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Abstract

Outside Looking In (OLI) is a youth development through recreation program for Aboriginal peoples in Canada. In this thesis, I examine OLI staff and Board members’ description of OLI’s creation and implementation processes. This thesis is comprised of two papers. The first paper shows that OLI staff and Board members describe OLI as relatively predetermined; however, OLI incorporates collaborative approaches to various aspects of program design. While OLI facilitates collaborative processes that can contribute to Aboriginal self-determination, Eurocentric influences and broader colonial forces make efforts of Aboriginal self-determination challenging. The second paper illustrates that OLI’s approach to Aboriginal youth development through recreation creates a hybrid third space that challenges colonial discourses. Together, this thesis not only describes the creation and implementation processes of a youth development through recreation program for Aboriginal peoples, but also how the tensions associated with Aboriginal self-determination and colonial relations of power can permeate such programs.
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Recreation programs offered to youths are often created to “develop” youths by reducing risk factors such as drug abuse while simultaneously building their self-esteem and character (Bembry, 1998). Literature pertaining to programs that use recreation to develop Aboriginal youths, however, remains sparse and underdeveloped. The existing literature suggests that recreation was and continues to be used to as a colonial tool to develop Aboriginal peoples according to Euro-Canadian standards and, as such perpetuates colonialism (Forsyth, 2007; Giles, 2008; Paraschak, 1998; Pettipas, 1994). There is little information, however, on how youth development through recreation programs are created and implemented for Aboriginal peoples and the broader social and cultural implications that can arise as a result of such programs.

The thesis presented herein makes an effort to expand the current body of literature by looking at the creation and implementation processes of one youth development through recreation program called Outside Looking In (OLI). OLI, which was established in 2007, uses arts-based recreation to develop Aboriginal youths’ sense of accomplishment and confidence and to encourage them to stay in school (OLI, 2010). In a collaborative effort, I consulted with OLI staff and Board members on this research’s direction and design. Given that OLI is a fairly new program, OLI staff and Board members expressed the desire that my research focus on documenting OLI’s creation and conducting an evaluation of its current programming. As a result, this research is informed by semi-structured interviews with OLI staff and Board members, fieldnotes, and archival documents. Written in the publishable paper format, in this thesis, which is comprised of two stand alone papers, I examine the creation and implementation of OLI within the context of Eurocentric culture, Aboriginal self-determination, and colonialism.
**Outside Looking In**

OLI is a complex program. Below, I provide a detailed overview of the program including the process, its program components, and then its policies, which I show is indicative of youth development through recreation programming.

As an Aboriginal charitable organization in Canada, OLI is an arts-based youth development through recreation program. The program was incepted by Tracee Smith, a member of the Missanabie Cree First Nation in northern Ontario, to offer high school youths living in First Nations communities the opportunity to express themselves through the arts: painting, journal writing, videography, choreography, and hip-hop (OLI, 2010). OLI takes place in First Nations communities during the youths’ school year and runs as a high school credit course in the winter semester. Throughout the school year, OLI youths engage in OLI activities namely a hip-hop dance routine. At the end of the school year, OLI youths and some community members travel to Toronto, Ontario and perform a multi-media performance in Toronto (OLI, 2010). Thus, OLI also provides non-Aboriginal Canadians the opportunity to learn about Aboriginal peoples through the youths’ performance (OLI, 2010). In 2012, 29 youths performed in Toronto from four First Nations communities.

**The OLI Process**

To participate in OLI, Aboriginal communities in Canada must first apply to be eligible for the program (OLI Inc., 2010b). Then, OLI staff and Board members consider each community’s application based on the community’s stated forthcoming dedication to the program through the community members’ willingness to implement OLI and on the community’s monetary investment ($25 000), which is returned if the community’s application is declined (OLI Inc., 2010b). In addition to OLI’s mandatory participation fee ($25 000),
government sectors’ and various corporate, private, and public organizations’ sponsorship and grants serve as OLI’s main source of income. OLI’s expenses include, but are not limited to youths’ stay in Toronto, theatre production expenses, OLI’s operational costs, and professional dancer fees.

Once OLI staff and Board members select partner communities for involvement in the year-long process, the organization works with the partner community members via teleconferences or in-person meetings from the summer months and throughout the school year to prepare for and make adjustments to the program (OLI, 2010). Partner community members refer to the principal(s) and teacher(s) who volunteer to implement the course credit, monitor attendance, and supervise rehearsals and to the volunteers such as parents, Band council members, and both youths that are and are not enrolled in OLI who aid in fundraising activities, act as OLI staff’s lead contacts, and support participating youths’ success.

Once the school year begins, participating youths partake in OLI arts-based activities and workshops. In January, participating youths enroll in an OLI course for a high school credit and begin rehearsing and choreographing a hip-hop dance routine with professional dancers who travel to communities every two weeks (OLI, 2010). In between these visits, partner community members continue to help the youths to rehearse (OLI, 2010). After six months of preparation, youths are hosted by the Tim Horton’s Farms Camp for two weeks during which time the youths participate in camp activities, meet participating youths from the other partner communities, sightsee, and rehearse. The day prior to departure from the Tim Horton’s camp, youths prepare for the show, which is held at the St. Lawrence Centre for the Arts’ Bluma Appel Theatre that seats more than 800 guests. At the 2012 show, 255 guests attended the performance. The majority of the audience was made up of community members and individuals associated with
OLI’s sources of sponsorship; these individuals often invite family members and friends to the show. The remaining audience members were comprised of the general public. During the show, the audience members watched the multi-media performance, which was supplemented with video clips of and made by the partner communities and participating youths. After the performance, the audience was invited to celebrate and congratulate the youths and to view pieces of art paintings and journal writings.

**OLI Program Components**

OLI has three main program components: fall workshops, high school course credit, and the Future Leaders Program. OLI’s workshops engage participating youths in arts-based activities during the first semester of high school. Piloted in September-December of 2011, the workshops challenge participating youths to attend school and achieve perfect attendance for one month long periods. Challenge winners are afforded the opportunity to engage in and travel to other partner communities to participate in OLI workshops with other participating youths. Workshops are held once a month from October to December in different partner communities.

As of 2011, OLI was approved by Ontario’s Ministry of Education to offer its program as a high school credit course (OLI, 2010). In January at the beginning of the new school semester, OLI youths work towards an OLI course credit (e.g., physical education, career counseling, or arts), which are chosen by partner community members (OLI Inc., 2010a). Participating youths travel to and perform in Toronto as their final credit requirement.

To aid in supporting participating youths approaching high school graduation, OLI created its Future Leaders Program, which was piloted in OLI’s 2011-2012 year. The Future Leaders Program is in place for participating youths who are in grades 10, 11, and 12, have been in the program for one year or more, have performed in Toronto, and have completed one month
(between September-December) of perfect school attendance (OLI Inc., 2012, January 12).

Those youths deemed “Future Leaders” are paired with a mentor—one of OLI’s staff or Board members. Once the match is made, the youth leaders and their mentors contact one another via email to build a relationship and discuss future opportunities. In March, OLI youth leaders travel to Toronto and stay at the Tim Horton’s camp for a week during which they meet their mentor, participate in leadership activities, and partake in arts-based activities and activities that focus on steps to pursue post-secondary education at local colleges and universities.

**OLI’s Policies: A Youth Development through Recreation Program?**

Throughout its efforts, OLI aims to positively impact Aboriginal youths. OLI attempts to “build up their [Aboriginal youths’] self esteem while developing a sense of accomplishment and confidence through the dance performance. Also important is they learn what it takes to succeed and work hard for a goal” (OLI, 2010, p. 6). These objectives are reflected in its policies: attendance, academic performance, dance rehearsal progress, and behaviour (OLI, 2010). The attendance policy requires participating youths to be enrolled and attend school regularly where the number of absences allowed for the youths is decided upon on a community-to-community basis. For instance, youths of one partner community may be afforded a maximum of twenty school days whereas youths from another partner community may be afforded a maximum of fifteen days. Second, the academic performance policy stipulates that participating youths must actively attend classes and commit to academic success. For instance, students must show an effort to engage in school activities and assignments and to passing all tests and exams (OLI, 2010). Third, the dance rehearsal progress policy calls for participating youths to demonstrate 100% effort and dedication to dancing at every rehearsal. Lastly, the behaviour policy mandates that participating youths display respectful and encouraging behaviour toward all community
members. Participating youths must follow these principles and guidelines, which are further set out in detail by their respective communities, in order to remain enrolled in OLI and participate in arts-based recreation (OLI, 2010). As such, OLI’s requirements reflect attempts to keep participating youths enrolled in school and to achieve further education while developing youths’ self-discipline and self-esteem through arts-based recreation (OLI, 2010). Thus, OLI mirrors that of youth development through recreation programming. This thesis, therefore, attempts to establish how OLI orients its creation and implementation efforts as a youth development through recreation program, specifically to determine if and how OLI staff and Board members describe its programming as reflecting Aboriginal peoples’ stated desires and part of a greater decolonization strategy.

**Literature Review**

To situate OLI and this research within the existing literature, below I provide an overview of Aboriginal self-determination and its complexities. I then describe youth development through recreation as it relates to Aboriginal peoples. Finally, I present a history of colonization to show how it continues to impact Aboriginal youths.

**Aboriginal Self-Determination**

Simplistically, Aboriginal self-determination can be referred to as Aboriginal peoples’ rights to determine and control their own lives (Napoleon, 2005). The need for Aboriginal self-determination stems from imperial and colonial forces of power, which eroded Aboriginal peoples’ ability to dictate their beliefs and ways of life. Napoleon (2005) argued, however, that Aboriginal self-determination is a Western construction based on principles of (neo)liberalism, which defines Aboriginal self-determination as the total liberation from all forms of dependency. Henriksen (2001) argued that this way of thinking positions Aboriginal self-deterministic efforts
as those that work to establish Indigenous peoples’ own independent nation state, which, according to Napoleon (2005), positions Aboriginal self-determination as a form of colonial domination. Henriksen (2001) suggested that Western governments put forth concepts of Aboriginal self-determination that may not align with the ways in which many Aboriginal peoples would exercise their right of self-determination. Henriksen (2001) explained that many Aboriginal peoples are not looking for their own state; instead, Aboriginal peoples view principles of the right of self-determination as those that reflect equity and non-discrimination within the already established state. Further, he suggested that many Aboriginal peoples often articulate the right to self-determination as the right to control their destiny, to freely express their cultural identity, and to have informed consent over actions dictated on their behalf. Henriksen (2001) thus contended that

The right to self-determination should be regarded as a “process right” rather than a right to a pre-defined outcome. In other words, the outcome of any exercise of the right of self-determination must be individually defined, through a process of dialogue in which the peoples concerned are participating on equal terms. (p. 14)

This thesis is informed by Henriksen’s (2001) depiction of Aboriginal self-determination. The struggle for Aboriginal peoples’ self-determination remains important, especially since the struggle for it “permeates all social processes,” including physical practices (Fox, 2007, p. 236). Paraschak (1998) explained that Aboriginal physical practices are physical acts embodied by Aboriginal peoples to express their beliefs and values. As part of a larger assimilative strategy, however, Forsyth and Wamsley (2006) described how “government administrations in Canada implemented strict policies and programmes designed to bring indigenous beliefs and customs in line with mainstream values and practices” (p. 296). As a result, Aboriginal peoples’
rights to self-determination to physical practices were constrained. Through the 1970s, however, Aboriginal peoples in Canada expressed their rights to self-determined physical practices with the establishment of all-Native sport and recreational games that was set apart from mainstream sport and recreation (Forsyth & Wamsley, 2006). Sport and recreation practices, like the all-Native system, give and continue to give Aboriginal peoples at least some freedom and control (as it is often contingent on funding) to dictate their physical practices. Although avenues exist for self-determined sport and recreation, Forsyth and Wamsley (2006) argued that limited resources of Aboriginal communities prevent Aboriginal peoples from creating their own sport and recreation programs, and I argue this is particularly the case in youth development through sport and recreation programming.

**Youth Development through Sport and Recreation**

Youth development through sport and recreation programs typically use sport and recreation as media to enhance youths’ self-esteem and self-confidence and to offer youths life lessons in an overall attempt to reduce youths’ problem behaviours (Bembry, 1998). The Sport for Development and Peace division of the Government of Canada, which is part of the Canadian Heritage, is dedicated to using sport and recreation for development internationally (Canadian Heritage, 2008, November 06). Certainly, development through sport and recreation initiatives in communities in Canada’s provinces and territories, and especially in Aboriginal communities for Aboriginal youths, have yet to receive as much attention as international efforts, despite the fact that many of these programs attempt to achieve many of the same goals as international initiatives (Nicholls & Giles, 2007). This area is, nevertheless, an important one for study, especially considering colonial relations of power that inform relationships between the Canadian state and Aboriginal peoples.
Darnell (2007) illustrated how a history of colonial relations of power is reproduced by development through sport and recreation initiatives. He argued that “discourses of sport and development, and racial encounters within development through sport initiatives, serve in the (re)construction of Whiteness as a standpoint of racialized privilege” (p. 574). As Darnell (2007) illustrated, the development through sport and recreation movement is laden with dichotomies of the empowered and disempowered, privileged and unprivileged, and experts and non-experts that inform discourses about the Other or Third World peoples. When initiatives seek to help so-called developing populations who are typically non-white, whites are (re)established as the privileged race with expert knowledge and, in opposition, non-whites are assumed to be unknowing and unintelligible (Darnell, 2007). Indeed, Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) argued that development through sport and recreation programs are based on Eurocentric beliefs and, as a result, often marginalize and suppress participant knowledges. I argue that the situation is very similar within Canada.

Colonization and Aboriginal Youths

The area now referred to as Canada is amongst the many regions that were invaded by European settler colonies who, over time, “annihilated, displaced and/or marginalized the indigenes to become a majority non-indigenous population” (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1998, p. 211). Aboriginal peoples living in Canada were deliberately segregated and marginalized through imperial and colonial powers’ assimilatory strategies, first by Europeans and then by Euro-Canadians after confederation. Assimilatory strategies were used to attempt to transform Aboriginal peoples’ values and beliefs to more closely resemble dominant Euro-Canadian ideals. Adams (1999) noted that colonization produced the colonizers as members of the superior race and class, and in doing so, subjugated and exploited all aspects of Aboriginal life. One of the
most significant ways in which colonization subjugated and exploited all aspects of Aboriginal youths’ lives was through the education system.

From the 1880s, when the Canadian government issued its first policy on Aboriginal education that formalized the use of residential/boarding schools to assimilate Aboriginal youths, until the last residential/boarding school closed in 1996 (Forsyth, 2007), many Aboriginal youths were taken from their homes and were placed in schools where they were forced to dismiss their Aboriginal roots and instead adhere to Euro-Canadian ways of life (Miller, 1996). Kirmayer, Simpson, and Cargo (2003) argued that the effects of the residential schooling and other government policies of assimilation are linked to the health problems that Aboriginal youths face today. Aboriginal youths living in Canada are subject to high rates of crime, incarceration, mental health problems, substance abuse, suicide, and low rates of school completion, all of which Kirmayer et al. (2003) argued are rooted in the continuing cultural oppression caused by colonial legacies. Colonialism created ideas about Aboriginal peoples as being inferior, lazy, worthless, unintelligent, and dirty (Adams, 1999) and such colonial discourses continue to impact Aboriginal peoples today since colonial domination is still rearticulated and/or is created in new ways (neo-colonialism) (McEwan, 2009). As Kirmayer et al. (2003) described,

The legacy of the policies of forced assimilation is also seen in the current relationship of Aboriginal peoples with the larger Canadian society. Images of the “savage” and stereotypes of the “drunken Indian” continue to recur in popular media. Racism is still widespread, if often subtle, and beyond active discrimination there is a continuing lack of historical awareness of the experience of Aboriginal peoples with colonisation and the enduring impact on their wellbeing and social options. Governmental, bureaucratic and
professional tutelage and control continue to undermine Aboriginal efforts at self-direction. (p. S18)

Since Aboriginal youths are a growing demographic in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2008, January), there is a need to better understand strategies that work towards Aboriginal peoples’, especially youths’, self-determination and that challenge colonialism in today’s society. I argue that efforts should be directed towards understanding youth development through recreation’s roles in these issues, which I attempt to do with OLI.

**Epistemology**

It is through a constructionist epistemology that researchers can look at how individuals construct meaning in society and how society, in turn, constructs meaning for individuals (Crotty, 1998). A constructionist approach enabled me to seek the ways in which both OLI staff and Board members and members of dominant society construct meanings of youth development through recreation programming. Specifically, I was able to develop a better understanding of how OLI staff and Board members construct ideas concerning the ways in which OLI is created and implemented. I was also able to understand how a history of colonization and dominant Euro-Canadian society have influenced the construction of OLI staff and Board members’ understanding of youth development through recreation programming for Aboriginal peoples.

**Theoretical Framework**

I used postcolonial theory and Bhabha’s (1994) notions of hybridity and the third space to examine colonial power relations that continue to exist today and impact Aboriginal peoples’ cultures. Below, I introduce postcolonial theory and a well-known postcolonial theorist, Bhabha (1994), and then justify the selection of his theoretical approach for this study.

