- 1 Supporting Indigenous Youth Activity Programmes: A Community-Based Participatory
- 2 Research Approach
- 3 Angela M. Coppola,\* Nicholas L. Holt, & Tara-Leigh F. McHugh
- 4 Faculty of Kinesiology, Sport and Recreation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
- 5 Author Notes
- 6 \*Angela M. Coppola was a doctoral student in the Faculty of Kinesiology, Sport and Recreation
- 7 at the University of Alberta when the research programme was designed and implemented. She
- 8 is currently an Assistant Professor of Health Sciences at Indiana University Kokomo.
- 9 Corresponding Author: Angela M. Coppola, angela.coppola1@gmail.com, coppolaa@iuk.edu,
- 10 Division of Allied Health Sciences, Indiana University Kokomo, 2300 S. Washington Street,
- 11 Kokomo, IN, USA.
- 12 Funding Acknowledgements: The authors would like to acknowledge the Interdisciplinary
- 13 Health Research Academy at the University of Alberta for providing seed funding for the
- community consultations in this research programme. The authors would also like to
- acknowledge the Alberta Centre for Child, Family, and Community Research (now Policy Wise
- 16 for Children & Families) for funding the final research and application phases of this programme
- through the first author's Scobey Hartley Doctoral Award.
- 18 Partner Acknowledgements: The first author would like to thank the second and third authors for
- 19 their long-term mentorship that contributed to the quality and impact of this research programme.
- The authors would like to thank our research programme partners, with a special thank you to
- 21 Susan Sinclair, who contributed their knowledge and time to this programme. Your prolonged
- 22 engagement was invaluable. This paper is dedicated to you.

This paper was written in memory of our community partner, Allison Pratley Laird, who was 23 24 devoted to supporting play and recreation opportunities for all youth. Her insight was integral to 25 the relevancy and impact of this research programme. 26 Notes on contributors Angela M. Coppola, PhD is an assistant professor in the Division of Allied Health Sciences at 27 28 Indiana University Kokomo. Her programme of research involves the use of community-based 29 participatory research methods to support health and activity initiatives with diverse youth and 30 communities. She also researches positive body image programmes with and for women. 31 Nicholas L. Holt, PhD is a professor in the Faculty of Kinesiology, Sport and Recreation at the 32 University of Alberta. He studies psychosocial aspects of participation in sport and physical 33 activity among children, adolescents, and their families. 34 Tara-Leigh F. McHugh, PhD is an associate professor in the Faculty of Kinesiology, Sport and Recreation at the University of Alberta. Her programme of research is focused on better 35 36 understanding and enhancing the sport experiences of youth. She has extensive experience

engaging in community-based participatory research with Indigenous youth.

60

research

38 Supporting Indigenous Youth Activity Programmes: A Community-Based Participatory 39 Research Approach 40 The purpose of this three-year, multi-phase community-based participatory research (CBPR) 41 programme was to explore how to support Indigenous youth activity programmes and 42 programme planners in Alberta, Canada. This CBPR programme was comprised of five phases: 43 (1) Identifying mutual interests and learning how to partner, (2) Building culturally-relevant 44 activity programmes with and for youth, (3) Defining CBPR programme goals and 45 understanding our roles, (4) Exploring how to support Indigenous youth activity programmes, 46 and (5) Applying and informing practices for supporting Indigenous youth activity programmes. 47 Phases Four and Five of this CBPR are the focus of this paper. Phase Four was an exploration of 48 programme planners' experiences of, and recommendations for, building partnerships and 49 programmes to identify how to support Indigenous youth activity programmes and programme 50 planners. Fifteen programme planners from four urban areas in Alberta participated in one-on-51 one interviews. Findings are represented by three themes: (1) Building capacity for collaboration 52 and programme planning, (2) Connecting partners and existing programmes, and (3) Aligning 53 and integrating goals and resources with existing programmes. Phase Five, the application phase 54 of this CBPR, involved the co-development of a gathering event to apply areas for support (i.e., 55 themes) from Phase Four of this CBPR, as well as to reflect on the strengths and challenges of 56 applying such supports. Partners can use implications from the research programme processes 57 and outcomes to explore their role in and practices for supporting these programmes. 58 Keywords: Indigenous youth, Aboriginal youth, activity, holistic health, capacity-building,

networking, partnerships, community-based participatory research, qualitative research, action

### Introduction

61

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

Activity programmes, which include physical activity (PA), sport, or recreation initiatives, have 62 been described as beneficial and relevant to the holistic development of Indigenous<sup>1</sup> youth<sup>2</sup> (e.g., Hanna 2009; McHugh, Deal, Blye, Dimler, Halpenny, Sivak and Holt 2018). Specifically, youth have described the perceived emotional, physical, mental, and spiritual benefits of activity programmes<sup>3</sup> (e.g., McHugh *et al.* 2018). For example, Indigenous youth have shared that mental benefits, such as communication skills, are fostered through sport and recreation (McHugh 2011). Indigenous youth have commonly described their activity experiences as being fun and making them happy, exemplifying the emotional benefits from these experiences (e.g., Halas, McRae and Petherick 2012). There is also evidence of the important role of cultural activities in this context, such as powwow (Kerpan and Humbert 2015), praying, and teachings from Elders (Sasakamoose, Scerbe, Wenaus and Scandrett 2016), which youth have perceived as spiritual health benefits. Lastly, youth have shared their perceived physical benefits from activity, such as a reduced likelihood for diabetes (Tang, Community Wellness Programmes and Jardine 2016), and the importance of making good health choices to perform an activity well (Petrucka, Bickford, Bassendowski, Goodwill, Wajunta and Yuzicappi et al. 2016). In addition to the potential holistic health benefits that can be experienced through activity programmes, negative experiences of racism, bullying, or exclusion have also been reported (Bruner, Hillier, Baillie, Lavallee, Bruner and Hare et al. 2016), making the context in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The term 'Indigenous' is used when referring to peoples and youth who are native to a land or country. In a Canadian context, this also is inclusive of First Nations, Metis, and Inuit Peoples.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In this paper and research projects cited in this paper, the age of youth reported being involved in activity, sport, and/or recreation programmes and studies ranged from age 5 to 19 years.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> 'Activity programmes' include any planned activities or initiatives that include the promotion of physical activity for youth within a community.

which activity occurs important to both youth and programme development. Activity opportunities have the potential to foster spaces for the positive development of Indigenous youth when these spaces promote holistic health, traditional culture and values, connections to the land (e.g., hunting and fishing), and relationships to Indigenous communities (e.g., family and community member support; Bruner *et al.* 2016; Hanna 2009; McHugh *et al.* 2018). Furthermore, those promoting or facilitating activity opportunities should also address social (e.g., exclusion, racism), financial (e.g., registration and travel), and physical (e.g., facilities, lack of cultural relevance) barriers to participation (McHugh *et al.* 2018).

