



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The social museum in the Caribbean : grassroots heritage initiatives and community engagement

Ariese, C.E.

Citation

Ariese, C. E. (2018, September 27). *The social museum in the Caribbean : grassroots heritage initiatives and community engagement*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/65998>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/65998>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/65998> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Ariese, C.E.

Title: The social museum in the Caribbean : grassroots heritage initiatives and community engagement

Issue Date: 2018-09-27

Case Study: Kalinago Barana Autê, Dominica

Arguably, grassroots action is the most significant form of “community action.”
Elizabeth Crooke (2015: 487)

Quite possibly indeed there is no greater community engagement than when independent interest in heritage inspires an individual or community to create their own museum as a grassroots initiative. Such grassroots action will require decision-making on most, if not all, aspects of the museum and its work. Yet, collaboration and negotiation will still be necessary as the museum project develops. This is even more pronounced when other participants who are seen as outsiders become involved. Thus, for grassroots initiatives as well as other community engagement projects, the *process* also requires close attention as it can be complex and subject to change over time.

Whereas the previous chapter assessed the participatory practices employed throughout the Caribbean on a wider scale, the aim of the two following chapters is to provide a more detailed analysis of two specific community engagement processes, as they are applied in the Caribbean, by zooming in on two distinct case studies. These case studies are not intended to function as contradictory examples or polar opposites; they also cannot reflect the entire scope of community engagement projects that are taking place in the region. Instead, these case studies each highlight a single point on the spectrum of Caribbean community engagement processes. Each case study provides a unique answer to the sub question: “how are community engagement processes, including their value and outcomes, perceived by Caribbean communities?” (see *Research Questions and Objectives*, page 18). The answers should not be seen as all-inclusive, but rather understood in their respective context. The two case studies are centered around different types of museums and focus on two distinct communities that each have their own characteristic cultures and histories. The community engagement project conducted in each case had different goals, as well as different outcomes. These differences are also visible in the length and the scope of the community engagement projects, and additionally in the development of the participatory process.

The focus of this chapter is on the case study conducted in the Kalinago Territory on the island of Dominica in the Lesser Antilles. The Kalinago Territory is home to Dominica’s Kalinago community and contains the *Kalinago Barana Autê* (KBA), an open air museum that is an ongoing community engagement project which began as

an Indigenous grassroots initiative (see figure 14). The KBA is currently operated by Dominica's Ministry of Tourism but managed by the Kalinago, requiring long-term collaboration between government and local community. The main aim of the case study is to assess the value and importance of the KBA for the Kalinago community and to identify how they feel the museum could improve for the future.

The chapter will begin by providing a brief (pre-)history of the Kalinago and their current community. Afterwards, the creation and foundation of the KBA will be discussed along with a description of the museum today. The fieldwork conducted for this case study will be detailed, with specific focus placed on the aims of this fieldwork period and my experiences in the Territory. Implications of fieldwork strategies, adjustments, and fieldwork experiences will also be incorporated throughout the remainder of the chapter. The fieldwork results are the core of the chapter, namely the perceptions of the Kalinago community in relation to the value that the KBA holds for them. These perceptions provide insights into the present outcomes of the community engagement project. The chapter will conclude by discussing the Kalinago community's hopes for the future of the KBA and any further outcomes they still wish to attain.

Brief History of the Kalinago in Dominica

Wai'tukubuli, known as Dominica after its English naming, is an island in the Eastern Caribbean and part of the Lesser Antilles (Boomert 2014; Honychurch 2000: 9). The island is of volcanic origin and is characterized by its extremely mountainous terrain and dense forest cover (see figure 15). The earliest human interactions in the Windward Islands have been dated to c. 3000 BC and show the settlement by Amerindian peoples possibly originating from the Northern coast of the South American continent (Bérard 2013; Honychurch 1995: 15; Honychurch 2000: 9; Keegan & Hofman 2017: 37-38). Over the next few millennia, various Amerindian peoples speaking Arawakan languages settled throughout the region. Archaeologists have debated the nature of this settlement and the cultural, technological, and linguistic characteristics of these Amerindian peoples for decades (Keegan & Hofman 2017). In many cases, the naming of pre-historic peoples and cultures has followed an archaeological classification based on pottery styles (*e.g.* Saladoid or Suazoid; Rouse 1992). The naming of the Amerindian peoples from the period of contact with Europeans was frequently based on historic accounts, either using the (often misguided or blatantly negative) terminology of the Europeans for various peoples or using Amerindian vocabulary and language families to identify groups (*e.g.* Carib, Arawak, or Taíno; Keegan & Hofman 2017: 11-15). Archaeologists now believe that the settlement of the region did not occur in rigid waves of ever more technologically advanced peoples, as had been hypothesized in the early 20th century (Hofman & Carlin 2010: 110; Siegel 2013: 24). Instead, it is argued that the Lesser Antilles in particular consisted of a mosaic of Amerindian peoples, speaking related Arawakan languages with at times markedly different cultural traditions (Hofman 2013: 214; Honychurch 2000: 25; Keegan & Hofman 2017: 236-237; Siegel 2013: 39).