**Postcolonial Theory**
The term “post” in postcolonial denotes two meanings: the first is associated to the period of time after colonialism in which colonial and imperial acts were relinquished to give nations or territories their independence (Goff, 2005); the second is associated to colonialism’s aftermath (McEwan, 2009). In reference to the first meaning, the post in postcolonial should not negate the colonial and imperial powers that still exist even though nations and territories are no longer politically controlled by colonial and imperial powers. McEwan (2009) has pointed out that actual colonies still exist today. Additionally, Wisker (2007) expressed that “in many cases the infrastructure established by [imperial and colonial] powers remained…[and] economic, political, military and ideological influence predominated” (p. 6), which creates a sense of dependence of the formerly colonized on the colonizer. The continued reliance on former colonizers is part of neocolonialism, which is the “economic hegemony…[in which the] postcolonial state remains in a situation of dependence on its former masters, and that the former masters continue to act in a colonialist manner towards formerly colonized states” (Young, 2001, p. 45). As a result, gaining formal independence did not remove nor further prevent the impacts that colonialism and neo-colonialism had and continue to have on colonized populations after the colonial period (Gandhi, 1998). As a result, the term postcolonial cannot be solely defined as a point in time after colonialism; rather, the term postcolonial signifies a relationship of continuity since it is colonialism’s aftermath that has and continues to have effects on those that were colonized.

Postcolonial theorists, therefore, work to unravel the past and present states of economic, political, and cultural conditions of those that are living in the aftermath of colonialism (McEwan, 2009). Specifically for the purposes of the second paper, I felt it important to engage with a postcolonial theoretical orientation that I could use to make sense of OLI’s use of hip-hop
with Aboriginal youths. As such, I employed Bhabha’s (1994) concepts of hybridity and the third space in my thesis. Below, I outline Bhabha’s (1994) contribution to postcolonial theory that was used to guide this research with OLI.

**Bhabha: Hybridity and the Third Space**

Bhabha’s (1994) contributions to postcolonial theory include his extensions and criticisms of work by Edward Said. As such, it is important to begin by providing a brief overview of Said’s (1978) work. Said (1978) is widely known for using the term Orientalism to refer to the Occident/Orient binary, which signifies the relationship between the Western cultural enterprise (or Occident) and non-Western cultures (or Orient). According to Said (1978), Western peoples, mainly British and French, used non-Western cultures to validate ideas of Western cultures. Thus, Orientalism became a system of knowledge concerning the Orient “organized around gender, class, rationality, or any number of other categories, at whose normative centre remains the figure of the white, Western, middle class, heterosexual male” (Childs & Williams, 1997, p. 101). Said’s (1978) work shows the ways in which power structures are involved in the construction of the Occident/Orient binary and related colonial discourses, which helps to explain meanings that are attributed to the Other.

In comparison to Said’s (1978) focus on binary oppositions, Bhabha’s (1994) approach to postcolonial theory draws on the similarities between the colonizer and the colonized rather than the differences. Bhabha (1994) criticized Said for over-simplifying binaries such as the West/East, Occident/Orient, and colonizer/colonized. Bhabha (1994) argued that in studying dominant and marginalized knowledges as binary opposites, binaries become separated and distinguished entities—dominant knowledges become more dominant and marginalized knowledges are further marginalized. As such, Bhabha (1994) argued that binaries such as
colonizer/colonized carry with them cultural connotations that are homogenous and fixed, which he argued further perpetuate colonial discourses. Instead, Bhabha (1994) reconceptualized the analysis of colonial discourses by suggesting that colonial discourses are ever-changing, in the sense that cultural meanings have no fixity. He viewed cultures as subject to change through a process called hybridity that takes place within a third space. The term hybridity refers to cultural mixing that exists within an in-between third space. In reference to Bhabha’s (1994) notion of hybridity, Childs and Williams (1997) stated that the term “shifts power, questions discursive authority, and suggests…that colonial discourse is never wholly in the control of the colonizer” (p. 136). The concept of the third space refers to a means whereby cultural systems are created through negotiation, translation, and interpretation disentangled from original moments (Bhabha, 1994). Hybridity and the third space thus signify processes of cultural productions that are the result of an ambivalent process whereby one’s interpretations are continuously mixing to create new cultural understandings (Bhabha, 1994). Bhabha (1994) thus argued that a universal culture is nonexistent; instead, cultures are always arising as new and unrecognizable. Locating cultures within hybrid third spaces allows other cultural meanings to emerge that are contradictory to meanings dominant discourses might suggest.

While Bhabha’s (1994) concepts of hybridity and the third space made significant contributions to the development of postcolonial theory, they have also been criticized. Since Bhabha’s (1994) approach to postcolonial theory examines colonial relations of power as shifting within a third space, this third space positions colonial relations of power as existing in balance (Childs & Williams, 1997). The disparity of relations of power between those who are and are not suffering from colonial legacies, however, epitomizes the forces of colonialism. As such, hybridity and the third space can underestimate the dominant power structures that continue to
suppress those still struggling from colonialism’s impacts (Young, 1995). Bhabha’s (1994) notions of hybridity and the third space, however, are not meant to overlook the ways in which the historical and contemporary world remains laden with colonial power structures. Instead, Bhabha’s (1994) employment of hybridity and third space can be used to understand how colonial relations of power continue to exist and produce differing cultural perceptions and worldviews in contemporary society.

I used postcolonial theory and Bhabha’s (1994) concepts of hybridity and the third space to examine if and how the creation and implementation of OLI is influenced by Eurocentric and colonial forces. To further achieve such objectives, this thesis used a case study methodology.

**Methodology**

Case studies, which Yin (2003) described as being a “comprehensive research strategy” (p. 13), offer in-depth observations and analyses of social phenomena in ways that provide a holistic understanding of real-life events (Yin, 2009). Simplistically, a case study is the study of a particular case (Stake, 2005). Researchers identify a person, a group of persons, an organization, programs, processes, etc. that is of special interest and strive to understand interactions within the specific, yet dynamic context in which these interactions occur (Stake, 1995).

Although case studies appear to be simplistic, they are complex and are often misunderstood in qualitative research. A common misconception of case studies used in the social sciences is that they only serve exploratory purposes, limiting the capability to recognize the dynamic relationships that researchers strive to understand. To address this concern, Yin (2003) argued that case studies fulfill both exploratory and explanatory research objectives. He suggested that case studies can answer the “who,” “what,” and “where” of a research question
“when the research goal is to describe the incidence or prevalence of a phenomenon or when it is to be predictive about certain outcomes” and also the “how” and “why” of a research question when the research goal deals “with operational links needing to be traced over time, rather than mere frequencies or incidence” (Yin, 2003, p. 6). I used a case study methodology to recognize the interactions involved in creating and implementing a youth development through recreation program and to understand them in relation to a specific socio-historical context. Although case studies enable an in-depth understanding of a specific case, researchers still need to attend to methodological considerations that occur when conducting research with Aboriginal peoples.

**Methodological Considerations**

Smith (1999) stated that research reproduces acts of colonization due to the ways in which it positions Western white peoples as superior beings and has marginalized Indigenous peoples. Smith (1999) contended that universities are white institutions where research remains a mechanism for colonial representations and constructions of Indigenous peoples. Indeed, Whittaker (1994) noted that writing about the Other can perpetuate the colonial system.

Indigenous methodologies, however, have been put forth in order to combat colonialism’s legacy within academia (Rigney, 1999; Smith, 2008; Steinhauer, 2002). Indigenous methodologies are predicated by principles such as trusting relationships between the researcher and Indigenous peoples/communities, a dedication to revealing Indigenous knowledges and worldviews, and facilitating Indigenous peoples’ involvement in and control of the research process (Smith, 2008; Steinhauer, 2002). There is debate, however, regarding whether or not non-Indigenous researchers can use Indigenous methodologies (Smith, 2008; Steinhauer, 2002). Young (1990) suggested, however, that it is important for both Indigenous
and non-Indigenous peoples to play a role in decolonization, since both were/are involved in the colonial process.

Thus, I attempted to use the principles that guide Indigenous methodologies to inform my research. With my close partnership with OLI staff and Board members and their frequent input in the research process, I sought to privilege their knowledge and have them control the research process. Throughout the research process, I consulted with OLI staff and Board members to determine their objectives for this research and the means through which to achieve them. Additionally, OLI staff and Board members participated in reviewing, writing, and revising interview questions and reviewing and revising drafts of each paper. In doing so, I attempted to create a medium for OLI staff and Board members to transmit their knowledge of OLI and to position them as experts on their own experiences.

**Methods**

Case study research combines multiple methods to elicit data from multiple sources in order to generate in-depth understanding of the case at hand (Torrance & Stark, 2005). There are a number of methods that researchers use to produce a credible case study that is rich with data such as archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant-observation, films, photography, and physical artifacts (Yin, 1994). For the purpose of this thesis, I used fieldnotes, semi-structured interviews, and archival documents. These methods of data collection were selected by OLI staff and Board members as the most appropriate and informative ways to obtain knowledge of the program. I believe the methods chosen reflect not only the wishes of OLI, but also the most suitable means to collect rich data. Below, I outline each method and describe its use in this thesis.

**Fieldnotes**
Fieldnotes are written recordings of significant and non-significant observations such as people’s behaviours, reactions (or lack thereof), and comments participants make, which provide the basis of the evidence (Belton, 2009). Fieldnotes take what we see and hear and turn it into written texts (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). Then, the written texts become data that are reviewed and studied (Emerson et al., 1995). As such, fieldnotes reflect a process of selection that is subjective to the researcher’s interpretation of significant or non-significant information (Emerson et al., 1995). Fieldnotes are often used as supplemental evidence and as a basis for further questioning during interviews (Emerson et al., 1995).

For my research, I recorded fieldnotes when I silently participated during two OLI conference calls, which occurred over the telephone between an OLI staff member and partner community members, and when I attended and volunteered to aid in running OLI’s fourth annual performance in June, 2011. Such instances provided me with the opportunity to gain significant information pertaining to OLI’s creation and implementation processes.

**Semi-Structured Interviews**

In addition to fieldnotes, I conducted semi-structured interviews. The semi-structured interview is designed to elicit open responses by asking the interviewee a small set of predetermined questions then probing for further insight and following-up with additional questions (Wengraf, 2001). Without a full list of questions, however, semi-structured interviewers are faced with the task of formulating a limited number of main questions that will elicit information needed to answer their research questions (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). To overcome this obstacle, Rubin and Rubin (2005) recommended creating both broad and focused main questions in order to learn from the interviewee about the given topic and then to discover specific details of the topic.
The opportunity to work with OLI on this research project arose through my thesis supervisor, who knew OLI’s program manager. Through this relationship, OLI became part of my supervisor’s larger SSHRC research project. Through communicating with OLI’s founder and the OLI staff, mutual negotiations were made that outlined both parties’ expectations for the new partnership. To help facilitate this partnership, I collaborated with OLI’s staff and Board of Directors throughout the research process. For instance, OLI staff and Board members expressed that they did not wish to engage partner community members and participating youths in the study at this point, so I conducted semi-structured interviews with each of OLI’s staff and Board members. Both OLI staff and I crafted broad and focused main questions. A sample of interview questions for this thesis included: Why was OLI created? What are some of the challenges that OLI faces when implementing the program? What are some of the strengths? Why is this program targeted for Aboriginal youth? What kind of opportunities does OLI provide Aboriginal youth? How does OLI differ from programs created for Aboriginal youth by non-Aboriginal people?

In November, 2011, I conducted semi-structured interviews with each of OLI’s three staff members (three females; one Aboriginal of descent) and four Board members (two females; two males; three Aboriginal descents) in November 2011. To provide context for this thesis, below I present background information pertaining to each staff and Board member, all of whom provided consent to use their real names for this research.

**OLI Staff**

At the time the data were collected, OLI staff consisted of three members: Tracee Smith, Stephanie Cressman, and Maureen Hatherley. Tracee is OLI’s founder and CEO and is a member of the Missanabie Cree First Nation (OLI Inc., 2010c). She is a professional dancer and
choreographer and holds a number of arts-, academic-, and business-related achievements (OLI Inc., 2010c). Tracee oversees OLI to ensure in its operational and financial stability. Stephanie is OLI’s program manager. With a background in dance and arts programming (OLI Inc., 2010c), Stephanie is responsible for regular contact and communication with participating communities to discuss program challenges, solutions, and overall goings-on. Lastly, Maureen serves as OLI’s education consultant. With twenty five years’ worth of teaching in a number of Ontario communities and implementing OLI in a First Nations high school during its inaugural years (OLI Inc., 2010c), Maureen’s experiential educational knowledge is integral to OLI, specifically its course credit component.

**OLI Board Members**

At the time the data were collected, OLI’s Board of Directors consisted of four members: Andres Hannah-Suarez, Vanessa Smith, Jess Hill, and Fred Carmichael. Andres serves as OLI’s president. He offers program guidance and advice generated through his professional background as a lawyer dealing with Indigenous related issues (OLI Inc., 2010c). Vanessa is OLI’s treasurer and as such is responsible for OLI’s bookkeeping. She is also a member of the Missanabie Cree First Nation and is a kindergarten teacher on a Six Nations reserve in Ontario (OLI Inc., 2010c). Jess is a member of the Oneida Nation of the Thames and is OLI’s director (OLI Inc., 2010c). She is an accountant and aids in organizing OLI’s financial records. Lastly, Fred is the first Aboriginal pilot in the Northwest Territories (OLI Inc., 2010c). He is a well known advocate for Aboriginal rights and self-sufficiency and serves on many Aboriginal councils. Fred provides OLI with guidance and advocates on behalf of the organization.

The interviews were conducted both face-to-face (n=3) and over the telephone (n=4) due to geographical restrictions. After each interview was transcribed, I returned the transcripts to
OLI staff and Board members who were given a two week time frame to make any changes they deemed necessary, after which time it was assumed changes were unnecessary.

Archival Documents

Archival documents are documents created in the past by a person or an organization and can take many forms including letters, journals, manuscripts, meeting minutes, reports, newspaper articles, and other media sources (Yin, 1994). Such documents, therefore, involve the person or organization who recorded the document, a time in history, and the context in which it was written (Prior, 2003). As a result, archival documents are constructed based on how the person/organization perceived the context during the time in which it was produced (Hill, 1993). According to Prior (2003), “documents are not just manufactured, they are consumed…they are manipulated in organized settings for many different ends and they also function in different ways…in short, documents have effects” (p. 4). Indeed, archival documents are produced in social settings and are thus social products (Hill, 1993; Prior, 2003).

Data found in archival documents are thus limited since such records provide only a partial view of history/an event (Hill, 1993). Though archival documents seldom give an entire view of a social phenomenon, they are useful in confirming and supplementing other sources of data (Yin, 1994). As OLI is a charitable organization, I used OLI documents including program manuals, media concerning OLI such as newspaper articles, and OLI’s website as supplemental and conformational pieces of evidence. Upon (re)reading the data obtained from the methods described above, I sometimes came across gaps in knowledge of the program and areas of uncertainty. When this occurred, I sought aid from Stephanie Cressman, OLI’s Program Manager, through email and telephone exchanges in order to gain additional information and/or to obtain clarity.
Analysis

I analyzed the data obtained from the methods outlined above using both thematic analysis (for the first paper) and critical discourse analysis (CDA) (for the second paper). Essentially, a thematic analyst attempts to describe patterns found in the data. Thus, a theme organizes the data into similar observations and interpretations of a phenomenon (Boyatzis, 1998). As such, thematic analysis is a relatively simple means to analyze data, is theoretically flexible, and requires little or no prior data analysis experience (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006). At the same time, however, thematic analysis’ simplicity and flexibility must not be taken for granted. Braun and Clarke (2006) suggested that these characteristics often result in guidelines that are blurred when attempting to gather all the data into specific categories and themes and thus makes focusing on the data difficult.

I, however, have attempted to overcome the shortcoming found in thematic analysis by using Creswell’s (2009) six-step guide to thematic analysis. Creswell (2009) recommended beginning the analysis by preparing the data for analysis through, for instance, organizing and transcribing it. For step two, Creswell (2009) suggested reading through all the data to generate an overall impression of the material. Step three is dedicated to coding the data. Creswell (2009) explained that codes are first generated by reading through the data and documenting insightful findings that relate to the research questions. Then, the documented findings are grouped into similar topics, which are then abbreviated into codes. In order to produce codes that are in line with the research objectives, Creswell (2009) recommended looking for codes according to the related literature, to theory, to unexpected findings, and to unusual findings. Once the codes are identified, codes are categorized using descriptive wording. Step four involves expanding each category into themes. Lastly, steps five and six involve using the themes to reveal the data and to
interpret the findings, which comprise a manuscript’s results and discussion sections. Using Creswell’s (2009) steps to thematic analysis, I grouped and then coded the data based on postcolonial theory and the ways in which OLI is created and implemented. I then created categories and developed descriptive wording for each category and analyzed and interpreted their meanings.

In the second paper, I employed CDA. CDA involves examining the ways in which relations of power and inequality are (re)produced and challenged through text and talk within the context in which they occur (van Dijk, 2001). According to Phillips and Hardy (2002), “discourses are shared and social, emanating out of interactions between social groups and the complex societal structures in which the discourse is embedded” (p. 4). Meanings and representations that are attached to discourses emanate from society and social interactions, which are then placed upon the individual or group associated with such discourses and inform what is real and true for these individual(s) (Fairclough, 2003). Since individuals are part of societal discourses that reproduce or challenge social realities or “truths,” which in turn define human life (Fairclough, 2003), discourses can privilege some and marginalize others.

Grounding the data in postcolonial theory, I attempted to better understand the impact of colonial discourses on OLI’s implementation efforts by using Willig’s (2008) six stage analytical framework for conducting discourse analysis. Willig’s (2008) six stage framework required me to identify the ways that discourses were constructed within the data, position the discursive constructions within broader discourses, question the discursive contexts within which the discursive constructions were embedded, look at the ways discourses dictated opportunities for certain practices while constraining others and the ways the discourses were reproduced and challenged, uncover how discourses affect the subjective experience for those who are part of the
discourse, and finally, illuminate the impacts such discourses have on the individual and the ways in which individuals reproduce and challenge dominant discourses. By using Willig’s (2008) six stages of discourse analysis, I was able to identify and question colonial discourses that influence OLI’s implementation and creation efforts.