Community-based researchers and practitioners have created and/or informed the development of Indigenous youth activity programmes using community-based and collaborative approaches (e.g., Blodgett, Schinke, Fisher, George, Peltier and Ritchie *et al.*, 2008; McHugh, Coppola and Sinclair 2013; Schinke, Yungblut, Blodgett, Eys, Peltier and Ritchie *et al.* 2010). Collaboration involves relationships between Indigenous youth, communities, and partners<sup>4</sup> who can put the pieces together to facilitate programme development that elicits positive experiences for Indigenous youth (e.g., Blodgett *et al.* 2008). Collaboration is particularly important when working with Indigenous communities because of their right to self-determination of decisions and programmes concerning their lives and wellbeing (Smith 2012). For example, McHugh and colleagues (2013) worked with community members to develop relevant PA-based research questions with communities, and findings from this research subsequently informed local Indigenous youth activity programmes. In these collaborative approaches, community members partnered with community-based researchers and/or practitioners whose roles support

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The term "partners" refers to any person or organization who seeks to or is currently collaborating with Indigenous youth activity programmes or programme planners. If a specific partner is being referred to, the type of partner or partnership is elaborated on.

community members to inform or develop activity programmes that Indigenous youth and communities may benefit from.

The purpose of this three-year, multi-phase community-based participatory research (CBPR) programme was to explore how to support Indigenous youth activity programmes and programme planners in Alberta, Canada. The research questions that guided this CBPR included:

(a) What are Alberta Indigenous youth activity programme planners' experiences of building (i.e., co-creating and engaging in) partnerships and programmes? (b) What are Alberta Indigenous youth activity programme planners' recommendations for building partnerships and programmes? Gaining a better understanding of how to support Indigenous youth activity programmes and programme planners can inform community-based practitioners' and policymakers' collaborative practices.

This CBPR was created from my (AMC<sup>5</sup>) long-term experiences of working with, and learning from, an Indigenous Elder and youth in urban school-communities. After a couple years of community engagement and reflections of cultural humility (i.e., my constant reflections of my role, and relational and methodological practices in the CBPR; see Coppola & McHugh 2016 for an example), I realised that I was not meant to deliver programme outcomes in communities, rather my role was to learn how to support my research and programme partners in their journey of facilitating or promoting activity programmes among Indigenous youth. In this paper, the five phases of a CBPR programme are described, with Phases Four and Five being the focus of this paper.

#### **Community-Based Participatory Research Method**

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> 'My' or 'I' in this paper refers to the first author.

A CBPR framework (Israel *et al.* 1998) is conceptualised as a partnership approach that equitably involves academic and non-academic partners in all phases of the research process. Each partner contributes their expertise and knowledge to understanding the community issue and enhancing the wellbeing of a community (Israel *et al.* 1998). Given this is a collaborative method which involves the inclusion of research practices, Israel and colleagues (2005) have offered several principles, such as building relationships and community partnerships, to guide the development and implementation of CBPR. Specific to CBPR with Indigenous Peoples, Fletcher (2003) describes how developing a self-determined research agenda involves the identification of community needs and the discussion and development of a research relationship.

As described in the following sections, various research partners were involved throughout the five phases of this CBPR. The research partners identified with diverse ethnic backgrounds including Indigenous backgrounds, such as Cree, Mi'kmaw, and Metis Peoples. Indigenous Peoples and community members have a right to decision-making in research or programmes that concern their community and wellbeing (Smith 2012), and this CBPR approach facilitated the development of a research agenda and the inclusion of community members who participated as research partners throughout the research process. A CBPR approach also aligns with the first author's research paradigm. I identify as a Caucasian-American woman, and a feminist participatory researcher. Specifically, my feminist perspective facilitates a balancing of power dynamics, which is important as I and my ancestors have not experienced colonisation. Feminist research from a participatory approach stresses the need for inclusion, participation, action, social change, research reflexivity, and placing the experiences and perspectives of participants at the core of the research (Frisby, Reid, Millar and Hoeber 2005; Reid 2004).

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

Conducting research from a feminist participatory research paradigm has enhanced my process of cultural humility (Tervalon & Murray-Garcia 1998) and building long-term research partnerships with those who have different experiences (e.g., racial marginalisation) and perspectives (e.g., Indigenous ways of knowing) than my own. Thus, my role is to support Indigenous Peoples' and community members' perspectives and voices as partners in CBPR, and to facilitate their engagement and decision-making in the research process. NLH and TLFM served as advisors and mentors to the first author, guiding her through partnership and methodology decisions.

While there is no specific set of guidelines for engaging in CBPR, researchers (e.g., Israel, Eng, Schulz and Parker 2005) have identified five phases to guide the development of a CBPR programme. The phases are broadly named and described, and can be renamed to be context-specific. The first phase is 'partnership formation and maintenance,' which is described as the fundamental phase that involves assessing and reflecting on each members' capacities, learning each partners' needs and interests, and working together to achieve mutual goals, and was renamed in this study as Phase One: Identifying Mutual Interests and Learning how to Partner. During the second 'community assessment and diagnosis' phase, CBPR partners gain an understanding of the relevant needs of the community based on a mutual area of focus or study. CBPR partners also identify a community assessment or consultation procedure. This phase was renamed Phase Two: Building Culturally-Relevant Activity Programmes with and for Youth. The third phase, 'definition of the issue,' involves the use of relevant data collection methods to formally refine the focus of the research partnership. This phase was titled *Phase* Three: Defining CBPR Programme Goals and Understanding Our Roles. In the fourth phase, 'documentation and evaluation of the partnership process,' the research goals and design are

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

implemented, CBPR partners identify a balance between knowledge and action, and re-assess the mutual benefits of the partnership. This phase was renamed *Phase Four: Exploring How to Support Indigenous Youth Activity Programmes*. The 'feedback, interpretation, dissemination, and application of results' phase includes the collaborative development of the application of results, and an exploration of the feedback, strengths, and challenges of the application. This phase was contextualised as *Phase Five: Applying and Informing Practices for Supporting Indigenous Youth Activity Programmes*.

