goals and what the process of ‘Indigenizing’ the camp should look like. Such discussions could also help the Cultural Team to feel more comfortable bringing their suggestions forward. After reaching an agreement on the camp’s goals they can discuss how to achieve them and begin working towards that.

This suggestion draws on backward design principles. Backward design, characterized by Wiggins and McTighe (2005), is a curriculum development tool that works “backwards” from learning objectives and helps educators focus on students’ learning processes. It involves starting with what you want students to take away and then thinking about how to get them there. Backward design has three stages to curriculum development: (1) Identifying desired results, (2) determining acceptable evidence, and (3) planning learning experiences and instruction. I think this process could be valuable for the camp as a whole. Having clearly articulated learning outcomes for students who attend the camp could help TSCC staff navigate the inevitable budgetary constraints that they will face, helping them to prioritize areas for change and consider how they can move in small but meaningful ways towards these shared goals. This approach could also be useful for individual sessions within the camp, if that aspect of the camp structure continues, though it would not address the Western framework of the camp itself and would continue with the kinds of structured lesson plans currently in use in the TSCC “science” sessions.
6.2.1.1 Potential Path Forward 1: Address the Hidden Curriculum

Explicitly teaching different ways of knowing is crucial for promoting cultural awareness and understanding. Reframing the camp to reflect Strong Like Two People could be one way to approach this. Despite Western science and pedagogies being more prominent within the TSCC, the on-the-land elements of the camp unintentionally follow the Tłḥchǫ pedagogy of transferring information into knowledge through personal experience (Legat, 2012). Perhaps one way to shift toward a Strong Like Two People approach would involve a more deliberate application of this Tłḥchǫ pedagogy within the camp. Another is by involving the Cultural Team in more aspects of the camp, the TSCC can combat the current Western-centrism and foster a sense of respect and appreciation for Indigenous knowledge and culture for the campers who attend. Finding ways for storytelling to become a more integral part of the camp could be another way in which the camp could become more reflective of Strong Like Two People. It would also help make it clear to the campers that there is value in learning from both perspectives.

At the beginning of this project John B. Zoe informed me how important it was for people to learn two ways (Chapter 3.2.1). He implied that we need to talk about knowledge that is of common interest to Indigenous and Western peoples from these two different understandings, while being respectful of both. For example, this could involve discussing how the conceptions of artifacts/belongings are different between archaeologists and descendant communities and how framing belongings as artifacts separates Indigenous peoples from their past. Explicitly discussing these two ways of knowing, the colonial processes at work in traditional archaeological practices, and the anti-colonial turn in archaeology would help students see that both knowledge systems
can offer valuable insights. Furthermore, using a Strong Like Two People approach can help to create a safe and welcoming environment for the Indigenous campers and Instructors who do not feel adequately represented at the camp. Ensuring that the “science” sessions within the camp foster a sense of belonging may also help Indigenous campers feel more represented. Reframing Indigenous knowledge as Indigenous science, while highlighting the differences between Western and Indigenous science could be one way to do this, as it would allow the campers to choose one or both methods. This would involve addressing the aspects of the hidden curriculum that place Western knowledge above Indigenous knowledge and instead teaching campers how these two different ways of knowing can create a more comprehensive and holistic understanding.

One possible way to achieve this would be by including Indigenous teachers who can co-instruct sessions at the camp. I offer this as a possible solution due to my conversation with Tom regarding his time instructing the Human History Session alongside Tłı̨chǫ Elder Harry Simpson. To Tom, having Harry at the TSCC and instructing the Human History session alongside him added something special for the students, whose eyes would light up and who listened with great interest when Harry was telling a story. Tom and Harry had a strong relationship from previous archaeological work they had done together; I believe that their friendship and the trust between them could be felt by the camp participants and elevated the Human History session.

You know, I'm a bit biased, because Harry was really special to me. He was the Elder who I worked with all those years doing archaeology. And he adopted me and, one year, he blew me away, we would, at the beginning of the archaeology [Human History] session, introduce each other. I thought it was fun, I’d always introduce him, and he’d introduce me. He would talk away for a few minutes telling them who I was, and mostly about what we had done together. And at one summer, he started
telling the students that I was his son. [I responded saying “wow” to this statement] wow, was right. I mean, it was a really powerful thing for me, you know, I think I maybe I had the best relationship with Harry as well. But he really was a skilled, dedicated teacher, it was really important to him. (Tom Andrews, October 18th, 2022)

Tom and Harry embody Strong Like Two People—Indigenous and Western knowledge working in tandem with one another due to their mutual respect and care for the other. Tom and Harry fostered a strong relationship with one another, which assisted in the instruction of the session together. Perhaps bringing Indigenous co-instructors into the program could eventually lead to these types of powerful relationships. Campers being able to recognize relationships built upon trust and respect between Indigenous and Western teachers will be beneficial to learning through Strong Like Two People. The addition of Indigenous co-instructors in the camp could also help address the aspect of the hidden curriculum that places Western knowledge as more important than Indigenous knowledge. Having more Indigenous representation amongst the TSCC staff would assist in allowing campers to see how Indigenous and Western knowledge can complement each other, as well as hopefully mitigate some of the feelings of alienation or separation that some Indigenous campers may feel. Including Indigenous co-instructors would also mean changing the sessions to be built on a foundation of both Indigenous and Western knowledge and pedagogies, to avoid pigeonholing the Indigenous elements into the existing Western curriculum.