**Thesis Format**

Two papers comprise this thesis. Both papers used semi-structured interviews with OLI staff and Board members, fieldnotes, and archival documents, all of which generated data that were grounded in postcolonial theory. Each paper sought to uncover the creation and implementation efforts of OLI from the perspectives of OLI staff and Board members, since they expressed the desire to not involve community members in the research process at this point in time. The first paper, “Youth development through recreation: Eurocentric influences and Aboriginal self-determination” focused on if and how OLI’s creation and implementation efforts are influenced by Eurocentric forces and the broader implications these factors have on achieving Aboriginal self-determination. In the second paper, “Outside Looking In: Resisting colonial discourses of Aboriginality,” I used CDA to uncover if/how OLI’s creation and implementation is influenced by colonial discourses. Together, these papers attempt to contribute to the gap in the literature pertaining to youth development through recreation programming for Aboriginal peoples.
Endnotes

1 The term Aboriginal is used to make specific reference to First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples in Canada, while the term Indigenous is used to make reference to Indigenous peoples in the rest of the world and to keep with as it is used in the literature.

2 The term Euro-Canadian is used to describe individuals from European origin who came to and now reside in what is now called Canada (Haig-Brown & Nock, 2006).

3 OLI staff and Board members chose not to disclose the names of First Nations communities that are or have been involved in OLI.

4 Although OLI’s participating communities have been First Nations communities in Canada thus far, OLI staff and Board members expressed they are not opposed to expanding OLI to other Aboriginal groups residing inside or outside of Canada.
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Youth Development through Recreation: Eurocentric Influences and Aboriginal Self-Determination
Abstract

In Canada, youth development through recreation programs often reflect Eurocentric culture and are used to modify or control youths’ social behaviours. Further, when such programs and interventions are targeted at Aboriginal youths, they often fail to consider or include Aboriginal peoples’ input or worldviews. In this paper, I examine the creation and implementation processes of an arts-based, youth development through recreation program called Outside Looking In (OLI) to determine if and how OLI staff and Board members perceive the program to be influenced by Eurocentric ideas of programming. Using data from semi-structured interviews, fieldnotes, and a review of archival documents, I employ postcolonial theory to argue that OLI staff and Board members describe OLI as a program that is somewhat pre-determined, but offers opportunities to involve participants in OLI processes through collaborative processes. I contend that while OLI reproduces Eurocentric programming, it also provides avenues to contribute to Aboriginal self-determination. Nevertheless, while Aboriginal self-determination is an important goal, OLI illustrated how tensions exist within recreation for youth development whereby attaining Aboriginal self-determination proves difficult.
Since programs created and controlled by Aboriginal peoples\(^1\) can challenge colonial relations of power (Franks, Smith-Loyd, Newell, & Dietrich, 2001), many scholars (e.g., Baker & Giles, 2008; Chino & DeBruyn, 2006; Fox, 2007; Reading, Ritchie, Victor, & Wilson, 2005) have advocated for Aboriginal peoples’ meaningful involvement in the design and control of recreation programs for Aboriginal peoples. Nevertheless, little evidence, if any, exists that describes how these approaches can be used in youth development through recreation programs for Aboriginal peoples, since evaluations and descriptions of youth development through recreation programs for Aboriginal peoples remain scarce.

In the research presented herein, I describe the creation and implementation of an arts-based, youth development through recreation program called Outside Looking In (OLI), which uses recreation to help Aboriginal youths to develop a sense of accomplishment and confidence and to encourage them to stay in school (OLI, 2010). Through the use of semi-structured interviews, fieldnotes, archival research, and postcolonial theory, I argue that OLI staff and Board of Directors members’ description of OLI’s creation and implementation processes mirror that of Eurocentric programming ideals, since OLI is described as offering a framework that is relatively pre-determined. At the same time, however, they also challenge Eurocentric intentions through the program’s collaboration with partnering communities’ members and participating youths—efforts that can be seen as contributing to Aboriginal self-determination. As a result, this paper not only makes a contribution to our scholarly understanding of how a youth development through recreation program for Aboriginal peoples can be designed and administered and the influences that Eurocentric culture has on such programming, but also identifies to the tensions that exist and make achieving Aboriginal self-determination difficult within youth development through recreation.
Review of Literature

To provide a broad context of understanding for this paper, here I provide an overview of several areas of research. First I examine youth development through recreation by outlining its roots in both development through sport and youth development programming. I do so to highlight the ways in which youth development through recreation programming is embedded within Eurocentric values that can perpetuate colonialism. Lastly, I describe Aboriginal self-determination and its relation to the struggle to combat colonialism.

Youth Development through Sport and Recreation

In general use, sport is often used to refer to competitive activities, which thus excludes recreational activities. In most of the development through sport literature, however, the term sport is typically used as an umbrella term to refer to sport, recreation, and physical activities. In this paper, I use the term sport in keeping with the meaning ascribed in the literature that I cite, but deliberately use the term recreation to refer to the non-competitive activities such as those with which OLI participants engage.

There exists a plethora of research that has examined the use of recreation- and sport-based (as well as leisure- and physical activity-based) programs to promote youth development (e.g., Bembry, 1998; Danish, Forneris, Hodge, & Heke, 2004; Fraser-Thomas, Côté, & Deakin, 2005; Petitpas, Cornelius, Van Raalte, & Jones, 2005). Such programs use recreation and sport to foster life lessons (Danish et al., 2004), psychosocial behaviours (Petitpas et al., 2005), and character building traits (Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005) in youths. Youth development though recreation and sport originated from two different areas: development through sport and recreation; and youth development. Below, I outline these areas and show how they are structured in ways that can reproduce colonial relations of power.
Development through sport (also known as sport for development and peace) has garnered increasing attention over the last two decades (Kidd, 2008), during which time government bodies, various international organizations (e.g., the United Nations), and most notably NGOs began a rapid trend of using sport, recreation, physical activity, and physical education to achieve a number of development and peace-related objectives (Black, 2010; Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011) for peoples in disadvantaged nations or territories (Kidd, 2008). Development through sport and recreation objectives include, but are not limited to, combating social inequalities and problems relating to poverty, education, and health (Beutler, 2008; Black, 2010; Kidd, 2008) and aiding in facilitating reconciliation in conflicted regions (Kidd, 2008).

At the same time, however, using sport, recreation, and physical activity as “a vehicle to achieve a range of...social, economic, and political objectives” (Levermore & Beacom, 2009, p. 8) positions development through sport and recreation as being far from a new phenomenon, as physical practices have been viewed, particularly by governments, as colonial tools to impart social order and European developmental objectives for over a century (Levermore & Beacom, 2009). Indeed, Aboriginal physical practices, which Paraschak (1998) explained are physical acts embodied by Aboriginal peoples to express their cultures, were one of the many means through which colonial assimilative strategies were enacted on Aboriginal peoples in Canada. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Euro-Canadians attempted to develop and/or assimilate Aboriginal peoples through “appropriate” physical practices for Aboriginal peoples – i.e., those that mirrored Euro-Canadians’ (Paraschak, 1998). As such, development through sport and recreation initiatives that impose Euro-Canadian cultural norms, beliefs, and practices on Aboriginal participants can be seen as perpetuating colonialism; this is also evident in youth development programming.
Youth development programming is typically rooted in the at-risk youth development and/or the positive youth development paradigms. A number of scholars (Case, 2006; Catalano, Hawkins, Berglund, Pollard, & Arthur, 2002; Haines & Case, 2008; Lupton, 1999) have demonstrated how interventions for youths that arose in the 1950s were aimed at developing youths by preventing them from participating in risky and problem behaviours such as drug and alcohol abuse, sexual activity, and withdrawal from school. By categorizing youths based on risky and problem behaviours, Case (2006) argued that dominant Eurocentric society has globalized youth development programs by situating problem youths within universal contexts. Interventions are thus universally implemented based on measures of risk factors that place all youths in categories such as troublesome, irresponsible, and delinquent (Case, 2006). Lupton (1999) suggested that notions of risk are connected to dominant white society’s need to control and develop apparently inferior groups to maintain white superiority. Groups whose practices deviate from dominant societal (i.e., white) practices are considered threatening. Thus, the at-risk youth development paradigm is premised on Eurocentric ideals of how youths should behave and is applied universally to develop and control marginalized youths.

Positive youth development (PYD) emerged to address the implications arising from youth development programs for at-risk youths. Rather than focusing on fixing problem or risky behaviours, PYD focuses on the assumption that all youths are capable of successful growth and development (Catalano et al., 2002). Nevertheless, Ginwright and Cammarota (2002) argued that the PYD paradigm universalizes youths and “homogenizes their experiences, simplifies their identities, and conceptualizes them through one dominant cultural frame” (Ginwright & Cammarota, 2002, p. 85). In this way, PYD programs and the activities that are offered can be based on dominant culture and attempt to shape youths accordingly.
Not only is the PYD model based on dominant white society, but focusing on positive attributes of youths has led to “dismissing serious social, economic, and political influences in the lives of urban youths. Consequently, we are left with an over-romanticized, problem-free view of youth” (Ginwright & Cammarota, 2002, p. 84). Ginwright and Cammarota (2002) argued that the PYD model takes little consideration of the social factors that are present and affect the lives of minority populations. de Leeuw et al. (2010) illustrated how colonial discourses are manifested through program initiatives that do not take into account the larger context in which issues pertaining to Indigenous peoples arise. Programs that focus on the apparent needs of Aboriginal peoples (e.g., to deal with poor mental health and substance addictions) can reproduce colonial discourses concerning the uncivilized nature of Aboriginal peoples and justify the need for superior, Euro-Canadian help. Consequently, PYD programs often reflect Eurocentric definitions of marginalized youths and appropriate programming and thus tend to reproduce colonial relations of power. Aboriginal self-determination, however, is a strategy that is used to attempt to overcome colonialism’s continuing effects.

**Aboriginal Self-Determination and Colonialism**

Although Aboriginal self-determination is often regarded as a vast and complex term (Napoleon, 2005) that is relatively undefined (Forsyth & Wamsley, 2006), *The United Nations (UN) Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (UNDRIP) (UN, 2008) defined Indigenous self-determination as the

right [to] freely determine their [Indigenous peoples] political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development…have the right to autonomy or self-governance in matters relating to their internal and local affairs, as well as ways and means for financing their autonomous functions. (pp. 4-5)
The Canadian government recently expressed its agreement with UNDRIP and purports to protect the rights of Aboriginal peoples in Canada (Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada [AANDC], 2010).

In Canada, the need for Aboriginal peoples’ self-determination stems from a long and ongoing state of colonialist regimes (Frideres, 1988). Though they were once self-governing groups, many of Aboriginal nations’ political, economic, social, and cultural conditions have been transformed through various means to reflect Euro-Canadian colonial ideals (Adams, 1999). As a result, self-determination strategies for Aboriginal peoples are growing in attempts to recollect/reconcile/reassert Aboriginal peoples’ agency and autonomy (Frideres, 1988).

Since Eurocentric culture has exercised a great deal of control over Aboriginal peoples’ physical practices (e.g., recreational practices) (Paraschak, 1998) in Canada, scholars (Forsyth, 2007; Paraschak, 1998; Rose & Giles, 2007) have argued for the need for Aboriginal peoples to control their own recreational pursuits and programs. Although such works have recognized the importance of Aboriginal self-determination, an in-depth understanding of how to implement recreation programs, specifically youth development through recreation programs, to facilitate Aboriginal self-determination

The influence or direction that Eurocentric programming has on youth development through recreation programs for Aboriginal peoples, however, remains missing from the literature as program evaluations and descriptions are scarce. OLI presents an optimal opportunity to extend the limited knowledge of the creation and implementation processes of programming for Aboriginal peoples within the context of youth development through recreation, but also to understand if and how such programming is influenced by Eurocentric
ideals of programming and the impact that in turn may have on achieving Aboriginal self-determination and on colonial legacies.

**Outside Looking In (OLI)**

Below, I provide a detailed overview of OLI. I introduce the program, describe its internal organization, outline the OLI process, and present the creation and implementation of OLI’s program components and then its attendance policy. Lastly, I show how OLI’s objectives situate the program within a youth development through recreation paradigm.

Founded in 2007, Outside Looking In (OLI) was created as a charitable organization in Canada in order to give Aboriginal youths opportunities to self-express and to give non-Aboriginal peoples opportunities to learn about Aboriginal peoples and their cultures (OLI Inc., 2010a). Specifically, OLI is an arts-based recreation program for Aboriginal high school students from First Nations communities in Canada. OLI currently operates as a program through which First Nations youths earn a high school course credit by engaging in hip-hop, choreography, videography, journal writing, and painting throughout the school year (OLI, 2010). At the end of the school year, participating youths travel to Toronto, Ontario and perform in a multi-media show that showcases a hip-hop dance routine in front of a live audience (OLI, 2010). Thus, OLI’s use of the arts allows Aboriginal youths to self-express while providing a medium for a Toronto-based audience to learn about Aboriginal youths (OLI, 2010). In 2012, 29 youths from four First Nations communities performed in Toronto.

OLI operates with a few staff members, a volunteer-based Board of Directors, external partnerships with government sectors and various private organizations, professional dancers, and most importantly, OLI’s participants, which I will often refer to as partner communities, partner community members, and participating youths throughout this paper. OLI staff and
Board members aid in implementing OLI through acting as liaisons with partner community members via telephone, email, or in-person, helping to prepare for the final event, and obtaining financial support. Although each partner community must contribute a sum of money to aid in program costs ($25 000), government sectors’ and various corporate, private, and public organizations’ sponsorship and grants serve as OLI’s main source of income. OLI’s costs include but are not limited to participating youths’ stay in Toronto, theatre production expenses, OLI’s operational costs, and professional dancer fees. Professional dancers are hired by OLI staff and Board members to travel to partner communities to help to choreograph a hip-hop dance routine with participating youths (OLI Inc., 2010a). As OLI staff and Board members typically facilitate OLI behind the scenes and on a broader organizational level, partner community members are responsible for implementing the program within their communities. Each partner community must run OLI as a high school course credit, monitor participating students’ participation, and raise money to cover the cost of OLI’s $25 000 mandatory participation fee (OLI Inc., 2010b). Partner community members include the principal(s) and teacher(s) who volunteer to implement the course credit, monitor attendance, and supervise rehearsals and the volunteers such as parents, Band Council members, and youths that are and are not enrolled in OLI who aid in fundraising activities and support the youths enrolled in OLI. Additionally, some partner community members act as OLI staff’s lead contacts. Since OLI’s first show in 2008, OLI has experienced a gradual growth each year with additional staff and Board members, increasing sponsorships/donors, professional dancers, and new partner communities and participating youths.

The OLI Process
To participate in OLI, Aboriginal communities in Canada must first apply to be eligible for the program (OLI Inc., 2010b). Then, OLI staff and Board members consider each community’s application based on the community’s stated forthcoming dedication to the program through the community members’ willingness to volunteer their time to implement OLI as a high school credit course, supervise and run rehearsals, and hold fundraisers (OLI Inc., 2010b). To further intensify the community’s dedication and to ensure OLI’s sustainability in the event of economic hardship (OLI, 2010), each community must invest a mandatory sponsorship fee of $25,000 upon application to the OLI program, which is returned if the community’s application is declined (OLI Inc., 2010b). Once OLI staff and Board members select partner communities for involvement in the year-long process, the organization works with each community’s lead contacts via teleconferences or in-person meetings from the summer months and throughout the school year to prepare for and make adjustments to the program (OLI, 2010).

Once the school year begins in September, participating youths take part in OLI arts-based activities and workshops. In January, participating youths enroll in an OLI course for a high school credit and begin rehearsing a hip-hop dance routine with professional dancers who travel to each community on a bi-weekly basis (OLI, 2010); these dancers also work with participating youths to co-create the choreography. After six months of preparation, participating youths are hosted by the Tim Horton’s Farms Camp for two weeks, during which time the youths participate in camp activities, meet youths from the other partner communities, sightsee, and rehearse. On the day prior to departure from the Tim Horton’s camp, youths prepare for the show, which is held at the St. Lawrence Centre for the Arts’ Bluma Appel Theatre, which seats over 800 guests. In 2012, OLI sold 255 tickets. During the show, the audience members watch the multi-media performance, which is supplemented with video clips of and made by partner
communities and participating youths. After the performance, the audience is invited to celebrate and congratulate the youths and to view pieces of the youths’ of art and journal entries.

**OLI Program Components**

There are three main OLI program components: fall workshops, high school course credit, and the Future Leaders Program. OLI’s workshops engage participating youths in arts-based activities during the first semester of high school. Piloted in September-December of 2011, the workshops challenge youths to attend school and achieve perfect attendance for one month long periods. Challenge winners are afforded the opportunity to engage in and travel to other partner communities to participate in OLI workshops with other participating youths. Workshops are held once a month from October to December in different partner communities.

As of 2011, OLI was approved by Ontario’s Ministry of Education to offer its program as a high school credit course to help students to complete secondary school (OLI, 2010). In January at the beginning of the new school semester, participating youths work towards an OLI course credit (e.g., physical education, career counseling, or arts), which is chosen by partner community members (OLI Inc., 2010a). One or two teachers (depending on the number of students) from the community’s school is/are responsible for implementing the course and monitoring attendance. At the end of the year, those youths who are unable to meet OLI’s participation requirements and are thus unable to perform in Toronto are given a different final assignment to ensure that they are still able to earn the school credit. Those youths who have met the requirements travel to and perform in Toronto as their final credit requirement.