### Phase One: Identifying Mutual Interests and Learning How to Partner

In the Winter of 2012, I began volunteering in a Junior-High/High School Indigenous Studies class taught by Marie (pseudonym), a Cree Elder. I helped her set up and implement activities in the class, however, it was not until I volunteered for a month that we had our first personal conversation. She asked me if I would like to bead with her and the students. Although I have poor craft skills, I agreed to it. After she gave me materials and showed me how to bead, I started working on my own project. Thirty-minutes later, we laughed together for the first time while looking at the result of my poor technique. Over the next couple months, Marie and I started to get to know one another and our mutual interests. We talked about the importance of connecting youth to Indigenous culture and traditions. Alongside the students, I learned about colonisation and the importance of Indigenous cultural revitalisation. Marie and I learned about our areas of interest and expertise. Her interests included traditional games and sport promotion, and connecting youth to culture. I was broadly interested in building relevant activity programmes with and for youth. My capacities or expertise were my knowledge of research practices, and my strengths in developing and facilitating youth sport activities. Her capacities or expertise were traditional Cree knowledges and practices, including traditional games

instruction. She also knew local and relevant issues in the Indigenous youth community in Edmonton as an educator and Elder. Combining our interests, Marie and I worked closely with youth to learn about Indigenous youths' meanings of sport (McHugh *et al.* 2013).

While collaborating to plan a 'sport sampler' event and a photovoice project, we learned how to work and research together. Marie and I had discussions about relevant research and ethical practices in the community as well as university ethics processes. We learned the importance of communication and specifically what each other should know before events or research activities are implemented. For instance, after a miscommunication about data collection, I learned how important it was to discuss recording purposes and, specifically, when and why recording would occur. Fueling our work was our mutual interests and values of cultural knowledge and traditions, and Cree language education through physical activities for youth. The research partners at this time consisted of myself, Marie, and Indigenous youth.

# Phase Two: Building Culturally-Relevant Activity Programmes with and for Youth

In the second phase of this CBPR Marie and I developed an activity programme with and for Indigenous youth. Marie and I met to discuss the goals and components of the programme. First, our programme goal was to promote cultural revitalisation and culturally-relevant sport and PA opportunities for youth. We created the Cree sport programme, wherein I would identify activities for the grade one and two youth, and consult with them (as our partners) to see if they liked the activity. Marie would then translate components of activities into the Cree language. For instance, we planned a jungle obstacle course. Marie translated verbs like jump, throw, and run in the obstacle course instructions so that students could learn the language while engaging in activity. The youth enjoyed a version of the game Gopher Tag. In Gopher Tag, the youth played a regular game of tag and were considered 'safe' if they were in a 'gopher hole' or hula

hoop. If a youth wanted to switch with another in a 'gopher hole,' she would high-five her and say, 'tanisi miscanaskos' which translates to 'Hello, Gopher.'

From our perspectives, the strengths of this programme were the ease of implementation, and the youth's consultation and informal feedback. One key challenge was identifying *how* to promote this type of programming and *how* community members could partner to share resources, and enhance relevancy and sustainability. In order to address these "how" questions, Marie and I knew we needed to consult with additional community members. We applied for and received a grant from the Interdisciplinary Health Research Academy at the University of Alberta to support the hosting of community consultations. The implementation and outcomes of the community consultations are described in the following third phase of this CBPR programme.

## Phase Three: Defining CBPR Programme Goals and Understanding our Roles

As is recommended by Israel and colleagues (2005), relevant data collection methods were identified and used to formally refine the focus of the CBPR programme. Community consultations were identified by Marie and a newly formed advisory group of Elders and community members as relevant and respectful practices for gathering knowledge. Marie and I provided peace offerings (i.e., blankets, tobacco, and cloth) to the advisory group members, and these members served to guide the purpose, agenda, and traditional ceremony practices for the gatherings. Four community consultations were attended by approximately 30 community members including Elders, Indigenous youth, parents, social workers, teachers, and members from organisations, such as the City of Edmonton, and Alberta Recreation and Parks Association (see Coppola & McHugh 2016). Ultimately, Marie and I learned through the consultations that

these community members wanted to engage in Indigenous youth activity programmes, but were not sure *how* to partner with programmes or what programme supports are needed.

Marie, myself, and a group of approximately 15 interested consultation participants cocreated a research purpose that would support us in addressing this gap in knowledge. We also
discussed that my role would be to lead the subsequent "research-focused" phase (i.e., Phase
Four described in the following section), and that I would share the findings with our research
partners, research participants, and any community members interested in engaging in
Indigenous youth activity programmes. The processes of data generation (i.e., interviews), and
sampling of participants who have played a role in creating and implementing Indigenous youth
activity programmes were also confirmed.

# Phase Four: Exploring How to Support Indigenous Youth Activity Programmes

The purpose of this fourth phase was to understand how to support programmes and programme planners by exploring Indigenous youth activity programme planners' experiences of, and recommendations for, building partnerships and programmes. Fifteen programme planners (12 women and three men) from Alberta, Canada were purposefully selected to participate in this phase of the CBPR programme. Purposive sampling involves the recruitment of individuals who can speak to a specific experience to better understand a phenomenon of interest (Mayan 2009). Thus, individuals who had current or previous experiences of co-creating (i.e., collaborating and engaging with partners to develop and implement) Indigenous youth activity programmes were invited to participate. The participants' experiences with activity programmes ranged from five to 20 years, with programming taking place at friendship centres, schools, or non-profit organisations. These programmes promoted overall health, PA, cultural teachings, and self-identity. Participants identified as First Nations, Métis, and non-indigenous Peoples. Their

experiences ranged from school to community programming on reserves near urban areas or in urban areas of Alberta, with a couple participants drawing on experiences in the Northwest Territories as well. Their experiences were rooted in a collaborative approach, and ensured connections to culture and traditions, as well as their respective communities. Pseudonyms are used to protect the participants' identity.