The Amerindians who lived in the Lesser Antilles during the period of contact with the Europeans were for many centuries referred to as 'Caribs' or 'Island Caribs' (to distinguish them from 'Caribs' on the mainland; Boomert 2000: 4; Honychurch



Figure 14: Entry to the Kalinago Barana Autê, Dominica.



Figure 15: Dominica. Left: satellite image. Right: map with a terrain view showing elevations.

2000: 24). The term was derived from the Indigenous word *Cariban*, which is used today to identify a group of languages spoken in lowland South America (Keegan & Hofman 2017: 14-15). The term was appropriated by the Spanish and used to signify the Amerindians they did not get along with, as opposed to what they deemed to be the more friendly and welcoming 'Arawak,' now more properly referred to as 'Taíno' (Allaire 2013: 97; Honychurch 2000: 14). This terminology is confusing, as both the 'Caribs' and 'Arawak' spoke Arawakan – not Cariban – languages (Taylor & Hoff 1980: 302). Of course, "the Spaniards did not come here as anthropologists."³⁵ Indeed, scholars have argued that this was a conscious process of othering that had implications in Europe related to the perceived validity of the colonization of the region (Boucher 1992: 6; Lenik 2012: 84). The term 'Carib' carried strong negative connotations, linked with the practice of cannibalism and 'Caribs' were frequently described as warlike and ferocious (Honychurch 2000: 15; Keegan & Hofman 2017: 14 & 240). The myth of the friendly and peaceful 'Arawak' and the violent and cannibalistic 'Caribs' can still be found to persist in schoolbooks and in the mindset of people throughout the region today (Con Aguilar *et al.* 2017: 337).

Caribbean Indigenous communities, archaeologists, (ethno) historians, linguists, and other scholars have done extensive research, and undertaken political and educational lobbying since the 1940s to put a halt to spreading this stereotypical dichotomy and to reflect newer perceptions of identity (Honychurch 2000: 3). As part of this process, the renaming of some Amerindian peoples has been proposed and in some places this has been politically and officially implemented. In the case of Dominica, the contemporary Indigenous community on the island revisited the writings of French missionary Raymond Breton who visited the island in 1642 and extensively recorded the language of the Amerindian population (Breton [1665] 1892; [1666] 1900; [1667] 1877). He had written that the people there called themselves *Callinago* or *Calliponam* (in the men's and women's languages respectively; *cf.* Allaire 2013: 97; Honychurch 2000: 14). Although the female term, *Karifuna*, was initially adopted by the Indigenous activists in the 1980s, today they primarily refer to themselves by the male term, *Kalinago* (Honychurch 2000: 14). The renaming of the community from 'Carib' to 'Kalinago' was officially passed in Dominica on 20th February 2015 and also led to the renaming of the community's collective lands from 'Carib Reserve' to 'Kalinago Territory' (Carib Reserve (Amendment) Act 2015). Dominican historian Lennox Honychurch had previously already interpreted this renaming of communities and locations as being an important part of the Indigenous revival movement occurring on the island and elsewhere in the Caribbean region (Honychurch 2000: 4).

Having sketched the intricacies surrounding the naming of various Amerindian peoples, we will now consider the history of the Kalinago in particular. The Kalinago are believed to have settled Wai'tukubuli and the neighboring islands between AD 1250-1400 (Allaire 2013; Bérard 2008; Boomert 1986; Boomert 2009; Honychurch 1995: 21; Keegan & Hofman 2017: 232-233). The Kalinago lived a life strongly connected to the ocean and they did not restrict their movements to individual islands, instead utilizing the resources of different areas, often seasonally (Bérard *et al.* 2016: 133; Callaghan 2013: 290-293; Hofman 2013: 209; Hofman & Carlin 2010: 107-108;