To aid in supporting participating youths’ approaching high school graduation, OLI created its Future Leaders Program, which was piloted in OLI’s 2011-2012 year. The Future Leaders Program is in place for participating youths who are in grades 10, 11, and 12, have been
in the program for one year or more, have performed in Toronto, and have one month (between September-December) of perfect school attendance (OLI Inc., 2012, January 12). Those youths deemed “future leaders” are paired with a mentor—one of OLI’s staff or Board members. Once the match is made, the youth leaders and their mentors contact one another via email to build a relationship and discuss future opportunities. In March, youth leaders travel to Toronto and stay at the Tim Horton’s camp for a week during which they meet their mentor, participate in leadership activities, and partake in activities at local colleges and universities to give them some tools to prepare for post-secondary education. In its inaugural year, five participating youths became future leaders and performed in Toronto.

**OLI’s Attendance Policy**

In order to be eligible to perform in Toronto, OLI, with support from participating community members, makes it mandatory that the youths adhere to an attendance policy (OLI, 2010). The attendance policy requires participating youths to be enrolled and attend school and rehearsals regularly. The number of allowable absences for the youths is decided upon on a community-by-community basis. For instance, youths from one partner community may be afforded a maximum of twenty allowable school days missed, whereas youths from another community may be afforded a maximum of fifteen.

OLI’s program components and policy reflect efforts that attempt to keep participating youths in high school, to encourage their completion of secondary school, and to aid them in achieving further education. OLI’s program components and policies also work to “build up their [participating youths’] self-esteem while developing a sense of accomplishment and confidence through the dance performance. Also important is they learn what it takes to succeed and work
hard for a goal” (OLI, 2010, p. 7). These goals align OLI with attempts to “develop” Aboriginal youths through recreation.

Delving deeper into how OLI is created and implemented will help to extend the limited knowledge surrounding evaluative looks at youth development through recreation programming for Aboriginal peoples and the ways in which, if at all, such programming is directed by Eurocentric culture. To produce such knowledge, I used postcolonial theory, a case study methodology that incorporated characteristics of Indigenous methodologies, multiple methods, and thematic analysis.

**Postcolonial Theory**

The use of “post” in postcolonial can be associated to a time when nations and territories were granted independence and thus were no longer controlled by colonial and imperial powers (Young, 2007). In most cases, however, colonial and imperial powers continue to directly or indirectly influence nations and territories even though they became politically independent (McEwan, 2009). As such, McEwan (2009) argued that postcolonial refers to colonialism’s aftermath. She (2009) further explained that dominant knowledge remains and continues to be produced by colonial powers although societies are postcolonial. Young (2007), therefore, suggested that postcolonial theory must acknowledge that there are ensuing impacts of colonialism in order to understand its influence (Young, 2007). Postcolonial theory helped me to understand how colonial relations of power can continue to be enacted or challenged through youth development through recreation programming with Aboriginal participants.

**Methodology and Methods**

Drawing on multiple methods, case studies help the researcher to gain in-depth understandings of the dynamics that occur within a single setting (Eisenhardt, 1989), like OLI. I
used a case study methodology to obtain a holistic understanding of the dynamics involved in OLI’s creation and implementation efforts.

Although case studies can offer a holistic grasp of the intricacies of a single case, case studies are not well-known for taking into account socio-historical considerations when Aboriginal peoples are involved in research. Such considerations are important to recognize since research, like recreation, is linked to a colonial history that has exploited Aboriginal peoples (Paraschak, 1998).

Smith (1999) argued that Western researchers have excluded Indigenous peoples in the research process and created misrepresentation of Indigenous peoples. Thus, Giles (2005) explained that Eurocentric-based methodological frameworks typically used by non-Aboriginal researchers can marginalize Indigenous worldviews. Indigenous methodological frameworks, on the other hand, are recognized for facilitating inclusive approaches to research that involve Aboriginal peoples, so they remain in control of the research process. Giles (2005), however, noted that there is a debate about who is able to use Indigenous methodologies. She argued that non-Aboriginal scholars are often challenged for both failing to use Indigenous methodologies—which is construed as marginalizing their use, and for using Indigenous research designs—which is construed as misappropriation. As a non-Aboriginal person, I did not feel comfortable using Indigenous methodologies in my research, as I did not want to be seen to be colonizing this emerging research methodology. I did, however, want this research to reflect inclusive research approaches inherent in Indigenous methodologies, in order to address this critique of non-Aboriginal scholars’ work. As a result, I attempted to build strong relationships with OLI staff and Board members to ensure they remained involved in and in control of the research process.
OLI staff and Board members prescribed the research objectives, reviewed and accepted the draft of this paper, aided in designing interview questions, and chose the research methods.

OLI staff and Board members identified fieldnotes, semi-structured interviews, and archival documents as the most informative and appropriate ways to obtain knowledge of the program. I took fieldnotes while I listened to two OLI conference calls on May 25th and 27th of 2011 and attended OLI’s annual performance in Toronto on June 22nd 2011. Both conference calls occurred over the telephone with OLI’s Program Manager and lead contacts of partner communities and encompassed final preparations, concerns, and questions regarding the upcoming show in June 2011. In addition, I volunteered my time at OLI’s 2011 performance day in Toronto during which I attended the performance and aided in taking photos of participating youths backstage. Essentially, fieldnotes are recordings that attempt to recreate events, conversations, and interactions that take place within the field (Van Maanen, 1998). My fieldnotes attempted to record and recreate conversations and happenings during conference calls and OLI’s final performance particularly those pertaining to OLI’s creation and implementation processes.

After I listened in on OLI conference calls, I conducted semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews are designed to facilitate a conversation between the interviewer and the interviewee with the aid of a prepared list of open-ended questions and prompts (Jennings, 2005). As such, semi-structured interviews can elicit in-depth understandings of processes in which the interviewer did not participate (Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

Since OLI staff and Board members suggested the research focus on OLI’s development and delivery from their point of view, I conducted seven semi-structured interviews: three with each of the OLI staff (all women; one of Aboriginal descent) and four with Board members (two
men and two women; three of Aboriginal descent). When the interviews took place, OLI staff members included Tracee Smith, OLI’s founder and CEO; Stephanie Cressman, OLI’s program manager; and Maureen Hatherley, OLI’s education consultant. OLI Board members included Andres Hannah-Suarez, OLI’s president; Vanessa Smith, OLI’s treasurer; Fred Carmichael, OLI’s director; and Jess Hill, OLI’s director (OLI Inc., 2010c). All participants provided informed consent to use their real names in this research.

For this study, the semi-structured interview questions were generated in collaboration with OLI staff. A sample of questions asked included, but were not limited to, “Why was OLI created?”; “Why do you think OLI is important to the youths’ and community’s development?”; “How do the communities contribute to OLI’s success and sustainability?”; “How do the youths contribute to OLI’s success and sustainability?”; “How do you think OLI might differ from other programs created for Aboriginal peoples?” I conducted the interviews in two formats: face-to-face and over the telephone. The two in-person interviews took place at OLI’s office in Toronto and one at a coffee shop in Brampton. The remaining four interviews occurred over the telephone due to geographical restrictions. The interviews ranged in length from 35 to 120 minutes. I transcribed the interviews verbatim and returned them to OLI staff and Board members for verification via email. OLI staff and Board members were given two weeks to make changes to their transcript if they deemed such changes necessary.

Lastly, I used archival documents. Archival documents are documents that are comprised of recordings of an organization’s events and processes; they are typically supplemented with data obtained from other methods (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). The archival documents that I reviewed included OLI program manuals, media coverage of OLI (e.g., newspaper clippings) – all of which OLI’s staff members provided to me, and OLI’s website. After collecting and
reviewing the data, I sought additional clarification needed concerning content from interviews, fieldnotes, and archival documents by contacting OLI’s Program Manager (Stephanie) via telephone and email.

Analysis

I analyzed the interview transcripts, fieldnotes, and archives manually using thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is the systematic organization of data that can be used to interpret experiences, events, and interactions within organizations (Boyatzis, 1998). Creswell (2009) suggested that thematic analysis can be conducted by organizing the data into codes, categories, and then themes (and subthemes if applicable). Creswell (2009) recommended looking for codes according to the related literature, to unexpected findings, and to unusual findings. I derived codes by clustering the data into similar topics and patterns as they emerged. Two broad code categories were established based on the ways in which OLI’s creation and implementation reflected participant self-determined goals. With the first code, “stable constructs of OLI,” I grouped the data according to OLI staff and Board members description of the fixed aspects of OLI’s creation and implementation (e.g., the arts components). With the second code, “shifting constructs of OLI,” I was more concerned with data that revealed adaptations to OLI’s creation and implementation. I then grouped the codes and expanded them into two descriptive categories/themes: i) fixed aspects of OLI: the participation fee and the art components; and ii) shifting aspects of OLI: OLI’s policies and program components are a result of collaboration.

Results

Below, I outline the research findings. I reveal the fixed and unstable aspects of OLI to illustrate how OLI staff and Board members describe OLI’s creation and implementation processes.
Fixed Aspects of OLI: The Participation Fee and the Arts Components

OLI staff and Board members identified two elements of OLI that are relatively unchanged (i.e., the $25,000 mandatory participation fee and the arts components) and then illustrated how they function for partnering communities and participating youths. In order to be considered a candidate for OLI, partner communities must provide a $25,000 participation fee at the time of application to OLI (OLI, 2010; OLI Inc., 2010b). Although the participation fee is significant and thus can be seen as a hardship, Fred stated, “I think any investment in the youth is not a hardship, it’s good and I think the [partner] community needs to get involved not only with money but with their own support and their own involvement” (personal communication, November 17, 2011). OLI staff and Board members made a link between partner community’s monetary investment and their involvement with OLI. Stephanie argued that the participation fee, “really means that the community and Chief and Council and everyone is very invested in the program because they are essentially sponsoring their youth to be a part of it” (personal communication, November 4, 2011). As a result, the participation fee creates a sense of ownership: “it’s very easy for a [partner] community to just sign up [for OLI] and say ya…we are behind it [OLI] and then put absolutely no support behind it in terms of what the [partner community members] need to do and so…it creates ownership in the program” (A. Hannah-Suarez, personal communication, November 5, 2011).

Stephanie explained that the $25,000 creates a sense of ownership because partner community members are the ones who have to apply for the program…and they have to pay a participation fee to be part of the program. So they really have to have it on their radar of finding creative
ways to get that money available to them and they really have to work together to make that happen. (personal communication, November 4, 2011)

Partner community members and participating youths come together and fundraise in order to cover the participation fee through activities such as “bingos, raffle prizes, bake sales and walk-a-thons to name a few” (OLI Inc., 2011, April 7). Amusingly, one partner community member dyed his hair red (Hammer, 2011, June 21) while another shaved his head (OLI Inc., 2010, December 16) in order to raise funds for OLI. OLI staff and Board members argued that the fee involves and invests partner community members and participating youths in OLI.

In addition to the participation fee, OLI staff and Board members discussed the art components and how they function in the communities. Through the dance, videography, journal writing, and paintings, OLI staff and Board members noted that OLI gives participating youths the opportunity to self-express. OLI staff and Board members illustrated how OLI’s dance component allows participating youths to have control over their expressive needs even though the majority of the dance is choreographed. Andres explained, “all dancing ultimately has a choreographer, but that doesn’t mean there isn’t an interpretation in there” (personal communication, November 5, 2011). OLI staff and Board members described the choreographed routine as a way for participating youths to interpret their own ways of moving. As Tracee explained,

it has to be your own expression like we’ll teach the kids [participating youths] moves…[but] I don’t say to the kids, ‘I don’t like the way you’re doing that move.’ I will teach them the moves and…as long as I can see they’re trying I don’t care what the move looks like at the end of the day because they made it their own….that’s what [they’ve] interpreted. (personal communication, November 15, 2011)
Although participating youths “are expressing themselves through their own style” (M. Hatherley, personal communication, November 18, 2011) with choreographed dance, Stephanie stated that the “youth take part in the choreography…so the dance teacher might say okay you come up with four counts, you come up with four counts, and then lets put them together” (personal communication, November 4, 2011). By both interpreting and creating the choreography, participating youths are able to create and take ownership of their own forms of expression.

Andres pointed out that OLI gives participating youths control over their involvement of self-expression through other aspects in addition to dance, such as “the painting aspect of it [and] their participation with the audio visual materials” (personal communication, November 5, 2011). Indeed, participating youths participate in painting, media projects, and journal writings most of which are available to view at OLI’s annual performance (OLI, 2010). For instance, as an audience member, I was able to view how OLI’s use of paintings and journal writings enabled some participating youths to express themselves in their own ways. The paintings and journal writings portrayed participating youths’ depictions and meanings of their experience with OLI through the colours they used, the images drawn, and their written testimonials.

Additionally, OLI staff and Board members identified the videography as an integral aspect of participating youths’ self-expression. As Maureen stated, “through…videography…the kids are given the camera and they go around in their community and try…[to] portray what the community is like from their eyes” (personal communication, November 18, 2011). Even though the videography is edited before the show by OLI staff and Board members, participating youths have control over the activity and their expressions as they portray their own views. Vanessa
explained that videography gives participating youths the “opportunity to say this is who I am”
(personal communication, November 9, 2011).

Overall, OLI staff and Board members identified that OLI’s art components contribute to
involving youths in modes of self-expression; as Fred said, “That’s their way of doing it”
(personal communication, November 17, 2011). As such, OLI staff and Board members
described both the participation fee and the arts as aspects of OLI’s creation and implementation
that allow partner communities and their members to be involved in OLI processes.

**Collaboration on Policies and Program Components**

Another theme that emerged from the data related to collaboration. Interviewees argued
that the ways in which OLI’s policies and program components are created and implemented are
based on OLI staff and Board members’ collaboration with partner community members and
participating youths.

OLI staff and Board members deemed OLI to be a collaborative program between OLI
staff and Board members and partner community members and participating youths for which it
is implemented since “it [OLI] brings the program to the community” (V. Smith, personal
communication, November 9, 2011), “with family involved and the school involved” (F.
Carmichael, personal communication, November 17, 2011). As such, OLI staff and Board
members participate in regular discussions with partner community members and participating
youths to gauge what they need from OLI (OLI Inc., 2010, October 20). For instance, Stephanie
stated, “we talk to the kids [participating youths]…and we ask them what they like about OLI”
(personal communication, November 4, 2011). As a result, partner community members and
participating youths are “driving the program, they’re saying to her [Tracee], ‘okay, we need this
or you know we need an all-year program...we need the kids to get a credit or we need...’ - you know whatever it is” (V. Smith, personal communication, November 9, 2011).

Indeed, OLI was created as a result of attending to the needs and feedback of a community. Tracee mentioned that in 2006, prior to OLI’s inception, she was sought out and hired by a First Nations community to come to their community for a week to teach youths hip-hop dance, because this was something the youths expressed they wanted. As a result of seeing community members’ and youths’ interest in hip-hop, Tracee decided to work with the First Nations community members to incept OLI. In this way, OLI was created and continues to be (re)created by Aboriginal peoples. Tracee and the rest of OLI staff and Board expressed that they continue to work with each partner communities prior to and throughout the school year to gauge what they need and are interested in having through OLI. Stephanie further mentioned:

We want to make sure that what we’re doing is relevant to the communities that we work in so...we’re talking to them [partner communities] on a daily basis trying to understand and ask them what their needs are in communities...and then creating our programs and polices around that in a collaborative way. (personal communication, November 4, 2011)

The creation and implementation of OLI’s program components and policies are reflective of processes of “collectivism and collaboration…rather than individualism” (S. Cressman, personal communication, November 4, 2011) to involve partner communities and participating youths so that OLI can address their needs.

In collaborating with partner communities and participating youths, OLI staff and Board members described how participants take part in how OLI’s policies and program components, specifically the course credit component, fall workshops, and the future leader’s program, are implemented according to their needs. With regards to OLI’s policies, OLI works closely with
partner community members and participating youths “to determine appropriate academic and [rehearsal] attendance policies to be implemented in each community” (OLI Inc., 2010, October 20). For instance, Jess stated, “the amount of days that they miss is actually set by the group. And they set it themselves” (personal communication, November 3, 2011). In fact, “this year [OLI] actually had the youth create the policy” (S. Cressman, personal communication, November 4, 2011). OLI staff and Board members reported that the number of school and rehearsal days that participating youths are allowed to miss, which frame OLI’s policies, are established on a community-by-community basis. Likewise, OLI’s course credit component differs on a community-by-community basis with regards to the types of courses offered. Stephanie explained, “there are ten different options for credits that the community could have used, just depending on what works best with their schedule and what they wanted to teach and what they need for their kids” (personal communication, November 4, 2011). When speaking about OLI’s ability to accommodate each partner community, Maureen stated, “there’s enough flexibility within OLI that communities can do whatever serves them best” (personal communication, November 18, 2011).

In addition to implementing OLI’s policies and program components as a result of collaborations with each partner community, OLI staff and Board members described how OLI’s program components were also created based on participant input. OLI’s course credit program, for instance, was incorporated into OLI as a result of partner community members’ and youths’ feedback. According to Vanessa, “the reasoning behind that [the school credits] was because the teachers…they’re the volunteers…it is…a lot of work for them because they have to do it as an extracurricular” (personal communication, November 9, 2011). OLI created the course credit component because partner community members were expressing difficulty in finding the time
to implement OLI as an extracurricular program. OLI also initiated the fall workshops based on partner community members’ stated wishes. As a result of community members saying, “that they really struggled to get the kids there [school] first semester…[OLI] created this idea of the fall workshops” (S. Cressman, personal communication, November 4, 2011). Similarly, the Future Leader’s Program was initiated because OLI “had a lot of kids [participating youths] who were starting to ask about…opportunities that are available to them once they graduate” (S. Cressman, personal communication, November 4, 2011). Stephanie expressed that “it’s what the kids are saying that they want. It’s not something necessarily that we’re saying is one of our major goals, but if the kids are saying to us this is what we want then it is important” (personal communication, November 4, 2011). Consequently, OLI created the course credit, fall workshops, and Future Leader’s program as a result of partner communities’ and participating youths’ need for a reduced demands on volunteers, increased school enrollment and attendance, and support after completing OLI.