### Data Generation

Upon institutional Research Ethics Board approval, all participants engaged in one-on-one semi-structured interviews at their convenience. One-on-one interviews seek the participants' interpretation of their personal experiences of social phenomena (Dicicco-Bloom and Crabtree 2006; Mayan 2009), which in this phase was their experiences of building (i.e., co-creating and engaging in) partnerships and programmes. One participant also engaged in a follow-up interview, and three engaged in follow-up email discussions. A semi-structured interview guide was developed based on suggestions from consultation community members from Phase Three, and piloted with an Indigenous youth activity programme planner. The interview guide included questions about creating partnerships and programmes with partners (e.g., How did you and partners co-create the programme? What were the facilitators and challenges? What are your recommendations for creating partnerships and programmes?), and engaging partners in programming (e.g., Please describe your process of engaging community members and youth in this programme).

The average interview duration was 66 minutes and approximately 18 hours of interviews including follow-up interviews were generated. Each participant received \$10 amazon.ca e-gift cards for each hour of participation for contributing their time and knowledge. Interviews were conducted face-to-face in the participants' respective communities or via conference call

services. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed by a professional transcription agency, and the first author then reviewed the completed transcriptions for accuracy. A reflexive journal was used to be responsive throughout the research process and to document the progression of data generation (Mayan 2009). Thus, interview reflections were noted to highlight the participants' key interview discussion points and messages.

### Data Analysis

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

Transcripts were analysed using Morse's (1994) four processes of contextualising and recontextualising data for practical use. The first three processes comprised the contextualising phase. Specifically, the first process involves *comprehending* in which the researcher learns about the setting from the participants and usually begins with data collection and continues through analysis. The first author read and re-read the transcripts to summarise the general message that the participants' conveyed. Then, she coded the transcripts by analysing pieces of participants' descriptions for information that addressed the research purpose. For instance, one participant mentioned that programmes could benefit from reducing pods or silos of initiatives and resources, so this was coded 'reduce pods.' Synthesising the data is a process of merging participants' experiences to describe patterns in the data. Within this study, the first author reviewed the codes to identify patterns, and reflected on how the patterns address the research purpose. For instance, participants' shared specific training and professional development (PD) supports which was synthesised to 'training and PD.' Theorising, or considering why a researcher is seeing specific patterns, involves a review of other theoretical or empirical sources that align with the findings. In this research, CBPR principles most closely related to the experiences and recommendations of programme planners. For example, building capacity is a key principle of CBPR (Israel et al. 2005), and one of the themes or patterns in this research was the recommendation to offer PD or capacity-building for programme evaluation. The generated knowledge is then used for *recontextualising* or synthesising into a form that is applicable to the context and other settings. The resulting themes are named and described to be applicable to Indigenous youth activity programme partnership and programme development practices.

#### Results

This fourth phase of this research sought to better understand how to support programmes and programme planners by exploring Indigenous youth activity programme planners' experiences of, and recommendations for, building partnerships and programmes. The findings are represented by three themes: (a) Building capacity for collaboration and programme planning, (b) Connecting partners and existing programmes, and (c) Aligning and integrating goals and resources with existing programmes.

Building Capacity for Collaboration and Programme Planning

The participants described and recommended the need for PD experiences that help them to build capacity to support their programmes. The two key areas identified for building capacity were collaboration and programme planning. In terms of collaboration participants described how communication skills are critical. In building collaborations, Saoirse explained how programme planners should communicate important aspects of their programmes, and can do so using key messages:

[You think about] the key parts of your programme and then your longer key messages that are anywhere from 2 to 30 minutes-what's most important for people to understand about our programme to be able to partner with us? So have a bullet list of maybe three or four points for each potential stakeholder that you think you'll have, so what would I say to youth about this?, what would I say to

a parent?, what would I say to a funder?

Programme planning was also identified as an area for building capacity. For instance, when describing the role of programmes in her community, Harper shared that 'Programming and evaluation is important because we [programme planners] have to reflect on what we're doing.' When talking about her experiences of evaluation and identifying programme outcomes for grants, Saoirse said these typically include physical literacy skills, but there are also hard to measure outcomes that she and her partners would like to consider:

The less measureable outcomes, a lot of those come from the informal things like trust being built and just confidence. Like you see kids that show up, they're so shy, and then by the end of the program...they're really taking initiative and you can just see them totally opening up. Often one of the unplanned outcomes is that a lot of kids that we [programme planners] work with end up going back to school.

Taken together, these results provide examples of capacity-building efforts that partners can address in the context of Indigenous youth activity programmes. Because these are specific, it would be beneficial for partners to ensure the relevancy of certain capacity-building activities before providing these supports. This can be achieved by making connections to build partnerships with programme planners, which was the foundation of the second generated theme.

Connecting Partners and Existing Programmes

The participants described the important role of connections between partners and to existing programmes, specifically, through networking and knowledge-sharing. Networking was described as fostering connections between programme planners and potential partners.

Knowledge-sharing was described as sharing programme experiences and examples to inform programme practices. For instance, Tiffany described the importance of connections:

I've always focused my ideas and initial strategies around what the youth would want so of course that has always meant having to have those relationships in place already or having youth interested in talking to me and giving me direction to start with.

These connections were described as informal conversations (e.g., asking questions) to get to know one another, or even as larger gatherings to exchange information. As an example of informal connections, when asked about her experiences of engaging youth and community members in programmes, Superwoman said, 'I just like to connect with people on a personal level and, you know, get to know them. And asking them questions and being just in their life, so that's basically like what I do.'

Participants also explained how they would benefit by being connected to existing programmes, and being introduced to various activity programme options through demonstrations. For instance, when Cally discussed networking opportunities, specifically, she said:

I think having [a] demonstration with things that are happening, like whether it is a traditional game or having those kind of things shared is part of it too, just to give people an idea of what else is happening or some of these projects, and like little tidbits of what people are working on. I think that would be valuable.

Lauren described how she and her programme partners connect with partners through a monthly gathering, and said, 'we just come together and it's all about communication, it's all about how can we [programme planners and partners] help each other, and really it's about how are we better supporting our students?' Networking and knowledge-sharing between partners could involve discussions related to the next theme of aligning and integrating goals and resources with existing programmes.

Aligning and Integrating Goals and Resources with Existing Programmes

The participants recommended the need to reduce silos, combine programmes and resources, and build upon existing programmes. As stated by Joyce, 'the community organisations aren't connecting with the schools, and the schools are running their own [programmes].' After describing the issues with recruiting youth for separate programmes running at the same time, she shared that programme planners 'have a hard [time], 'cause there's no relationship...so I think we [programme planners] should be working together more, and you know supporting each other more. There needs to be more communication, more interagency work.' The participants shared the importance of knowing existing programme goals and expectations, and your role in the programmes. Bowden said, 'with the programme, you have to find your role,' and went on to say that in the youth centre he worked, he played a supporting role in already existing programmes. He and his partners,' 'role was to support and add on to things, so if someone asked us to help out with this, we [co-programme planners] would be there. It is totally dependent on what's there, and what's going on already.'