However, there is the issue of space and funding for the additional Indigenous instructors. The TERS station currently has limited space available, and the TSCC operates at nearly total capacity yearly. This may mean additional Indigenous instructors cannot be accommodated without a camp expansion, which may be too costly without a
concrete action plan and additional resources to support Indigenizing the TSCC. There are other possibilities that could be more achievable within the existing budget. They could be used individually or in tandem with one another to address some of the issues at the camp. The first is hiring at least two Indigenous educators as additional instructors who can work with the other Instructors at camp and co-instruct their sessions. Employing two additional Indigenous instructors would ensure that each concurrently running session has a dedicated Indigenous instructor. This approach also avoids exceeding the camp’s capacity. However, it also risks overworking the two Indigenous teachers depending on how many sessions they will be expected to co-instruct. The second alternative would be to undertake a series of workshops with Indigenous teachers for each of the sessions at the camp in order to develop a backward-designed curriculum that weaves together Indigenous and Western knowledge. The GNWT’s Traditional Knowledge policy states that Traditional Knowledge Coordinators can help to “identify areas where traditional knowledge could successfully be incorporated into the design or delivery of government programs,” and it may be possible for the TSCC to reach out to these Traditional Knowledge Coordinators for assistance in these workshops (Government of the Northwest Territories, 2005, p. 4). These programs could potentially be delivered by a single non-Indigenous instructor if no Indigenous co-instructor was available. This would not address the issue of representation, but could at least help to bring more Indigenous knowledge into the camp and avoid over-extending Indigenous instructors during the camp.
6.2.1.2 Potential Path Forward 2: Reimagine the Camp Structure

This is the final and most far-reaching of my suggestions for Indigenization at the TSCC. Only so much can be done to Indigenize a Western program. The Indigenous elements are limited within the confines of the program structure. Because, like bringing different pieces of furniture into a house will not renovate it, attempting to change one session within the TSCC will not affect the Western ideological structure that encompasses the camp. Some pieces of furniture may not fit properly, and no amount of rearranging will change that. Some Indigenous pedagogies cannot be applied as they were meant to be within a Western framework. A fuller Indigenization demands changing the metaphorical shape of the house. What exactly that would look like will depend on the goals the TSCC sets for its future and the discussions between the staff and Indigenous communities involved. It would likely involve significant changes to the schedule. They could involve more time spent at the basecamp or having the Elders decide on an additional daily chore for the campers to complete. The new schedule may also involve different sessions than the ones currently running within the program or more periods of large group learning rather than splitting off into smaller groups. For example, one practical strategy to enhance the program would be the introduction of “theme days.” As illustrated in Chapter 4.4, these thematic days would center around a specific overarching topic, such as water. During these sessions, instructors and campers would come together as one large group to engage in open discussions about the chosen theme, each sharing knowledge relevant to the theme, coming from their own perspectives. There could be a focus on specific activities for each theme. For example, fishing and water sampling activities for that water theme where all instructors can share
and answer questions, in a similar way to the making ehgwàa (dryfish) in the Tłı̨chǫ Activities sessions (see Chapter 5.3). Relationality could also be introduced to these theme days as they could display how all these different perspectives connect and relate to one another under theme for that day. These theme days would be largely unscheduled; they operate without the need for a structured curriculum. Instead, they thrive on the collaborative sharing of information and would be student driven. This method fosters a dynamic and spontaneous learning environment better suited for Indigenous pedagogical approaches than the current framework of the camp and encourages a deeper exploration of the chosen theme through diverse perspectives.

Reimagining the camp structure in this way would help to address the current imbalance between Western and Indigenous knowledges within the camp. Helping students to see the value of both would also involve changing the name of the camp to move away from the dichotomy currently implied by the Tundra Science and Culture Camp title. Again, I suggest a series of workshops with the current TSCC staff and members of Indigenous communities who made use of the area around Daring Lake, with the understanding that this process will likely take many years to realize.

6.3 Conclusion

These recommendations address the issues faced when attempting to Indigenize the Human History session and can be used as starting points for those interested in anti-colonial education. However, without additional resources, support, and time provided to the TSCC and its staff to continue to resist its Western framework, the TSCC will always run the risk of returning to “business as usual” (see Chapter 4.2.1). The TSCC could address these challenges by reallocating funds or potentially partnering with Indigenous-
led programs within the Territory, such as the Dechinta Centre for Research and Learning, for additional support. However, re-evaluating priorities and goals by setting aside even just one day for all the staff and Elders to convene and discuss the camp could serve as an initial step. As John B. Zoe said when we discussed Indigenizing the camp, “the only way to make that change in the Tundra Science Camp is . . . actually piece by piece by piece. It's going to take a long time” (John B. Zoe, June 17th, 2022). I hope my project represents a small piece and provides some direction for the pieces that will follow.
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