On the other hand, OLI staff and Board members described an instance where OLI did not involve partner community members and participating youths in decision making processes. Since integrating OLI into high school requires each partner community to implement at least one OLI course into its school calendar (OLI, 2011), OLI faced a challenge when a principal in one community refused to integrate an OLI course credit into the high school timetable. The principal’s refusal to integrate an OLI course credit resulted in the community not receiving the program that year (T. Smith, personal communication, November 15, 2011).

With the exception of the situation noted above, OLI staff and Board members overwhelmingly described OLI as a program that draws upon participant feedback. As Vanessa stated, “we’ve been re-working the program all the time; getting the feedback from the
communities and what we could be doing differently” (personal communication, November 9, 2011). By implementing and (re)creating OLI’s policies and program components on a community-by-community basis and on partner community members’ and participating youths’ input, OLI was described as a program that collaborates with partner community members and participating youths to take their needs into consideration.

**Discussion**

Below, I show how OLI staff and Board members’ description of OLI challenges the ideas of flexible programming, as the program can be seen as offering a rather fixed framework. Despite how OLI mirrors Eurocentric ideas of programming, the ways in which OLI is created and implemented through collaborating with program participants suggests that OLI can contribute to Aboriginal self-determination. Eurocentric influences on youth development through recreation programming, as seen with OLI, however, illustrates some of the complexities associated with efforts of Aboriginal self-determination as a result of colonial legacies. OLI creates an opportunity for scholars and practitioners to problematize and question the tensions that exist in trying to create and implement youth development through recreation programs for Aboriginal peoples.

**OLI: Eurocentric Influences?**

Although OLI staff and Board members explained how the creation and implementation of the participation fee, the arts components, and the course credit attempt to involve partnering community members and participating youths in OLI processes, these components of OLI are largely pre-determined without input from community members and youths. The $25 000 mandatory participation fee required at the time of application to OLI is a standard set by OLI staff and Board members for all partner communities who wish to be part of OLI. Although
OLI’s staff and Board believe that the participation fee instills a sense of ownership in the partner communities, many Aboriginal communities cannot run sport and recreation programs due to limited resources (Forsyth & Wamsley, 2006); thus, if Aboriginal communities that wish to apply for OLI are unable to cover the entire cost of OLI’s participation fee at the time of application, those communities forfeit their opportunity to have the program. Negotiation and collaboration on a community-to-community basis (much like OLI’s other programs and policies) and/or the creation of a payment plan for the participation fee might prove to be more beneficial for facilitating a partner community’s creation and involvement in OLI processes and thus further address partner communities’ needs.

The arts components are also a largely pre-determined concept of OLI. Even though the idea of hip-hop was incepted by community members and youths from a First Nations community, other First Nations community members and youths may wish to focus programming in communities on other recreational activities. Initially asking about the type of recreational activities the community members and youths want to engage in and then orienting the program as a result might lead to greater input and more meaningful programming for participating communities and their youths.

In addition, while the course credit component may have started as a result of a collaborative effort with some communities, it is now a requirement for all communities’ involvement in OLI. The results show that if a partner community’s school fails to re-structure its timetable to allow for the students to obtain the OLI course credit, that community is no longer eligible for OLI. Thus, Aboriginal communities that are unable to implement OLI as a high school credit course or do not want to do so are not afforded another option other than ineligibility for OLI programming. OLI staff and board members can further adjust the program
to aid in either supporting the community to find ways to implement an OLI course or to make it possible for communities to choose to opt out of the course credit component. OLI’s mandatory participation fee, the arts components, and the high school course credit can further address Aboriginal peoples’ needs by allowing partner communities to create and/or take control over the process in ways that best suit their community.

Programs that offer pre-determined frameworks are consistent with Eurocentric ideas of youth development through recreation. Young (1995) argued that development programs for Aboriginal peoples continue to be engrained in top-down approaches, which “generally fail to consult effectively with those undergoing development to gauge what their aspirations for the future might be” (p. 6). Young (1995) explained that top-down approaches inherent in Eurocentric programming result in inflexible programming that “destroys opportunities for fine-tuning the [developmental] process to bring it more in line with aboriginal needs” (p. 262). As a result of such an approach, Aboriginal peoples’—and especially youth participants’—input into development programs can be marginalized. As such, OLI can be seen as a program that is influenced by Eurocentric ideas of programming and, as a result, perpetuates some aspects of Eurocentric youth development through recreation.

In response to colonial impacts of Eurocentric programming, Rose and Giles (2007) advocated for the meaningful incorporation of Aboriginal peoples’ input into youth development programs. They argued that “if youth development programs are to be provided for Aboriginal peoples by Aboriginal and/or non-Aboriginal peoples, then the inclusion of Aboriginal peoples in all phases of a program’s planning is…crucial” (p. 430). Franks, Smith-Loyd, Newell, and Dietrich (2001) argued that when Aboriginal peoples are involved in and assume positions of control for programs that are intended for their own benefit, such as decision making,
administrative, and implementation processes, such programs can be used to achieve Aboriginal self-determination.

**A Shift towards Aboriginal Self-Determination**

In the Canadian context, an abundance of literature can be found on efforts to facilitate Aboriginal self-determination within the areas of education (e.g., Battiste, 1998; Rozon, 2001), research (e.g., Castellano, 2004; Warry 1990), and healthcare (e.g., Jacklin & Warry, 2004; Tookenay, 1996). To bring about self-determination, scholars within these fields have recognized the need for Aboriginal peoples to be in control of decision making processes (Rozon, 2001), to transfer responsibility to Aboriginal peoples and communities in designing and administering duties (Jacklin & Warry, 2004), and to collaborate on endeavors in ways that meet Aboriginal peoples’ self-determined goals (Warry, 1990). Such literature makes evident a shift from programs and principles that are created on behalf of Aboriginal peoples to those that are created and controlled by Aboriginal peoples. This shift, however, remains largely missing from the literature pertaining to youth development through recreation programs that target Aboriginal peoples.

Rose and Giles (2007) noted that being inclusive of Aboriginal peoples’ self-determined needs promotes Aboriginal cultures and problematizes Euro-Canadian-derived youth development through recreation interventions, which often attempt to control Aboriginal youths’ social behaviours in a way that results in their behaviours better aligning with Euro-Canadian norms and values. Thus, the “deficiency” paradigm that positions Aboriginal peoples, especially youths, as being in need of Euro-Canadian-derived interventions can be challenged by programs that are created by and involve Aboriginal peoples, particularly youths. Consequently, I argue that youth development through recreation should focus on departing from Eurocentric-styled
programming and instead focus on facilitating processes that enable Aboriginal peoples, but particularly youths, to create and be involved in such programs.

**OLI: Efforts of Resistance**

Despite the areas where OLI mirrors Eurocentric principles of recreation for development programming, the areas in which OLI produces great efforts to involve partnering community members and participating youths in re- and co-creating aspects of OLI cannot be dismissed. Like OLI staff and Board suggested, OLI focuses its programming on working with partner community members and youths, so their feedback pertaining to OLI’s policy and program components can be taken into consideration. OLI staff and Board members argued that such feedback is essential to altering OLI to better accommodate each partner community’s needs and, in this way, OLI staff and Board members are flexible in supporting OLI participants’ and their broader communities’ goals. As a result, OLI’s approach stands in contrast to Eurocentric ideas of development programming that are typically lack flexibility in addressing participants’ needs (Young, 1995). For instance, partner communities and their members helped to initiate OLI, choose the rules that govern OLI’s policies, decide how and when each of OLI’s program components operates, and dictate the creation of new program components. As such, partner community members and participating youths (re)create and control OLI processes due to OLI’s collaborative approach.

In orienting its (re)creation and implementation efforts in such a way as to collaborate with partner communities and their members in addressing many issues, OLI is (re)created and controlled by Aboriginal peoples. As such, I argue that OLI can be seen as making important, though measured, contributions towards Aboriginal peoples’ self-determined needs concerning youth development through recreation programming. Despite this finding, OLI’s reproduction of
Eurocentric programming alludes to the challenges and tensions associated with efforts to achieve Aboriginal self-determined programming and associated outcomes—challenges and tensions that are largely a result of the postcolonial state.

**Aboriginal Self-Determination and Colonialism: The Larger Picture**

Aboriginal self-determination and colonialism are inherently linked. The social, political, and cultural ills that Aboriginal peoples in Canada have faced and continue to face as a result of colonization, such as economic and cultural marginalization, have resulted in the need for reasserting Aboriginal self-determinism, which seeks to recognize Aboriginal peoples’ right to dictate their own lives (Frideres, 1988). Henriksen (2001) contended that

The right to self-determination should be regarded as a “process right” rather than a right to a pre-defined outcome. In other words, the outcome of any exercise of the right of self-determination must be individually defined, through a process of dialogue in which the peoples concerned are participating on equal terms. (p. 14)

Henriksen’s (2001) work illustrated that Indigenous self-determination is not predicated on the state abandoning Aboriginal peoples; rather, Indigenous self-determination should be achieved through engaging with Indigenous peoples to identify and then satisfy their needs—much like OLI’s approach to some of its policies and program components.

In order to identify and satisfy Aboriginal peoples’ needs, however, colonial relations of power need to be addressed. In other words, although the need to reassert Aboriginal self-determination arose because of colonial relations of power, colonial relations of power that persist deter Aboriginal self-determination (Cassidy, 1991). For instance, how do Aboriginal peoples design and run programs in the context of a retreating welfare state, the chronic underfunding of health and education, and mega natural resource extraction efforts on traditional
lands? While youth development through recreation programs can certainly work to challenge Eurocentric influences and colonial intentions and can contribute to Aboriginal self-determination, it is crucial to understand these efforts as part of a broader effort, one that is made all the more challenging by current social conditions and enduring unequal relations of power.

**Conclusion**

Given that Aboriginal communities have been and often continue to be offered pre-packaged youth development programs that reify colonial relations of power (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011), renewed efforts towards creating youth development through recreation that meet Aboriginal peoples’ self-determined needs are necessary. There are, however, implications to facilitating Aboriginal self-determination. Colonial legacies that influence Aboriginal peoples’ lives must be addressed in order for Aboriginal peoples to achieve broader self-determination. Thus, while programs like OLI can make a contribution towards self-determination, they alone are not enough. Further research within the area of Aboriginal youth development through recreation should consider participants’ perspectives of programs that are (re)created and Aboriginal peoples for a more nuanced understanding of the ways in which youth development through recreation programs can facilitate Aboriginal directed programming and challenge colonialism.
Endnotes

1 The term Aboriginal is used to make specific reference to First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples in Canada (Department of Justice Canada, 2012), while the term Indigenous is used to make reference to Indigenous peoples in the rest of the world.

2 The term Euro-Canadian is used to describe individuals from European origin who came to and now reside in what is now called Canada (Haig-Brown & Nock, 2006).

3 Although OLI’s participating communities have been First Nations communities in Canada thus far, OLI staff and Board members expressed they are not opposed to expanding OLI to other Aboriginal groups residing inside or outside of Canada.

4 OLI staff and Board members chose not to disclose the names of First Nations communities that are or have been involved in OLI.
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Outside Looking In: Resisting Colonial Discourses of Aboriginality
Abstract

In this paper, I examine the ways in which the staff and members of the Board of Directors of Outside Looking In (OLI), a youth development through arts-based recreation program for Aboriginal youth in Canada, shape the program to respond to colonial discourses about Aboriginality in Canada. Based on interviews with OLI staff and Board members, fieldnotes from Board of Directors’ meetings, and the review of archival documents, I argue that OLI exemplifies Bhabha’s (1994) notion of a hybrid third space because it reflects Aboriginal youths’ contemporary cultural interests in mainstream hip-hop dance and music, integrates kinesthetic education into Eurocentric learning regimes, and its participants return the colonial gaze at OLI’s annual performance. As a result, OLI resists colonial discourses of Aboriginality in Canada.
Historically, imperial and colonial assimilatory acts aggressively intervened into and transformed the lives of Aboriginal peoples living in what is now known as Canada. Scholars have investigated the colonial project and its continuing impact on Aboriginal peoples in Canada in many areas, including recreation (Forsyth, 2007; Giles, 2008; Paraschak, 1998; Pettipas, 1994). These authors have noted that recreation is a significant, though often overlooked, site where colonial acts continue to be (re)articulated and used to shape Aboriginal peoples’ belief systems, values, and ways of life. As such, they have argued that recreation initiatives typically fail to account for Aboriginal peoples’ histories with colonialism. There remains, however, a dearth of knowledge regarding the impact colonial discourses have on Aboriginal youth development through recreation programs and their youth participants.

In this paper I address our limited understanding of colonialism’s influence on youth development through recreation programs by examining a program called Outside Looking In (OLI). OLI was created in 2007 to offer Aboriginal youths in First Nations communities in remote and rural Canada the opportunity to self-express through the arts, namely hip-hop, and to further engage Aboriginal youths in school. The program was also created to provide non-Aboriginal Canadians the opportunity to learn about Aboriginal peoples beyond the information presented in the media; this is achieved through OLI’s annual multi-media performance in Toronto (OLI, 2010). My objective for this research was to determine how OLI’s staff and members of the Board of Directors shape the program to respond to colonial discourses of Aboriginality in Canada.

Results from semi-structured interviews with OLI’s staff and Board members, fieldnotes taken during Board of Directors’ meetings, and OLI archival documents show that when trying to incorporate hip-hop culture in OLI and in the school curriculum for Aboriginal youths, OLI
staff, Board members, and youth participants encounter three dominant colonial discourses: Aboriginal youths engage only in traditional activities; Aboriginal peoples and youths should learn according to mainstream education standards; and Aboriginal peoples are inherently flawed. I argue that OLI resists these discourses by creating what Bhabha (1994) described as a hybrid third space through hip-hop music and dance, integrating kinesthetic education into mainstream Eurocentric learning regimes, and returning the colonial gaze by showing non-Aboriginal peoples positive aspects of Aboriginal youths and their communities.

**Literature Review**

In this section, I provide an overview of media and media-related technologies, hip-hop, education and their intersections with Aboriginal peoples and colonialism. I do so to situate OLI within the extant literature.

**Media: (Re)presentations of Aboriginality**

Media portrayals of Aboriginal peoples in Canada are filled with negative stereotypes and misrepresentations (Harding, 2006; Roth, 2000). Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, and Signorielli (1994) argued that distorted images or representations in the media over a prolonged period create stereotypes that often dictate what the public thinks and believes to be true about social groups. In an analysis of news media pertaining to Aboriginal issues over three decades (1960-1990), Harding (2006) found little difference in depictions of issues such as suicide rates, poor housing conditions, and alcoholism: Aboriginal peoples continue to be represented negatively in the media, which serves to reproduce social inequalities that disadvantage Aboriginal peoples. As Knopf (2010) argued, “such [media] coverage…sustains [colonial] stereotypes of the lazy Indians on welfare and the Indians as victims to be blamed for their state” (p. 91). Indeed, Harding (2006) found that the socio-political context in which Aboriginal peoples live is often
ignored. Mass media play a pivotal role in constructing our perceptions and understandings of
social realities (Furniss, 2001; Knopf, 2010). Discourses that were created by colonial powers
that suggest that Aboriginal peoples are lazy, deviant, and worthless (Adams, 1999) persist today
through mainstream media and continue to dictate the general public’s perceptions of Aboriginal
peoples’ lives and cultures.

Aboriginal peoples, however, are not passive recipients of images produced about them
by others. Roth (2000) suggested that in the late 1960s, Aboriginal peoples “began to realize the
power of the media to erode their cultural strength, but they also saw it as a tool for self-
determination/empowerment in their struggles against pressures to conform to mainstream values
of Canadian society, and as a vehicle for mediating social and race relations” (p. 255). In the
1980s, policies were formed to allow Aboriginal peoples to create their own media through
broadcasting programs (such as the Aboriginal Peoples Television Network, which was
established in 1999) (Roth, 2000). Today, Aboriginal peoples have access to and can create
media-related avenues to represent Aboriginal issues themselves. Many scholars (e.g.,
Baltruschat, 2004; Knopf, 2010; Meadows, 1994; Retzlaff, 2006) have agreed that whether it is
radio, television, newspapers, films, or magazines, Aboriginal peoples are now using mainstream
technologies to represent their cultures in ways that challenge misrepresentations and stereotypes
about Aboriginal peoples that are produced by mainstream media.

Due to their use of mainstream media technologies, Aboriginal peoples are targeted by
another discourse: Aboriginal peoples’ use of contemporary technologies is untraditional for
Aboriginal peoples. As Christen (2005) described, Aboriginal peoples’ engagement in new
technologies contradict images of traditional Aboriginal peoples. Thus, Aboriginal peoples are
discursively constrained as traditional peoples incapable of engaging in technologies that define
the contemporary world. Such a situation for Aboriginal peoples persists today (Fowler, 2007), especially in rural and remote Canada.

**Aboriginality Shaped through Mainstream Technologies in Rural and Remote Canada**

Marsh (2009) noted that global media technologies such as the internet can be found in Aboriginal communities in Canada’s North, whereas transportation and access to such communities are problematic. Marsh (2009) showed the ways in which Aboriginal communities are underdeveloped in relation to southern Canada, yet are technologically attune with the developed world. As such, Christen (2005) argued it is wrong to think that Aboriginal peoples “cannot be simultaneously traditional and modern, technologically savvy and politically astute, materially oriented and authentically Indigenous” (p. 318). Aboriginal peoples in remote and rural Canada engage in contemporary technologies like YouTube and Facebook as ways to understand and develop meanings of Aboriginality in the contemporary world (Marsh, 2009). As Proulx (2010) suggested, “on the reserves…satellite TV and the Internet have brought the consumer/information world to their doors changing how peoples understand themselves locally and in relation to the rest of the world” (p. 58). Proulx (2010) further argued, “hip hop is one such import” (p. 58).