Aligning programmes and resources was also described as an important recommendation because without alignment of priorities, there was added stress of sustaining the programme. The participants shared that there was a lack of alignment between some government or funders' priorities and the community priorities. For example, Briana stated:

[The government is] completely ignoring what the community is saying are issues and just focusing on what they think is an issue, and then just forcing the community through funding to provide programming that they think is important or relevant.

The participants shared that clear funding criteria, funding flexibility, combining programmes to share grant resources, and core (i.e., long-term or multi-year) funding would be beneficial to

existing programmes. Many of the programmes received pilot (short-term, one-year) funding, which was viewed as problematic, because if there is no continued support, there is no consistency for youth. It can also seem like programmes and programme planners are coming into communities and leaving quickly. When discussing her funding support, Stacy shared:

We prefer core funding because a lot of our programmes aren't just yearly based. Now, if there was the opportunity to do pilot funding and then have it turn into core funding so that a programme can be sustainable, that would be a lot better, whereas opposed to certain programmes, if you get pilot funding, it's only for a year. So you introduce a new programme to the community, well everybody loves it, at the end of the year it's kinda like OK, money's out, program's ended, that's it, that's all.

In summary, those partnering with Indigenous youth activity programmes might consider the resources they can share, and what role they can play in supporting existing programme goals. Funding partners should consider how to align priorities and the length of funding opportunities with the needs of communities offering Indigenous youth activity programmes.

#### **Discussion**

The findings from Phase Four of this CBPR provide insight into how to support programmes and programme planners by building capacity, connecting partners, and aligning and integrating programme goals and resources, all of which are integral to partnerships and programmes with and for Indigenous Peoples (e.g., Ball and Janyst 2008; Fletcher 2003; Loppie-Reading and Wien 2009). Broadly, capacity-building can be conceptualized as supporting community potential for responding to health issues (e.g., Chino and DeBruyn 2006). Based on the findings, it is recommended that partners begin exploring capacity-building for programme planning (e.g.,

evaluation) and collaboration (e.g., communication) skills that programme planners could use in the development and implementation of programmes.

Researchers adopting collaborative and participatory approaches draw upon mutual capacity-building (Ball and Janyst 2008) or co-learning (Israel, Schulz, Parker and Becker 2001) in which community members and their partners both share and receive knowledge to build specific skills needed to develop and implement a programme or service. Thus, this type of capacity-building can be adopted to promote programme sustainability (Hacker, Tendulkar, Rideout, Bhuiya, Trinh-Shevrin and Savage *et al.* 2012). In an indigenous context, mutual capacity-building is encouraged (Ball and Janyst 2008; Chino and DeBruyn 2006) to ensure that partners understand that their expertise (e.g., programme evaluation) is important, but there are knowledge and skills (e.g., traditional practices) to be learned from Indigenous community programme planners and/or members. Taking this into account, it is recommended that partners also explore what knowledge and skills they will need from community members or programme planners in the partnership to establish co-learning and mutual capacity-building.

Partnership-building with community members is key to developing Indigenous youth activity programmes (e.g., Blodgett *et al.* 2010). Therefore, connecting partners and existing programmes, specifically through networking and knowledge-sharing, support and extend upon the partnership-development literature in this context. Specifically, the study findings indicate that partners can support Indigenous youth activity programmes by facilitating connections between existing programmes and between programme planners and potential partners, and these connections might involve opportunities to network and share knowledge. These connections could also occur through informal discussions or through community gatherings or meetings. Ultimately, those supporting programmes can facilitate partnership-building, a key component to

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

the development in Indigenous youth activity programmes (e.g., Blodgett *et al.* 2010), by creating connections (e.g., community gatherings, meetings, and informal group discussions that include networking and knowledge-sharing activities) between existing programmes and between programme planners and potential partners.

Aligning and integrating programme goals and resources can support programmes and programme planners. Reading and Wien (2009) shared that a silo approach fails to address the health of Indigenous Peoples because it is inconsistent with their historically collectivist worldview and does not take into account the complexities or multiple determinants (e.g., education, income) of health. Building upon Reading and Wien's (2009) discussion, partners might consider their complementary roles in existing Indigenous youth activity programmes instead of building new and separate programmes with similar missions. Furthermore, aligning programme goals and resources are important to ensure that partners are supporting the needs and priorities of communities and programme planners (e.g., Israel et al. 2005). The Indigenous youth activity programme planners in this study described funding providers as partners. Multiple participants shared that federal funding agencies focused on economic development programmes, however, community members wanted support for other community- or schoolbased holistic health programmes, which they perceived would facilitate economic development. Thus, funding partners can ensure that their priorities are consistent with community priorities (e.g., holistic health approach; Reading and Wien 2009) or have less strict funding criteria, recognising that Indigenous Peoples and communities should (and have a right to) determine their own initiatives (Smith 2012). Funding partners can also ensure more long-term as opposed to short-term or pilot funding opportunities are available.

Phase Five: Applying and Informing Practices for Supporting Indigenous Youth Activity

**Programmes** 

You have given life to a purpose and like a child, it needs to be nurtured, keep feeding...the child will mature. — *Anonymous participant from Phase Five*As recommended by consultation community members in Phase Three, a preliminary analysis and report of the Phase Four research was shared with a group of consultation community members in Phase Three and research participants from Phase Four to facilitate discussions of how to apply the research findings. Such discussions supported the development of the fifth and final "application phase" of this CBPR programme, which involved a gathering event to support Indigenous youth activity programmes in Alberta. Three formal pre-gathering discussions were held with a group of 12 consultation community members from Phase Three and research participants from Phase Four to inform the development of the gathering, including the programme agenda and potential gathering participants. The main goal of the gathering was to apply recommendations (i.e., themes) from Phase Four of this CBPR, as well as to reflect on the strengths and challenges of applying such recommendations.

The gathering included approximately 35 attendees from various provincial and community organisations, university, education, and First Nations communities in Alberta. As requested by the pre-gathering discussion participants, an Indigenous leader shared traditional ceremonies, specifically prayer and smudge, to open and close our gathering and acknowledge community protocols. The gathering was held at a community hall in Edmonton, Alberta.