**Hip-Hop**

Hip-hop (often synonymous with rap) is a complex form of mass-mediated related content (Rose, 1989) made-up of four creative parts: “graffiti (or aerosol art), b-foying/b-girling (or break dancing), deejaying, and emceeing” (Forman, 2010, p. 61). In the 1970s, rap music and hip-hop emerged from impoverished Black youths living in the South Bronx, New York City as a way for them to express the poor social and political conditions to which they were subjected
(Rose, 1989). As such, hip-hop created spaces for disadvantaged youths to collectively voice their struggles and lived experiences (Rose, 1989).

Forman (2010) made the distinction between rap and hip-hop, even though they are often used as synonymous terms. Forman (2010) characterized rap as the music behind the cultural and artistic expression of hip-hop, while hip-hop reaches beyond the scope of music. Hip-hop is not only the production and consumption of music; hip-hop is an embodiment of one’s culture, values, ways of life, and simply, of one’s self. Indeed, Rose (1991) noted that hip-hop is a means for cultural production as it “involves the contestation over public space, expressive meaning, interpretation, and cultural capital” (p. 276). Given that colonial forces altered and continue to alter Aboriginal peoples’ cultures through Euro-Canadian physical practices (Forsyth, 2007; Giles, 2008; Parascak, 1998; Pettipas, 1994), hip-hop is an especially relevant form of recreation for Aboriginal cultural production.

**Hip-Hop and Aboriginality**

Despite hip-hop’s origins with Black youths, Michell (2001) argued, “hip-hop and rap cannot be viewed simply as an expression of African American culture; it has become a vehicle of global youth affiliations and a tool for reworking local identity all over the world” (pp. 1-2). Indeed, scholars (Buffam, 2011; Lashua, 2006; Lashua & Fox, 2006, 2007; Marsh, 2009; Proulx, 2010) have noted that Aboriginal youths engage in hip-hop culture. Proulx (2010), however, suggested that when Aboriginal peoples appropriate what is known as a Black American musical form, Aboriginality is perceived as less authentic and nontraditional. Indeed, Marsh (2009) noted that some locate Aboriginal youths within a colonial discourse as a result of their participation with hip-hop: Aboriginal youths are cast “as bodies invested in ‘tradition,’” bound only to
‘traditional’ ways of being in the world, isolated from the effects of colonialism, diaspora, globalization, and transnationalism” (p. 111).

Although Aboriginal youths who participate in hip-hop are sometimes deemed to be non-traditional, hip-hop is a mode for marginalized peoples, like Aboriginal peoples, to express narratives of resistance to the historic racisms they face (Marsh, 2009). Indeed, Marsh (2009) identified Aboriginal youths as using and appropriating hip-hop arts practices to articulate their cultures and experiences living in today’s society. Moreover, Lashua and Fox (2006) showed that hip-hop allows Aboriginal youths in urban settings “to share stories of making meanings, identities, [and] cultures” (p. 273). More specifically, Lashua (2006) found that urban Aboriginal youths used hip-hop to “build new compositions to express their views, experiences, and emotions” (para. 16). Such compositions “represent a compelling remix of personal narratives interwoven through the issues and social contexts” (Lashua & Fox, 2007, p. 145). Hip-hop is a popular outlet for Aboriginal youths to rearticulate their cultures and understand them in relation to Euro-Canadian culture, which can enable resistance to the social and political challenges they continue to face.

Hip-hop’s popularity with Aboriginal youths has led many education-based projects in Canada’s inner cities to be premised on hip-hop practices to engage Aboriginal youths in school (Marsh, 2009). Lashua and colleagues’ (Lashua, 2006; Lashua & Fox, 2006, 2007) research primarily focused on a hip-hop program for Aboriginal youths that was implemented in an urban education centre in Alberta. Through their work they have suggested that Aboriginal youths’ participation in hip-hop practices can lead to education retention; however, they focused primarily on the nuances of hip-hop. There is a limited body of knowledge concerning the ways in which hip-hop can be integrated into the mainstream school system to contribute to Aboriginal
learning, specifically for Aboriginal youths in rural and remote regions of Canada. Finding ways to integrate Aboriginal youths’ interests into mainstream education is especially pertinent given Aboriginal peoples’ history with colonial policies and programs that have shaped Aboriginal peoples’ education.

**Aboriginal Education**

Colonization and imperialistic processes enacted through government policies and programs, like the *Indian Act* (Department of Justice Canada, 2011), worked to erode Aboriginal knowledges and ways of learning (Battiste, 1998). For instance, from the 1880s, when the Canadian government issued its first policy on Aboriginal education that formalized the use of residential/boarding schools to assimilate Aboriginal youths, until the last residential/boarding school closed in 1996 (Forsyth, 2007), many Aboriginal youths were taken from their homes and were placed in schools where they were prohibited from practicing their cultures and instead they had to adhere to Euro-Canadian ways of life (Miller, 1996). Battiste (1998) argued that Eurocentric knowledge and language supported through colonial policies and programs came to be considered as universally appropriate educational content for schools across Canada. Battiste (1998) further suggested that curricula lacked Aboriginal input: Aboriginal knowledges and ways of learning were and continue to be deemed illegitimate. Battiste (1998) noted that colonial discourses continue to suggest that Eurocentric education is the means through which all people should learn.

To challenge Eurocentrism within educational realms, Battiste (1995) argued that Aboriginal peoples engage in an on-going struggle to promote their worldviews and cultures within mainstream education (Battiste, 1995). Neegan (2005) stated that as Aboriginal peoples are given more control over Aboriginal education models, Aboriginal peoples can administer
education in ways that reflect their cultures and are respectful and sincere through, for example, including their worldviews.

Wotherspoon (2006), however, argued that mainstream education leaves little room for adaptive approaches to education—and that where there is room, there is often a lack of understanding of how to address Aboriginal youths’ learning styles and social circumstances. Wotherspoon (2006) argued that the education system should undergo changes to allow Aboriginal youths to integrate their cultures. With the explosion of technologies and arts-based media, Hoechsmann (2008) specifically noted that educators need to adapt teaching styles to incorporate this new era of youth cultures across the globe.

Since OLI uses media-related technologies, hip-hop, and education in its programming, all of which the above review of literature have shown to be implicated in the exercise of colonial relations of power, I was interested in the ways in which its staff and Board members orient OLI to respond to these issues.

**Outside Looking In (OLI)**

Created in 2007, OLI is a youth development through arts-based recreation program created for Aboriginal peoples in Canada (OLI, 2010). OLI programming is focused on First Nations youths in high school and thus is offered during the academic year as a course credit.

**Why Was OLI Created?**

OLI’s founder Tracee Smith, a member of the Missanabie Cree First Nation, created OLI to give Aboriginal youths an opportunity to self-express through the arts and also to give a Toronto, Ontario audience an opportunity to learn about Aboriginal cultures (OLI Inc., 2010a). To achieve these objectives, OLI engages youths in arts-based practices, such as videography, painting, journal writing, and especially hip-hop dance, during the school year. At the end of the
school year, the students travel from their home communities, which are typically rural and remote communities in Canada, to Toronto to perform in a multi-media performance in front of a live audience (OLI Inc., 2010a).

**OLI Performance Day**

OLI’s performance day is held at Toronto, ON’s St. Lawrence Centre for the Arts’ Bluma Appel Theatre, which seats more than 800 guests. The performance day comprises of a matinee and an evening show. The matinee audience is open to local youths and schools to enlighten Toronto youths of First Nations peoples whereas the evening show, being the main event, is mainly made up of community members and individuals associated with OLI’s sources of sponsorship; these individuals often invite family members and friends to the show. The remaining audience members are the general public. At the 2012 show, 255 guests attended the evening performance.

The evening show commenced with a VIP reception and ended with a post-show reception. The VIP reception took place two hours before show time and included entertainment, a silent art auction (in addition to selling youth’s art, OLI required each community to donate a piece of art made by a local artist), some displays of partner community members’ and participating youth’s written testimonials, a light dinner, and greeting speeches by founder and CEO Tracee Smith and other OLI staff, board, and associates of OLI’s sponsorships (OLI, 2010). During the show, the audience members watched the youth’s and professional dancers’ performance (including OLI dance instructors, Smith’s dancer colleagues, and Smith herself, all of which opened the show and were seen throughout), which was supplemented with video clips of and made by partnering community members and participating youths. The post-show reception invited the audience to celebrate and congratulate the youths and to view and buy
pieces of art. In June 2012, 29 youths from four First Nations communities\(^3\) participated in the program.

**OLI’s Internal Organization**

OLI is a not-for-profit organization. The program is implemented by a few staff and Board members, partner First Nations communities, financial contributors, and professional dancers. In 2011, when the data were collected, OLI had three staff members and four (volunteer) members of the Board of Directors who provided guidance on implementing OLI partner communities. In addition to partnerships with each community, OLI partners with various organizations, governments, and corporate entities for financial support/sponsorship, such as the Ontario Arts Council, Tim Horton’s Children’s Foundation, and TD Financial, and with professional dancers who travel to participating communities to help participating youths choreograph a hip-hop dance routine (OLI, 2010). Since its inception, OLI has experienced gradual growth with increasing staff and Board members, partner communities and participating youths, monetary contributions, and professional dance instructors.

Although OLI staff and Board members aid in implementing the program through, for example, weekly conference calls with partner community members, theatre production preparations, soliciting donations, and hiring dance instructors to visit each partner community, OLI is largely administered by partner community members and participating youths. For instance, partner community members and participating youths must be committed to administering and supervising OLI programming in their schools, holding fundraiser activities, and supporting participating youths (OLI Inc., 2010b). Partner community members refer to the principal(s), teacher(s), Band Council members, parents, and both youths enrolled and not enrolled in OLI. Participating youths refer only to those youths that are enrolled in OLI.
The OLI Process

From the beginning, Aboriginal communities who apply for OLI must demonstrate that their community members are fully committed to administering OLI in order to be eligible for the program (OLI Inc., 2010b). After acceptance to the program, OLI staff and Board members travel to partner communities to meet their members in person in order to discuss the upcoming school year’s activities (OLI, 2010). Once the school year begins, participating youths engage in OLI arts-based activities and workshops. In January, participating youths are enrolled in an OLI course for a high school credit (i.e., a dance, arts, physical activity, or careers credit) and begin rehearsing a hip-hop dance routine choreographed with a professional dancer who travels to each community on a bi-weekly basis (OLI, 2010). The OLI course credit requires participating youths to attend a certain number of days of school and rehearsals, both of which are set out by each partner community and approved by the Ministry of Education. Those participating youths who succeed in meeting the course credit requirements are rewarded with a trip to Toronto at the end of the semester where they give a performance; those who fail to meet the criteria to travel to Toronto are assigned a different final task to ensure youths are still able to earn the credit (OLI, 2010).

In order to conduct research with OLI and better understand how a history of colonial relations intersects with OLI’s creation and implementation, it was imperative that I select a theoretical framework that complemented the objectives of this research.

Theoretical Framework

Postcolonial theory informs this research. The “post” in postcolonial is not meant to signify the end of colonialism, but rather to signify a relationship of continuity since it is colonialism’s aftermath that has and continues to have effects on those who were colonized
Colonial relations of power informed and continue to inform understandings of race, ethnicity, gender, etc., and thus created and continue to create political, economic, and cultural realities for those societies living under colonial rule (McEwan, 2009). Postcolonial theorists, therefore, strive to understand the matrix of issues that arose from colonialism and persist today (Quayson, 2000). As this research is focuses OLI’s response to colonialism, Bhabha’s (1994) concepts of hybridity and the third space and the notion of the colonial gaze are employed in this paper.

**Hybridity and the Third Space**

Bhabha’s (1994) inception of hybridity and the third space emerged from his criticism of binary positions such as the colonizer/colonized and the West/East (as seen in Said’s (1978) work). Bhabha (1994) argued that binaries such as colonizer/colonized carry with them cultural connotations that are homogenous and fixed, which he argued further perpetuate colonial discourses. Instead, Bhabha (1994) viewed cultures as ever-changing through a process called hybridity that takes place within a third space.

For Bhabha (1994), hybridity and the third space are related terms. The term hybridity refers to cultural mixing that exists within an in-between third space. The concept of the third space refers to a means whereby cultural systems are created through negotiation, translation, and interpretation disentangled from original moments (Bhabha, 1994). Hybridity and the third space thus signify processes of cultural productions that are the result of an ambivalent process whereby one’s interpretations are continuously mixing to create new cultural understandings (Bhabha, 1994). Bhabha (1994) argued that a universal culture is nonexistent; instead, cultures are always arising as new and unrecognizable. Locating cultures within hybrid third spaces
allows other cultural meanings to emerge that are contradictory to meanings dominant discourses might suggest.

Although Bhabha (1994) is credited for problematizing rigid cultural meanings that arise from binary formations, Bhabha’s (1994) notion of hybridity and the third space have been criticized for detracting focus from the material impacts that persist through colonial relations of power (Young, 1995). Kraidy (2002) argued that since hybridity celebrates cultural mixing, the inequalities and privileges that characterize cultural boundaries become blurred and superficial. As such, colonialism’s historical and contemporary impacts are displaced (Young, 1995).

Pieterse (2001) suggested, however, that hybridity is not problematic; rather, the dilemma lies in society’s obsession with boundaries. Pieterse (2001) contended that boundaries posit hybridity as a new and extraordinary conception when in fact hybridity and cultural mixing have long lineages with history. As such, postcolonial theorists need not focus on fixed entities, but should instead delve deep into understanding differing cultural perceptions and worldviews that make-up the contemporary world (Grewal & Kaplan, 1996).

**The Colonial Gaze**

Originating from Foucault (1977), but applied to postcolonial theory, the gaze is a concept that signifies a visual domination that constructs discourses of otherness—a concept that embodies those whose cultures differ from dominant society (Knopf, 2010). The colonial gaze, therefore, signifies representations and dominant discourses created by the colonial observer to depict the observed others. Bhabha (1984) argued, however, that the colonial gaze is displaced when the observer becomes the observed through rearticulating cultural identities.

The concepts of hybridity, the third space, and the colonial gaze helped me to understand colonial legacies’ impact on OLI’s creation and implementation.
Methodology

In this study I employed a case study methodology. Stake (1995) argued that case study research works to disentangle the intricacies that characterize a single case, which can range from an individual to an organization (Yin, 2009). As such, case study researchers are particularly concerned with gaining in-depth understandings of real-life events and processes that serve to broaden our knowledge of social, political, and cultural phenomena (Yin, 2009). To bring about such knowledge, Yin (2009) noted that case studies have a distinct ability to answer the “how” and “why” of research questions. Although this research meets the criteria of a case study as it seeks to unravel colonialism’s impact on OLI’s creation and implementation, there are considerations involved in research with Aboriginal peoples that also require scrutiny.

Methodological Considerations

Smith (1999) stated that research is “one of the dirtiest words” for Indigenous peoples (p. 1). Smith (1999) contended that universities are white institutions where research is a mechanism for colonial representations and constructions of Indigenous peoples. Indeed, Whittaker (1994) noted that writing about the Other can perpetuate the colonial system. Indeed, as I am a white, relatively privileged individual who works within the academy, I have the potential to colonize the very research I am attempting to decolonize.

Smith (1999) stated that as Indigenous peoples have more control over research activities and knowledge produced about Indigenous peoples, research efforts can work towards decolonization. Indeed, Schinke, Enosse, Peltier, Watson, and Lightfoot (2010) revealed how non-Aboriginal researchers can work with Aboriginal peoples to involve them in each step of the research process. Schinke et al. (2010) argued that involving Aboriginal peoples in the research facilitates control over and privileges Aboriginal-produced knowledge. My close partnership
with OLI staff and Board members helped to keep them involved in and in control of the research process through, for instance, reviewing this paper, constructing and reviewing interview questions, and selecting the data collection methods.

**Methods**

The methods used for this paper were chosen with OLI staff and Board members, who identified the most appropriate and informative ways to gain in-depth knowledge of OLI. They deemed semi-structured interviews, fieldnotes taken during OLI conference calls and OLI’s fourth annual performance in June 2011, and OLI archival documents as essential for providing a holistic understanding of OLI.

Prior to conducting interviews, I silently participated in OLI conference calls and actively attended and volunteered at OLI’s final performance in 2011. First, I listened in on two conference calls, both of which occurred over the telephone with an OLI staff member and representatives from participating OLI communities. Since each conference call occurred in May 2011, prior to OLI’s final performance in June, I recorded notes pertaining to final preparations for OLI’s performance. Second, I recorded notes at OLI’s annual performance in Toronto, during which I was present backstage, in the audience, and acted as a volunteer to aid in the preparation of performance day. Such fieldnotes served to identify the preparations for the final performance and the experiences of being part of the audience. Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) elucidated that fieldnotes take what we see and listen to and turn them into written texts. Fieldnotes, therefore, involve inscriptions of social life transformed into data to be reviewed and studied (Emerson et al., 1995). Emerson et al. (1995) also argued that fieldnotes should be used as supplemental evidence and as a basis for further questioning during interviews (Emerson et al., 1995).
OLI staff and Board members expressed the desire that this research focus on OLI’s implementation processes; thus, I conducted seven semi-structured interviews with each of OLI’s three staff members (three females; one of Aboriginal descent) and four Board members (two females; two males; three of Aboriginal descent) who were part of OLI at the time the research was conducted. OLI staff and Board members consented to the use of their names in this research. Given that the research focuses on OLI, providing anonymity for participants was impossible and given that these individuals deserve credit for their insights—much as published academic authors do, they elected to have their names revealed. OLI staff members included Tracee Smith, Stephanie Cressman, and Maureen Hatherley (OLI Inc., 2010c) and OLI’s Board of Directors included Andres Hannah-Suarez, Vanessa Smith, Jess Hill, and Fred Carmichael (OLI Inc., 2010c).