Gathering participants were given a conference bag, food for lunch, and refreshments throughout the day. Previous research (e.g., Blodgett, Schinke, Fisher, Yungblut, Recollet-Saikkonen and Peltier *et al.* 2010; McHugh *et al.* 2013) has acknowledged the importance of respecting cultural

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

protocols, and included a feast and refreshments when conducting sharing circles with Indigenous youth to offer thanks for sharing their knowledge. The pre-gathering discussion participants and I also incorporated activity into the agenda to enhance opportunities for informal relationship-building and to simply be active. For instance, a walk in the river valley of Edmonton was an opportunity to engage in informal conversations about each other and our roles in programmes.

Two key components made up the gathering agenda: professional development (PD) speakers and open space technology discussions. The PD session topics (i.e., Connecting with Youth, Sustaining Programmes, and Promoting Stronger Interagency Support) were based on identified needs of participants that were highlighted in Phase Four and during the pre-gathering discussions. For the "Connecting with Youth" session, a community leader with over 12 years of experience engaging with youth as a fitness instructor, and a community athlete and programme developer shared their experiences and strategies for connecting with youth and the community. The "Sustaining Programmes" session included a community-based researcher and evaluator who shared knowledge and resources for conceptualising programme evaluations in a community setting. In the "Promoting Stronger Interagency Support" session, partners in the Mi'Kmaw Physical Activity Leader (MPAL) programme (i.e., a MPAL and the Regional Physical Activity Consultant) shared their experiences of bridging the gap between the Nova Scotia government and Mi'kmaw communities to support PA opportunities. Open space technology (OST; Owen 1993), a highly engaging process whereby the attendees propose topics of discussion and facilitate those discussions with other attendees, was also used to provide a space for discussion of relevant issues related to Indigenous youth activity programmes.

Feedback was solicited, and twelve gathering participants filled out the feedback form.

Gathering participants who provided feedback were primarily from university, non-profit organisations, and social services and heard about the gathering through word-of-mouth or email listserves. They attended the gathering primarily to network, to find support, and to learn from and engage with others. They shared their thoughts on components they found useful and beneficial, their ability to network, their key take-away points, and their next steps in supporting Indigenous youth activity programmes. Using the feedback, OST discussion outcomes, and my personal reflection, I identified outcomes, strengths, challenges, and recommendations for future application. The reflections were guided by the three areas of support identified in Phase Four.

The gathering participants who provided feedback reported that they learned and will apply skills and strategies shared in the professional development (PD) sessions, with many asking for future workshops, and one participant even volunteering to plan future gatherings. However, a barrier to understanding capacity-building in this setting was that I was unsure if the gathering participants applied knowledge and ideas even though they indicated they would. Therefore, scheduling follow-up interviews or programme visits is recommended in order to identify the strengths and limitations of applying knowledge in their context, and ultimately to provide long-term support.

A welcomed surprise and perceived strength of the gathering was that capacity was not only enhanced during PD sessions, but also during the OST (Owen 1993) discussions. Several gathering participants who provided feedback mentioned that they learned new ideas in OST sessions, and would apply the ideas in their own context, which was the ultimate goal of the gathering. For instance, one participant shared that she would apply learned community engagement strategies from an OST session, saying she took away 'ideas for community

engagement,' and would 'like to apply some of the ideas with the families I work with.' This indicates that pre-planned PD activities are important, but capacity-building also occurs through participant-driven activities and discussions (e.g., OST).

OST discussions fostered a space in which participants' voices were heard and respected. When discussing open space discussions, a gathering participant who provided feedback shared that she 'enjoyed them because it offered an open, safe atmosphere.' OST discussions also facilitated genuine knowledge-sharing and networking between programme planners. One gathering participant who provided feedback summarised the relationship between OST and knowledge-sharing clearly, stating:

Open space sessions gave participants a chance to contribute as well as gain. Knowledge exchange is very valuable in each sector, not only for moving forward for 'next steps,' but also just for affirmation and encouragement.

It was encouraging to see from participant feedback that this component of the agenda was deemed valuable. In my role, it was important to learn from the research programme partners and implement their ideas. Supporting findings from Bryson and Anderson (2000), a strength of OST is that the technique promotes a participant-driven agenda. A recommendation is to continue exploring the co-development and implementation of OST to support Indigenous youth activity programmes.

There was evidence that gathering participants considered their roles when sharing their next steps in programmes. For instance, one gathering participant stated, 'I know I need to show up and be a role model [for youth], we [programme planners] as leaders and individuals need to be part of the change.' Another shared that the most useful, valuable, and beneficial part of the gathering was 'finding out what is going on in Alberta, [the] challenges, and how I can help.'

Therefore, it is recommended to continue prompting and promoting opportunities for partners and programme planners to consider their roles. Whereas role identification was evident, the gathering could have better facilitated the alignment and integration of goals and resources between programmes and partners. For instance, policymakers were invited, and there was a representative from the Ministry of Health. A couple representatives of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta were invited, and one representative RSVP'd, but did not attend. Thus, co-developing a plan for contacting and/or working with government representatives or decision makers to discuss collaboration or policy change to support programme planners is recommended.

### **General Discussion**

This research offers a practical example of responsive participatory research that led to the identification and direct application of areas for supporting Indigenous youth activity programmes. Importantly, the findings from this research are inclusive of the voices of Indigenous peoples, and the research process and outcomes are timely for two main reasons. First, the findings might be useful to policymakers or community-based researchers and practitioners who collaborate with Indigenous Peoples to support and develop Indigenous sport policy, programmes, and initiatives in Canada. Second, the processes and outcomes of this research participatory research programme provide an example of inclusion of underrepresented populations, and a collaborative process of knowledge generation that can deepen our understandings of phenomena in qualitative research in sport, exercise, and health (McHugh 2017).

The findings of this research contribute to the PA literature by identifying necessary considerations for supporting Indigenous youth activity programmes. Recent research has synthesised the sport and recreation experiences of Indigenous youth (McHugh *et al.* 2018) and

systematically reviewed research on the positive development of Indigenous youth through sport, activity, or recreation (Bruner *et al.* 2016). The aforementioned research outlined important factors that should be considered when developing Indigenous youth activity programmes, such as programmes that promote holistic health, integrate culture and traditions, and optimize on community relationships. This CBPR project adds to these recent reviews by identifying areas for supporting programmes and programme planners who work in these contexts (i.e., by building capacity for collaboration and programme planning, connecting partners and existing programmes, aligning and integrating goals and resources with existing programmes, and exploring the implementation of the aforementioned areas for support).