Prior to conducting interviews with the above participants, OLI staff helped me to craft the interview questions. Questions included but were not limited to the following: How do youths express themselves through choreographed dance? Why is it important to learn about Indigenous youth in today’s society? Why does OLI want to share Aboriginal youths’ cultures with the non-Aboriginal audience? As Wengraf (2001) suggested, semi-structured interviews require pre-determined interview questions, but evoke open discussions through the interviewer posing additional questions that build upon the interviewee’s thoughts. As such, semi-structured interviews can elicit in-depth understandings of events and processes in which the interviewer did not participate (Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

Due to geographical restrictions, four semi-structured interviews occurred over the telephone. The remaining three interviews occurred face-to-face at the interviewees’ preferred location: OLI’s Toronto office (n=2) and a coffee shop in Brampton (n=1). Each interview was
recorded and transcribed verbatim. Interview transcripts were then returned to each interviewee for verification. Interviewees were given two weeks to make necessary changes to their transcripts, after which time it was assumed that changes were unnecessary. Following the interviews and during the writing process, additional clarification was sought through a telephone call and several emails with OLI’s Program Manager.

Data from the semi-structured interviews were further supplemented by OLI archival documents. According to Yin (2009), archival documents are created in the past by a person or an organization and can take many forms including letters, manuscripts, reports, and newspaper articles. Data found in archival documents, however, is limited since such records provide only a partial view of history/an event (Hill, 1993). Thus, I used OLI archival documents such as OLI’s program manual, newspaper clippings, and OLI’s website in conjunction with the data from the interviews and fieldnotes.

Analysis

I analyzed the data obtained from semi-structured interviews, fieldnotes, and archival documents using critical discourse analysis (CDA). According to Phillips and Hardy (2002), discourses are defined as interrelated texts (written texts, spoken words, symbols, pictures, etc.) that make meaning. Fairclough (2003) suggested that discursive meanings emanate from society and social interactions that bring realities into being. In other words, discursive meanings are placed upon the individual or group associated with such discourses and inform what is real and true for the individual(s) (Fairclough, 2003). Since individuals are part of societal discourses that reproduce or challenge social realities or “truths,” which in turn define human life (Fairclough, 2003), discourses can privilege some and marginalize others. CDA, therefore, is focused on identifying dominant discourses and then questioning the discursive contexts within which the
discursive constructions are embedded (Willig, 2008). As Willig (2008) argued, by questioning the ways in which discursive constructions are situated within the discursive contexts, the analysis is geared toward action to understand what the discursive object is able to achieve. A researcher using CDA strives to illuminate the subjective feelings, experiences, and thoughts of those that are part of the dominant or subordinate discourse, the impacts such discourses have on the individual or group, and the ways in which individual(s) reproduce(s) and challenge(s) dominant discourses (Willig, 2008).

**Results**

My analysis identified that within the scope of their work, OLI staff and Board members encountered three colonial discourses: Hip-hop is not an Aboriginal activity; Aboriginal peoples need to learn through mainstream forms of education; and Aboriginal peoples’ lives and behaviours are inherently flawed. Below, I illustrate how these discourses affect OLI’s programming and overall approach.

**Hip-hop is not an Aboriginal Activity**

OLI staff and Board members recognized how OLI’s use of hip-hop music conjures discourses surrounding the types of activities in which Aboriginal peoples should engage. Specifically, Tracee explained that Aboriginal peoples are characterized by society as those who engage only in “Aboriginal” activities: “I get asked all the time, ‘so your show, is it like Aboriginal dancing?’ I say, ‘well Aboriginals are dancing, but it’s not Aboriginal dancing’…right away in their [the Canadian public’s] mind it’s a stereotype of what Aboriginal people should be doing” (personal communication, November 15, 2011). Tracee further mentioned, “different people…will say…‘how come you don’t use Aboriginal music or how come you don’t use Aboriginal dancers?’…And I just say…‘Would it make it more authentic to
you” (personal communication, November 15, 2011)? OLI staff and Board members discussed how such statements from the non-Aboriginal public reflect the idea that Aboriginal peoples are perceived to be “stuck in the past” (A. Hannah-Suarez, personal communication, November 5, 2011). As a result, hip-hop, a contemporary phenomenon, is not seen as coinciding with or being a meaningful part of Aboriginal youths’ culture.

Despite such beliefs, OLI staff and Board members argued that contemporary culture is very much a part of Aboriginal youths’ everyday lives. For instance, Maureen illustrated how Aboriginal youths from rural and remote Canada are living in and are part of contemporary society: “They [Aboriginal youths] feel the effects of living in a remote place without a lot of services or amenities, but at the same time they’re so wired in to what’s out there on YouTube and Facebook…you just have to look at the culture that these kids are in, which is music, right? They’re used to Facebook, like, that is their culture right there” (personal communication, November 18, 2011). With regards to hip-hop dance music specifically, Jess noted, “that’s what they [participating youths] listen to” (personal communication, November 3, 2011). Fred further suggested, “[Aboriginal] kids today will jump on the wagon with the hip-hop dancing and other popular dances” (personal communication, November 17, 2011). Jess and Fred argued that participating youths identify with and are culturally bound to mainstream hip-hop music and dance. In fact, Tracee mentioned that in 2006, prior to OLI’s inception, the youths of a First Nations community expressed they wanted hip-hop to be incorporated in their physical education class. As a result, the community hired Tracee to come to their community for a week and teach the youths hip-hop dance. At the end of the week, the youths performed a hip-hop routine in their school gym in front of community members. As a result of seeing the community and youths’ interest in hip-hop, Tracee decided to work with the First Nations community members to create
OLI. Tracee and the rest of OLI staff and Board expressed that they continue to work with each partner communities prior to and throughout the school year to reflect what they need and are interested in having through OLI.

As a result, OLI staff and Board members articulated that OLI serves to engage and showcase participating youths’ lived experiences and interests. As Tracee mentioned,

I’m trying to make [Aboriginal] communities look like they are…what their community looks like today…what our kids [participating youths] look like…we’re not throwing powwow dancers into that show or the video. We’re not going to show stuff that isn’t happening in the community. You know, if it’s not in the community, then why would we try to create another stereotype? (personal communication, November 15, 2011)

Instead of creating a stereotype, OLI staff and Board members described the organization as building on and adhering to youths’ existing cultural interests. Vanessa mentioned that OLI, “is addressing…the needs of …the children [participating youths]…the music’s there [in remote and rural Canada], the dancing is there and so…that’s where you’re really attracting the youth to the program because it’s where they are. It’s what they like to do; it’s what they see on TV” (personal communication, November 9, 2011). By orienting its programming for participating youths, OLI reflects many Aboriginal youths’ current cultural interests: hip-hop music and dance.

Furthering Vanessa’s explanation of using hip-hop in attracting and retaining youths, Tracee drew upon hip-hop’s ability to serve as a tool for participating youths’ cultural expression. Tracee questioned, “why do they keep coming back for more?...I think it’s because…they’re [participating youths] the engines to express who they are” (personal communication, November 15, 2011). Tracee recognized OLI’s capacity to use hip-hop so
participating youths can express their cultures in their own ways. Stephanie described how involving participating youths in the choreography allows them to self-express: “So the dance teacher might say, ‘okay you come up with four counts, you come up with four counts and then let’s put them together.’ So they’re using their imagination to do it” (personal communication, November 4, 2011). Stephanie further explained how the professional dancers’ choreography still allows Aboriginal youths to self-express: “So some kids might be very big and loud or sharp and quick or some have smaller movements…So everybody has their own way of interpreting choreography and that really comes down to…what you’re feeling at the time and what you’re wanting to say” (personal communication, November 4, 2011). Thus, through mainstream hip-hop dance, OLI offers participating youths the opportunity to reflect and express who they are as Aboriginal peoples in today’s society.

Overall, OLI staff and Board members stated that they believe that OLI gives participating youths the opportunity to engage in and express their culture—OLI opens up a space to learn about Aboriginal peoples and youths in present day and to resist the discourse that hip-hop cannot be an Aboriginal cultural practice.

**Aboriginal Youth Need to Learn Through Mainstream Forms of Education**

Drawing upon OLI’s course credit component, OLI staff and Board members expressed frustration with the discourse that suggests that Aboriginal peoples/youth should learn through mainstream, Euro-Canadian forms of education. As Maureen noted, “First Nations youth have…been expected to fit into a mould that’s already out there. They’re expected to fit into high school where, you know, kids act a certain way and they respond to structure in a certain way — and that’s not necessarily the way that works for all kids” (personal communication, November 18, 2011).
OLI staff and Board members are familiar with how Aboriginal youths learn. As Vanessa argued,

education just doesn’t happen in the classroom and that’s...something people have to get over, thinking, okay, these kids are not in the classroom, so how can we count that?...they’re missing the boat...on how Aboriginal kids learn...we [Aboriginal peoples] actually learn by doing things, hands on kinds of things...there are different learners and I think trying to fit everybody into this same standard...just isn’t right...there are different ways to learn things. (personal communication, November 9, 2011)

Vanessa noted that Aboriginal youths can learn through activities that differ from classroom-based, mainstream forms of education. Indeed, OLI has been credited for facilitating hands-on learning—a form of learning that works for Aboriginal youths (Toronto Star, 2007). Thus, OLI is oriented to support Aboriginal youths’ learning styles by being “a different outlet than...a school classroom where they’re sitting down learning from textbooks” (S. Cressman, personal communication, November 4, 2011). Maureen spoke to OLI’s use of hip-hop culture and the ways it is compatible with Aboriginal youths’ learning styles:

The school structure just doesn’t work for a lot of [Aboriginal] kids and those same kids have so many talents and they’re so gifted...like their kinesthetic intelligence is so strong, but they never get to use that...so by creating OLI, you’re tapping into those intelligences. (personal communication, November 18, 2011)

Thus, OLI staff and Board members argued that OLI integrates hip-hop dance and music to create a learning approach that is beneficial for participating youths.
OLI staff and Board members identified many positive outcomes for participating youths due to OLI’s approach to teaching and learning. Jess stated, “when they’re [participating youths] in class, they’re paying more attention; they’re not just there because ‘well I have to be here or else I’m going to get kicked out of OLI.’ They’re actually there” (personal communication, November 3, 2011). Maureen argued that incorporating hip-hop into educational settings not only actively engages participating youths, but it also creates an environment where they can achieve success: “once people realize that, wow, I’m really good at something and this is fun…I can also excel at something I really like, then it just makes reaching for those other goals like getting your English credit or getting your math credit more manageable” (personal communication, November 18, 2011). Vanessa provided an example of how OLI helped a participating youth stay in school after many failed attempts:

We had the one young man…he only had [a total of] two [high school] credits and he always had good intentions. He’d start school in September then he’d drop out…The first year when OLI came…he joined OLI and he stayed in school for the whole year…I think he’s in his last year right now; he’s in grade 12, so he’s been in the program 3 years and now he’s in grade 12 because of the program. Because he wanted to be in OLI, he stayed in school—he had a reason to stay in school. (personal communication, November 9, 2011)

Additionally, one partner community reported that the total number of youths attending high school increased from three students one year to twenty students the following year as a result of OLI’s presence in their community during that subsequent year (Hammer, 2011).

Despite dominant discourses that suggest Aboriginal youths should adopt Eurocentric ways of learning, OLI increases participating youths’ engagement and retention in school by
offering an alternative learning environment that is pertinent for its youth participants. As Maureen stated, OLI has “a way of really bringing learning, bringing things alive for them [participating youths] in a way that they like” (personal communication, November 18, 2011).

**Aboriginal Peoples’ Lives and Behaviours are Inherently Flawed**

Along with the discourses that hip-hop is not an Aboriginal activity and that Aboriginal peoples must learn according to mainstream learning methods, OLI staff and Board members alluded to how the Canadian public’s rather negative views of Aboriginal peoples create discourses that construct Aboriginal peoples as inherently flawed. For instance, Maureen stated, “I think so much of what the Canadian…general population hears about First Nations is very negative” (personal communication, November 18, 2011). Tracee explained how negative stereotypes of Aboriginal peoples dictate how OLI is implemented:

There are just so much negative stereotypes and media in terms of what Aboriginal people are today…so…our [end of year] show is so positive. [The] program’s very positive - people aren’t used to seeing that kind of stuff necessarily because they’re so used to, like, the bad homes, the housing situations… the water situation, the suicides. (personal communication, November 15, 2011)

As Tracee stated, OLI and the final performance is structured so that positive discourses can be used to challenge negative discourses about Aboriginal peoples/youths’ apparently flawed lives and behaviours. Stephanie detailed how the final show gives the audience a better idea of what Aboriginal youths and their cultures are like in today’s society:

I think it’s about breaking down stereotypes…We read about all these things about Aboriginal peoples in not such a positive light, whereas we’re hoping that our audiences will see our kids [participating youths] for all the fantastic things about them…all those
biographies that we have from each of our clips are really highlighting [participating] youth and what they’re passionate about, what their interests are, and what their home life is like to…break down those stereotypes that do exist and show our youth and also the communities for the wonderful places that they can be…it really captures how our kids are on a day-to-day basis in their communities, what the community life is like. (personal communication, November 4, 2011)

OLI attempts to bring together Aboriginal peoples/youths and a non-Aboriginal audience to challenge negative discourses about Aboriginal peoples and instead portray participating youths in a more positive light—in their daily lives. As Jess stated, “It’s good to…overcome people’s current perception and maybe give them an actual look in [to participating youths’ lives]” (personal communication, November 3, 2011).

To challenge negative discourse of Aboriginal peoples, OLI attempts to create a positive cross-cultural space for its final performance, one that is “supportive, encouraging, and motivating environment” for participating youths and the audience to break down stereotypes (OLI, 2010, p. 6). Maureen stated,

it [OLI] does create that type of [positive] environment…I know that because when you’re in the audience you can feel it, there’s almost like a vibration going on in the theatre, it’s a very different experience because when the kids [participating youths] are up dancing or even when they come on the screen sometimes, it’s like the people from the audience especially from the community but I would say it spreads to the audience as a whole are so profoundly impacted by what they see…like people will be yelling out and they’ll be like laughing. (personal communication, November 18, 2011)
Similarly, Andres noted, “I’m not too sure how it happens, but half the bloody audience ends up clapping for a good chunk of the show” (personal communication, November 5, 2011). As Fred noted, “our kids can excel, too. People can see that, hey, there is lots of potential, these kids can do it…Mixing with and getting positive feedback from non-Aboriginals in the audience is a positive experience for the kids [participating youths] seeing that appreciation for their talent and potential” (personal communication, November 17, 2011). As an audience member, I had the opportunity to be part of OLI’s cross-cultural experience. Without personally knowing participating youths and audience members, I struggled to fight back tears. Even though words cannot do it justice, the performance was moving, inspiring, and energetic.

Although negative perceptions of Aboriginal peoples dictate Aboriginality as a negative entity, OLI staff and Board members challenge such discourses by orienting OLI to depict Aboriginality in a positive fashion in order for the general public to learn about Aboriginal peoples/youth cultures in today’s society (NationTalk & Smith, 2009).

**Discussion**

The results illustrate the ways in which OLI encounters mainstream understandings of Aboriginal cultures that confine Aboriginality to rigid colonial discourses. Below, however, I discuss how all cultures, including Aboriginal cultures, are in fact subject to change and I use Bhabha’s (1994) concepts of hybridity and the third space to provide an explanation for this phenomenon. I then discuss how OLI’s use of hip-hop, the program’s integration of hip-hop into high schools, and the return of the colonial gaze at its annual performance reflect creation and implementation efforts that make hybrid third spaces possible.

**Cultural Flux: Opportunities for Aboriginal Resistance**
Kirmayer, Simpson, and Cargo (2003) explained that all cultures are in constant flux. Like all cultures, Aboriginality exists “at the confluence of historical currents and contemporary forces” (Kirmayer et al., 2003, p. s19); in other words, Aboriginal peoples in Canada refurbish their cultures in contemporary society, but often in ways that maintain ties to their ancestral histories and worldviews (Kirmayer et al., 2003). Bhabha’s (1994) concept of hybridity and the third space can be used to show how Aboriginal cultures are in flux through existing within an in-between space that is neither historical nor contemporary, but an entirely new entity. This third space problematizes rigid cultural boundaries by enabling other cultural positions to emerge (Rutherford, 1990). Below, I discuss how OLI exists within hybrid third spaces that disrupt colonial discourses that suggest that Aboriginal peoples are being untraditional when they engage in hip-hop, that Aboriginal youths need to learn through mainstream educational practices, and are flawed peoples and then show the importance of doing so.

**Hybridity with a Hip and a Hop**

OLI is a program that engages Aboriginal youths in hip-hop. Even though OLI staff and Board members noted that participating youths who engage in hip-hop are perceived by the Canadian public as inauthentic, they described participating youths as being receptive to and interested in hip-hop culture. Proulx (2010) argued that Aboriginal peoples are both immersed in and consumers of popular culture. To explain how a contemporary practice like hip-hop results in Aboriginal youths’ cultural consumption and production, Proulx (2010) suggested, “Aboriginal youth…have numerous lifeways, knowledges, practices, and styles from which to pick-n’-mix in the creation of their identities” (p. 58). Proulx’s (2010) reference to a cultural “pick-n’-mix” is reflective of Bhabha’s (1994) notion of hybridity and the third space. Bhabha (1994) suggested, “[people] construct their culture from the national text translated into modern
Western forms of information and technology, language, dress” (p. 55), which creates a third space where new cultural positions emerge. In this way, hybridity is inherent to hip-hop (Gilroy, 1993). When Aboriginal youths engage in hip-hop, they are using mainstream practices and mixing them with their world views and practices (Proulx, 2010) to create a productive hybrid space of Aboriginal meaning and representation.

As OLI staff and Board members indicated, participating youths use hip-hop on their own terms to express their worldviews and cultures through aiding in the dance choreography and by self-interpreting each move. With regards to choreography, Marsh (2009) claimed that hip-hop offers a “do it yourself” approach where Aboriginal youths rely on themselves to satisfy their expressive needs. Hip-hop’s “open-ended-ness” does not confine Aboriginal youths to either traditional or contemporary cultural expressions (Marsh, 2009, p. 119). Rather, hip-hop’s openness creates hybrid spaces that position “the structure of meaning and reference [as] an ambivalent process,” which brings about “cultural knowledge…customarily revealed as an integrated, open, expanding code” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 54). By creating hip-hop dance moves and practices, participating youths are merging cultural practices that form a hybrid space in which they produce cultural meanings of Aboriginality.

Hip-hop also has components of self-interpretivism, which relates to Bhabha’s (1994) notion of hybridity and the third space. Bhabha (1994) stated, “[cultures] are always subject to intrinsic forms of translation” (p. 210). In other words, individuals internalize another’s cultural practices and articulate them in ways that reflect their own values and world views. In an interview with Myers, Lessig (Myers & Lessig, 2008) argued that culture as a whole is a form of mixing and remixing. When individuals rearrange an entity from its original form based on interpretations from their own lives, it becomes something new—a production of their own ideas.
and being. As a result, “original” cultural meanings are displaced, which opens up a third space where different meanings and practices can emerge (Rutherford, 1990).

In both choreographing and interpreting hip-hop dance moves, participating youths are mixing and interpreting popular culture to reflect their own cultures, which displaces and disrupts fixed notions of Aboriginality. Indeed, OLI staff and Board members stated that participating youths are met with perceptions that they are inauthentic Aboriginal peoples when they take up hip-hop practices. Fowler (2007) suggested that Aboriginal authenticity is a Euro-American/Canadian construct created by colonial relations of power. Dominant society has established certain images and ideas of what Aboriginal cultures mean and ways in which to express it (Smith, 1999). This paper’s findings support Fowler’s (2007) assertion that discourses pertaining to authenticity persist today, since Aboriginal peoples are seen as inauthentic when engaging in contemporary practices—those that deviate from apparently authentic Aboriginal practices. Through hybrid spaces, however, OLI operates in ways that create opportunities for participating youths to contest ideas surrounding fixed notions of authenticity and instead portray their lived cultures as being part of contemporary society. As such, OLI problematizes the very boundaries that work to confine meanings of Aboriginality.

**Hip-hop and Education: Creating Hybrid Third Spaces**

OLI staff and Board members reported that dominant discourses deem Aboriginal youths as being in need of learning according to mainstream classroom-based forms of learning. OLI staff and Board members argued, however, that Aboriginal youths’ learning styles differ from approaches used in mainstream education. They stated that hip-hop is an effective means through which Aboriginal youth can become engaged in learning. Although hip-hop can be considered a mainstream practice, Aboriginal peoples are using it according to their own educational purposes
to refashion education in ways that reflects their learning styles. Like Bhabha (Rutherford, 1990) noted, cultures are a product of internal making whereby original meanings are displaced and possibilities for different meanings are generated.

By creating possibilities for different cultural meanings, Marsh (2009) noted that Aboriginal youths who engage in hip-hop artistic practices are enabled with strategies to take part in society, which includes educational settings, in new ways. Thus, hip-hop’s facilitation of hybrid spaces makes it possible to displace “histories…and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives” (Rutherford, 1990, p. 211) within an education context. In this way, partner community members and participating youths are determining their ways of learning and are taking control over practices that continue to be formally controlled by colonial powers (i.e., education) through hybrid third spaces.

It is important to recognize opportunities for Aboriginal peoples to take control over their education since scholars (Battiste, 1995; Giles, Castleden, & Baker, 2010; Smith, 1999) have argued that colonial discourses continue to marginalize Aboriginal knowledges. Williams and Tanaka’s (2007) work, however, demonstrated how hybrid third spaces create opportunities to contest colonial discourses that position Aboriginal knowledges as inferior to Euro-Canadian knowledges. They pointed out that Aboriginal knowledges can exist without being suppressed through hybrid third spaces, which requires not choosing one pedagogical perspective over the other. Rather, it is finding a way to make space for both—and to be enriched by both. This is a process that requires the dominant academic discourse to pause, listen, and make room for a discourse that may seem incongruous and dissonant at times. (p. 15)
Williams and Tanaka (2007) described a process whereby hybrid third spaces are created and make possible opportunities to blur ideas of dominant culture and integrate meanings of Aboriginal cultural learning regimes that resist dominant pedagogy. My findings support Williams and Tanaka’s (2007) work, as this research shows that OLI creates opportunities for Aboriginal peoples’ learning styles to exist despite dominant ideas of education. OLI creates a hybrid third space by integrating hip-hop into its programming as an alternative way for Aboriginal peoples to participate in formal education. In doing so, OLI operates in such a way that challenges colonial discourses suggesting that Aboriginal youths need to learn according to mainstream ideals.

**Returning the Colonial Gaze at OLI’s Annual Performance**

OLI’s annual performance is another aspect of OLI’s creation and implementation that attempts to resist colonial discourses. As OLI staff and Board members discussed, OLI’s Toronto show is designed to portray Aboriginal peoples in a positive light, since OLI staff and Board members reported that Aboriginal peoples are portrayed negatively in mainstream media. Williams and Tanaka (2007) showed that when positive cross-cultural environments are created between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples, hybrid spaces are created whereby cultural discourses are woven together to create new avenues for learning and knowledge translation. They further explained that when such positive cross-cultural exchanges take place, non-Indigenous peoples can take on listening roles. When this happens, the historical colonizer/colonized relationship breaks down and opens up an avenue where power relations spread and equalize. As a result, Williams and Tanaka (2007) suggested that the cross-cultural experience becomes comfortable, which allows Indigenous peoples to express their ideas and worldviews. Similarly, OLI staff and Board members stated that OLI’s final performance strives
to be a welcoming and positive place where the Canadian audience can watch and listen as partner community members and participating youths use arts-based media to display their cultures.

According to Bannerji (1993), Indigenous created arts and media communicates Indigenous representations of cultures and worldviews that disrupt colonial representations. Since media have typically served and continue to serve as forms of imperial/colonial gaze whereby observations of Aboriginal peoples are generated through being observed and defined in terms of the superior observer, Bannerji (1993) argued that Indigenous peoples return the neo/colonial gaze by engaging with colonial tools of representation, such as media. At OLI’s annual performances, partner community members and participating youths present the Toronto audience with self-created arts and media that display a positive and encouraging view of Aboriginal peoples and youths. Knopf (2010) argued that Aboriginal peoples “decolonize the neo/colonial media by creating self-determined images and discourse free of stereotypes and objectification…and by asserting control over the products” (p. 93). By creating self-depicted, positive images through the multi-media performance, OLI is returning the colonial gaze and opening a hybrid third space for decolonizing representations of Aboriginal peoples.

OLI’s final performance in Toronto brings together a cross-cultural audience that serves to return the gaze through hybrid spaces, which challenges Westernized notions of Aboriginal peoples. As such, colonial discourses that negatively portray Aboriginal peoples as inferior, lazy, and worthless (Adams, 1999) are resisted. Instead, OLI’s hybrid third space contributes to challenging the general public’s negative perceptions of Aboriginal peoples.

Conclusion
Through OLI, Aboriginal peoples and youths are able to take hip-hop, the arts, and multimedia and use and transform them according to their own cultures through interpretation and re-articulation, which disrupts dominant representations of their cultures. Bhabha’s (1994) assertion that all cultural forms have transformative potential not only exemplifies OLI’s use of hip-hop, multimedia, and the arts as creating productive spaces that challenge colonialism, but also suggests that the same transformative power can be applied to other cultural forms. Future and existing efforts in youth development through recreation programming for Aboriginal peoples, therefore, can learn from OLI’s creation and implementation efforts by providing Aboriginal peoples with other outlets to self-express and re-articulate their cultures and worldviews. Creating such opportunities can produce spaces that trouble dominant relations of relations and challenge dominant understandings of Aboriginality.

It is, however, important to address a significant limitation to this paper, which is the lack of input from partnering community members and participating youths. Without this, this paper and the conclusions drawn are based solely on the interpretations of OLI staff and Board members and the ways in which they perceive the program to be influenced by colonialism. Future research can build upon this study by seeking community members’ youths’ understandings of their involvement in youth development through recreation programs. Gaining input from Aboriginal peoples can build a more in-depth understanding of how recreation programs can create productive spaces that resist dominant discourses. Such understandings are crucial to decolonizing recreation and broader Canadian society.
Endnotes

1 The term Aboriginal is used to make specific reference to First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples in Canada (Department of Justice Canada, 2012), while the term Indigenous is used to make reference to Indigenous peoples in the rest of the world.

2 Although OLI’s participating communities are First Nations communities, OLI expressed they are not opposed to offering their program to other Aboriginal communities.

3 OLI staff and Board members chose not to disclose the names of First Nations communities that are or have been involved in OLI.
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Conclusions
Outside Looking In (OLI) is a program that strives to influence two groups of people: Aboriginal youths who participate in OLI programming and a Toronto audience (OLI, 2010). During the OLI performance in Toronto, Aboriginal youths are on the “outside” and “look in” on a city and non-Aboriginal cultures, while Torontonians are “outside” and “look in” on Aboriginal communities and cultures. Reflecting on my first in-person encounter with OLI’s staff, Board members, and participants at its show in Toronto in 2011, I can recall feeling excluded from those around me, as if I were an outsider who did not belong. As I watched the performance, I felt incredibly moved and realized that despite my extensive formal education, I knew very little about Aboriginal peoples. Thereafter, I began to reflect on my position as a researcher. For some, the term researcher can represent positions of authority and intellectual superiority; yet, at OLI’s performance I felt uneducated and inferior. Although being a Euro-Canadian female with a relatively privileged upbringing and working within academia separated me from the OLI youths, I desperately wanted to work closely with OLI so I could gain as much information on OLI as possible. From then on, the relationship between OLI and me was not defined by ideas of researcher/research or insider/outsider, but rather something else besides; this relationship reflected mutual understanding, trust, and collaboration, so that this research could be conducted with OLI. I collaborated with OLI staff and Board members to ensure that their needs guided the research process.

This thesis makes apparent how members of dominant Euro-Canadian society’s norms, practices, and values continue to be imposed on Aboriginal peoples – including within youth development through recreation contexts. Yet, at the same time, my work shows how youth development through recreation programs can be used to work towards Aboriginal self-determination and can be a site where colonial relations of power are resisted.
Below, I discuss the gaps in published research to illustrate how this thesis attempts to provide a novel contribution to the current body of literature. I then present suggestions of avenues for future research. Finally, I offer practical recommendations for how OLI and other existing and future youth development through recreation programs can be used to meet Aboriginal peoples’ self-identified needs and resist colonial legacies.

**Existing Research**

Research to date has suggested that Aboriginal peoples’ self-determined needs are not met through recreation since the historical effects of colonialism continue to exert strong influences on recreation programs (Forsyth, 2007; Giles, 2008; Paraschak, 1998; Pettipas, 1994). There remains, however, a lack of knowledge and recognition concerning how/to what extent youth development through recreation can facilitate Aboriginal peoples’, but particularly youths’, self-determination and address colonial legacies that continue to be expressed through recreation. It is necessary to make an effort towards extending this knowledge because existing programs for youth development through recreation are typically designed to encourage participants to adopt Eurocentric values (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011). Consequently, current programs can work against Aboriginal peoples’ efforts at self-determination and instead contribute to the colonial agenda of “bettering” or “developing” (i.e., making more European) Aboriginal peoples.

**My Effort to Begin to Fill the Gap**

The first paper in this thesis examines the ways in which a youth development through recreation program, OLI, can attend to Aboriginal self-determination - an issue that is conspicuously missing from existing literature. My research shows how OLI staff and Board members regularly collaborate with partner community members and participating youths, which
gives partner community members and participating youths’ ownership of OLI. As a result, OLI’s creation and implementation processes are largely controlled and created by Aboriginal participants. By orienting its programming in this way, OLI attends to Aboriginal peoples’ self-determined needs. For instance, partner community members and participating youths determine the types of fundraising activities, the acts of self-expression through different arts-based activities (especially hip-hop where youths co-choreograph and self-interpret the dance moves) in which they wish to engage. In addition, they determine the form and delivery of a great deal of OLI’s policy and program components. As a result of this approach, OLI works toward broader efforts towards Aboriginal self-determination and challenges colonial legacies in youth development through recreation programming.

In the second paper in my thesis, I tease out the tensions associated with creating and implementing OLI. Using postcolonial theory, specifically Bhabha’s (1994) notions of hybridity and the third space, I identify and then problematize three colonial discourses that impact OLI: Aboriginal peoples, especially youths, are inauthentic when participating in hip-hop; Aboriginal peoples need to learn according to mainstream Eurocentric education standards; and Aboriginal youths are inherently flawed. OLI staff and Board members suggested that the general public believes that OLI should not engage youths in hip-hop because it is not a culturally appropriate activity for Aboriginal peoples, that Aboriginal youths should learn in a classroom setting with textbooks, and that Aboriginal youths are predestined to follow a negative life trajectory. All of these discourses are reflective of colonialism’s continuing impacts. OLI staff and Board members recognized these discourses and showed how OLI was created and is implemented in ways that reflect participating community members’ and youths’ lived cultures. They suggested that hip-hop is actually reflective of participating youths’ contemporary interests and learning
styles. Additionally, OLI’s final performance is structured to display partner community members’ and participating youths’ in a positive light. In doing so, OLI creates a hybrid third space. Taken together, the two papers describe OLI’s creation and implementation processes and show how such processes are self-determined by Aboriginal peoples and work to resist colonial legacies.

**Future Research Considerations**

Although this thesis makes a contribution towards extending scholarly knowledge, I must acknowledge that the absence of partner community members’ and participating youths’ narratives is a significant limitation to this work. While OLI staff and Board members shared their insight on how OLI is created and implemented, input from partner community members and participating youths would have allowed for a more holistic and in-depth understanding of OLI and thus of youth development through recreation. Nonetheless, this thesis is a starting point upon which future research can build.

In the future, researchers should also consider looking at other youth development through recreation, sport, leisure, or physical activity programming for/by/with Aboriginal peoples to understand the ways in which these programs cope with colonial relations of power and issues pertaining to self-determination. Given that research shows that youths are more invested in programming that they create (Nicholson, Collins, & Holmer, 2004), an especially important contribution to future research could be made by conducting research with programs that are created and controlled by their youth participants. Certainly, youth development through recreation for Aboriginal youths is a rich area for future research.

**Practical Recommendations**
In addition to recommending areas for future research, I also have some practical recommendations for OLI and for existing and future youth development through recreation programs for Aboriginal peoples. Since OLI currently attends to issues pertaining to Aboriginal self-determination and challenges colonial discourses, I recommend that OLI staff and Board members maintain their current efforts. OLI staff and Board members should continue to engage with collaborative processes with partner communities and enable partner community members’ and participating youths’ ownership of OLI. OLI staff and Board members should also continue to ensure that the program reflects participants’ interests and preferences and showcases participating youths in a positive light. As such, OLI can maintain its efforts to reflect partner community members’ and participating youths’ needs. By doing so, OLI can continue to work towards Aboriginal self-determination and challenge colonial discourses.

While OLI overwhelmingly attempts to address Aboriginal self-determination, the first paper highlights a few instances where OLI’s creation and implementation can be improved to further address participants’ and their communities’ needs. With regards to OLI’s mandatory participation fee and course credit component, participating communities that cannot gather the funds required for OLI’s fee at the time of application to OLI and/or cannot administer OLI as a course credit become illegible for OLI programming. As such, there is little room for partner communities to determine alternative ways of payment and solutions to implementing OLI as a course credit that are reflective of the community’s needs. OLI staff and Board members can better attempt to address such needs through further collaboration with partner communities to co-determine solutions, as OLI does so well with other aspects of its programming.

Other youth development through recreation programs intended for Aboriginal peoples should attempt to be created and controlled and thus self-determined by participants and work to
create hybrid third spaces that allow Aboriginal peoples to challenge colonial notions of Aboriginality. In doing so, such programs can work towards Aboriginal self-determination with regards to programming, which will in turn lead to participants’ using the program according to their needs and thus contribute to the greater efforts of Aboriginal self-determination.

This thesis shows that youth development through recreation efforts have the potential to make strong contributions to combating colonial legacies and facilitating Aboriginal self-determination. Nevertheless, these outcomes are not pre-given outcomes; instead, they are outcomes that can only be realized with a great deal of time, thought, and effort. It is my hope that this thesis will provide Aboriginal youth development through recreation programmers and policymakers with an opportunity to reflect on the ways in which their programs are designed and implemented so that these programs have a greater likelihood of challenging colonial relations of power and to make contributions to Aboriginal peoples’ broader struggles for self-determination.
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Contributions

Alana Rovito developed, designed, and undertook this thesis, its theorization, analysis, and writing. Dr. Audrey Giles supported all aspects of the dissertation’s development, theorization and analysis, and provided assistance and input into writing and reviewing the final product. OLI staff and Board members contributed their insights and knowledge of OLI, provided input on the research direction and design, and verified and made changes to each draft. Both papers will be published with Rovito as first author, Giles as second, and Outside Looking In as third.