In addition to deepening understandings of how to support Indigenous youth activity programmes, this CBPR project also makes an important methodological contribution to the PA literature. I shared detailed descriptions and reflections on how I (as an academic partner) considered my role complementary to the role of my research programme partners. A recommendation for future researchers is to consider including such detail when describing not only CBPR projects, but other equally relational research projects, such as many qualitative studies. Furthermore, co-learning and capacity-building typically evolves as part of a participatory research programme (Israel *et al.* 2005), but is not always reflected on and reported. Informing McHugh's (2017) suggestions for deepening our understandings in qualitative research, exploring and reporting these pieces may contribute to a deeper understanding of the necessity and complexity of collaborative research.

National, provincial, and local policymakers and community-based practitioners that are hoping to support Indigenous youth activity programmes may benefit from these findings that can inform their roles in developing practices and policies with community members. One future

direction or recommendation is for researchers, community members, and policymakers to collaboratively explore how and where the findings can be shared. Knowledge-sharing or translation is important to bridge the gap between research and practice (CIHR 2014), and doing so with these findings can inform role identification in various positions when collaborating to develop Aboriginal sport, activity or recreation programmes and policies. That said, these findings may have international relevance as, for example, Sport and Recreation Victoria (Australia) promotes the Indigenous Sport and Recreation Programme with a mission to create sport and recreation opportunities that are inclusive of and accessible to Indigenous communities (Victoria State Government, 2017). Therefore, researchers, community-based practitioners, and policymakers in this context in other countries working collaboratively with programme planners may use the findings to explore how to support Indigenous youth activity programmes.

A key strength of this research was the rigor that was established as a result of the prolonged engagement with participants (Schinke, Smith and McGannon 2013). I facilitated a democratic and equitable process over time, promoting prolonged engagement of the research programme partners throughout this CBPR (Schinke *et al.* 2013). This helped me reflect on my responsiveness as a researcher (Morse *et al.* 2002) in which I would ask myself if research questions, methods, practices were relevant to the research programme partners and addressed the purpose of the research programme. If unsure, I would consult with the research programme partners. Despite the various contributions of this research, it also has some limitations, which have subsequently highlighted areas for future directions. For example, with the exception of one participant, single one-on-one interviews were conducted with participants in Phase Four of this CBPR project. To enhance the depth of experiences shared, future researchers might consider more iterative processes for data generation. As well, Phase Five of this CBPR project also had

some limitations. Despite the invitation of youth to participate in the gathering, there was very little representation from Indigenous youth. The purpose was to discuss how to better support Indigenous youth activity programmes in Alberta, and it would have been beneficial to have more youth voice and representation. In this programme, the Phases Four and Five participants were those who planned programmes with youth. However, Indigenous youth could have provided insight into their basic and holistic health needs, yielding a much richer experience for gathering participants. Thus, exploring youths' involvement and role in programme support initiatives in the future would be beneficial.

In conclusion, this research programme's processes and outcomes yielded several implications for supporting Indigenous youth activity programmes, and advancing understandings of collaboration in research, practice, and policy. This research programme outlines CBPR phases, specifically descriptions and reflections of the processes and outcomes of collaboration and identification of areas of support for Indigenous youth activity programmes. Based on the current CBPR process and outcomes, methodological and practical ideas are offered for elaborating on the process of Indigenous youth activity programme development (e.g., Bruner *et al.* 2016) and participatory research development (McHugh 2017).

References

647

648

649

650 651

652

653

654

658

659

660

661

662663

664665

666

667 668

669

670

671

- Ball, J., & Janyst, P. (2008). Enacting research ethics in partnerships with Indigenous communities in Canada: "Do it in a good way." *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 33-51. doi: 10.1525/jer.2008.3.2.33
- Blodgett, A. T., Schinke, R. J., Fisher, L., A., George, C. W., Peltier, D., Ritchie, S., & Pickard,
   P. (2008). From practice to praxis: Community-based strategies for Aboriginal youth
   sport. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 32, 393-414. doi: 10.1177/0193723508323701
  - Blodgett, A. T., Schinke, R. J., Fisher, L., Yungblut, H. E., Recollet-Saikkonen, D., Peltier, D., Ritchie, S., & Pickard, P. (2010). Praxis and community-level sport programming strategies in a Canadian Aboriginal reserve. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 8, 262-283. doi: 10.1080/1612197X.2010.9671953
  - Bruner, M. W., Hillier, S., Baillie, C. P. T., Lavallée, L. F., Bruner, B. G., Hare, K., Lovelace, R., & Lévesque, L. (2016). Positive youth development in Aboriginal physical activity and sport: A systematic review. *Adolescent Research Review*, doi: 10.1007/s40894-015-0021-9
- Bryson, J. M., & Anderson, S. R. (2000). Applying large-group interaction methods in the planning and implementation of major change efforts. *Public Administration Review*, 60, 143-162.
  - Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR). (2014). *About knowledge translation and commercialization*. Available from: http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/29418.html [Accessed 27 January 2014].
  - Chino, M., & DeBruyn, L. (2006). Building true capacity: Indigenous models for indigenous communities. *American Journal of Public Health*, *96*, 596-599. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2004.053801
  - Coppola, A. M., & McHugh, T-L. F. (2016). Considering culturally-relevant practices and knowledge-sharing when creating an activity-promoting community research agenda. *Sport, Education, and Society, 23*, 14-27. doi: 10.1080/13573322.2015.1129942
  - Dicicco-Bloom, B., & Crabtree, B. F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education*, 40, 314-321. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x
  - Fletcher, C. (2003). Community-based participatory research relationships with Aboriginal communities in Canada: An overview of context and process. *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health*, 1, 27-62.
- Frisby, W., Reid, C. J., Millar, S., & Hoeber, L. (2005). Putting "participatory" into participatory forms of action research. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 367-386.
- Hacker, K., Tendulkar, S. A, Rideout, C., Bhuiya, N., Trinh-Shevrin, C., & Savage, C. P.,
   Grullon, M., Strelnick, H., Leung, C., & DiGirolamo, A. (2012). Community capacity-building and sustainability: Outcomes of community-based participatory research.
- 677 Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action, 6, 349-678 360. Doi: 10.1353/cpr.2012.0048
- Halas, J., McRae, H., & Petherick, L. (2012). Advice for physical education teachers from Aboriginal youth: Become an ally. *Physical & Health Education Journal*, 78(3), 6–11.
- Hanna, R., (2009). Promoting, developing, and sustaining sports, recreation, and physical
   activity in British Columbia for Aboriginal youth. Document created for First Nations
   Health Society. Available from:
- http://www.fnhc.ca/pdf/Sports\_Recreation\_and\_Physical\_Activity\_
- BC Aboriginal Youth.pdf [Accessed 15 April 2013].

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

717

718

719

- Israel, B. A., Eng, E., Schulz, A.J. & Parker, E. A. (2005). Introduction to methods in community-based participatory research for health. In B. A. Israel, E. Eng, A. J. Schulz, & E. A. Parker (Eds.), *Methods in Community-Based Participatory Research for Health* (pp. 3-26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 19, 173-202. doi: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.19.1.173
  - Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (2001). Community-based participatory research: Policy recommendations for promoting a partnership approach in health research. *Education for Health*, *14*, 182-197.
  - Kerpan, S., & Humbert, L. (2015). Playing together: The physical activity beliefs and behaviors of urban Aboriginal youth. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 12, 1409–1413. doi:10.1123/jpah.2014-0533
    - Loppie-Reading, C., & Wein, F. (2009). Health inequalities and social determinants of Aboriginal Peoples' health. Retrieved (April 8, 2015) from: http://www.nccah-ccnsa.ca/docs/social%20determinates/nccah-loppie-wien report.pdf.
  - Mayan, M. J. (2009). *Essentials of qualitative inquiry*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, Inc. National Aboriginal Health Organization, n.d. *Publications: Terminology*. Available from: http://www.naho.ca/publications/topics/terminology/ [Accessed 10 April 2013].
  - McHugh, T-L.F. (2011). Physical activity experiences of Aboriginal youth. *Native Studies Review*. 20, 7–26.
  - McHugh, T-L. (2017). Thinking about the future: Challenges and possibilities. In B. Smith & A. C. Sparkes (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise* (pp. 445-449). New York, NY: Routledge.
  - McHugh, T-L. F., Coppola, A. M., & Sinclair, S. (2013). An exploration of the meanings of sport to Aboriginal youth: A photovoice approach. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise, and Health, 5,* 291-311. doi: 10.1080/2159676X.2013.819375
- McHugh, T-L. F., Deal, C. J., Blye, C-J., Dimler, A. J., Halpenny, E. A., Sivak, A., & Holt, N. L.
   (2018). A meta-study of qualitative research examining sport and recreation experiences of Indigenous youth. *Qualitative Health Research*, 1-13. doi: 10.1177/1049732318759668
  - McHugh, T-L., F., Kingsley, B. C., & Coppola, A. M. (2013). Enhancing the relevance of physical activity research by engaging Aboriginal peoples in the research process. *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Health*, 11, 293-305.
- Morse, J. M. (1994). "Emerging from the data: The cognitive process of analysis in qualitative inquiry. In J.M. Morse (Ed.), *Critical issues in qualitative research methods* (pp. 23-43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morse, J., *et al.*, 2002. Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International journal of qualitative methods*, *1* (2), 1-19.
- Owen, H. (1993). Open space technology: A user's guide. Retrieved from,
  http://elementaleducation.com/wp-content/uploads/temp/OpenSpaceTechnologyUsersGuide.pdf.
- Petrucka, P., Bickford, D., Bassendowski, S., Goodwill, E-W., Wajunta, E-C., Yuzicappi, E-B., Yuzicappi, L., Hackett, P., Jeffery, B., & Rauliuk, M. (2016). Positive leadership, legacy, lifestyles, attitudes, and activities for Aboriginal youth: A wise practices approach for
- positive Aboriginal youth futures. *International Journal of Indigenous Health*, 11, 177-
- 732 197. doi: 10.18357/ijih111201616017

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

- Reid, C. J. (2004). Advancing women's social justice agendas: A feminist action research framework. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *3*(3). Article 1. Retrieved June 21, 2015 from http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/3 3/html/reid.html
- Robbins, J. A., & Dewar, J. (2011). Traditional Indigenous approaches to healing and the
   modern welfare of traditional knowledge, spirituality and lands: A critical reflection on
   practices and policies taken from the Canadian Indigenous example. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 2. Retrieved September 27, 2015 from:
   http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/iipj/vol2/iss4/2
   DOI: 10.18584/iipj.2011.2.4.2
  - Sasakamoose, J., Scerbe, A., Wenaus, I., & Scandrett, A. (2016). First Nation and Métis youth perspectives of health: An Indigenous qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 22, 636–650. doi:10.1177/1077800416629695
  - Schinke, R. J., Smith, B., & McGannon, K. R. (2013). Pathways for community research in sport and physical activity: Criteria for consideration. *Qualitative Research in Sport Exercise and Health*, 5, 460-468. doi: 10.1080/2159676X.2013.846274
  - Schinke, R., Yungblut, H., Blodgett, A., Eys, M., Peltier, D., & Ritchie, S. et al. (2010). The role of families in youth sport programming in a Canadian aboriginal reserve. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 7, 156-166.
  - Smith, L. T. (1999; 2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
  - Sport and Recreation Victoria. (2017). Aboriginal sport and recreation. Retrieved August 10, 2018 from: http://sport.vic.gov.au/our-work/participation/inclusive-sport-and-recreation/aboriginal-sport-and-recreation
  - Tang, K., Community Wellness Program, & Jardine, C. G. (2016). Our way of life: Importance of indigenous culture and tradition to physical activity practices. *International Journal of Indigenous Health*, 11, 211-227. doi: 10.18357/ijih111201616018
- Tervalon, M., & Murray-Garcia, J. (1998). Cultural humility versus cultural competence: A
   critical distinction in defining physician training outcomes in multicultural education.
   *Journal of Healthcare for the Poor and Underserved*, 9, 117-125. doi: 10.1353/hpu.201
   0.0233
- 763 Thorne, S. (2008). *Interpretive description*. Walnut Creek, California: Left Coast Press Inc.
- 764 Thorne, S., Reimer-Kirkham, S., & O'Flynn-Magee, K. (2004). The analytic challenge in interpretive description. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *3*, 1-12.