35 Conversation with guide at *Centro Indígena Caguana* (Utuado, Puerto Rico, 29 January 2015).

Hofman & Hoogland 2012: 69; Hofman & Hoogland 2015: 102; Shearn 2014: 368). With the European settlement in and invasion of the Caribbean region, this pattern of trade and movement in the Lesser Antilles was disrupted – initially only irregularly, later more and more destructively (Hofman & Hoogland 2012; Hofman *et al.* 2014: 602; Shafie *et al.* 2017: 65). In the early 16th century, mainly the Spanish interacted with the Kalinago: landing on their islands, engaging in skirmishes, and capturing Kalinago to transport them as slaves to other islands (Bright 2011: 47; Honychurch 1995: 33-34; Lenik 2012: 84). The active resistance of the Kalinago coupled with the mountainous terrain of the island is often cited as the reason that European influence in Dominica was kept minimal for several centuries. It is estimated that by 1569 around 70 Europeans and Africans were living among the Kalinago – presumably many of these had been taken in after being shipwrecked – with no European settlement on the island (Honychurch 1995: 37).

The British were the first to officially ‘claim’ the island in 1627, with the French following soon after (Honychurch 1995: 38-39). Despite these claims, both the French and the British were mainly stationed on other islands, only infrequently interacting with the Kalinago on Dominica for trading or raiding. In the 1640s, French missionaries visited the island for longer periods and left records of the Kalinago and their culture (*e.g.* Raymond Breton, mentioned above). In 1660, the French signed a treaty with the Kalinago, promising not to colonize Dominica and St. Vincent (Honychurch 1995: 43). This was a period in which the French and the British fought extensively over control of the Lesser Antilles (Shafie *et al.* 2017: 65-66). The Kalinago on Dominica and the neighboring islands were directly entangled in this struggle by joining into battles and varyingly supporting one or the other side, as well as indirectly by having their usual movements in the region restricted by Europeans (Honychurch 1995: 46; Shafie *et al.* 2017). When France and Britain signed a peace treaty in 1686, Dominica was designated as a neutral island to be left to the Kalinago (Honychurch 1995: 47). However, although settlement was prohibited by this treaty, nothing was said about temporary use of the island, for instance to collect wood or other resources. It was the French who first began to slowly encroach on Dominica’s Kalinago population over the course of the 18th century. Initially, families and individuals were stationed there temporarily, but as these became permanent settlements, a commander was appointed in 1727 (Honychurch 1995: 49-50). The non-Kalinago population of the island was rapidly increasing, with the French settlers and planters outnumbered by enslaved Africans in 1745 (Honychurch 1995: 54-55). Despite the signing of a new treaty of neutrality between the French and the British in 1748, the French kept their influence on the island. By 1750, the living space of the Kalinago had been restricted to the leeward side of the island (Honychurch 1995: 50).

The Seven Years War between France and Britain (1756-1763) was mainly fought at sea or on other islands, with the exception of the capture of Dominica by the British in 1761 (Honychurch 1995: 58). It was officially ceded to the British in 1763 after the French had gradually expanded their influence on the island for over 100 years (Honychurch 1995: 60). During this period of unrest, many enslaved Africans escaped inland and formed maroon communities (Honychurch 1995: 93). It was British surveyor John Byres in 1776 who first officially set aside a piece of the island for the Kalinago, 134 acres on the Eastern coast (see figure 16; Honychurch

2000: 173). In a later map made by surveyor Hesketh Bell, this lot was erroneously calculated to be 232 acres. The first map legally bound the Kalinago not only to one island – while they had previously been mobile in a wide seascape – but to a small acreage on the rugged East coast of the island. The end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century were characterized by even more uncertainty and colonial violence: the French briefly recaptured the island (1778-1783), they invaded again in 1795, and the British and local maroon communities were engaged in a number of wars between 1785-1815 (Honychurch 1995: 84-116). The Kalinago were involved in several of these struggles, either choosing to fight on one side or being unintentionally affected by the conflict (Bright 2011: 47).

At the start of the 20th century, Hesketh Bell brought up the issue of the Kalinago's land and delineated a much larger area, 3700 acres or roughly 2% of the island, as a 'Carib Reserve' in his 1901 map (Honychurch 2000: 173). This plan not only officially gave the Kalinago a much larger tract of land, but also supported the appointment and official recognition of a Kalinago chief who would receive a governmental allowance (Honychurch 1995: 161). Although the boundaries of the land remained an issue, this did give the Kalinago a small amount of political autonomy and also served to make the community slightly more visible to the government. Despite the initial positive effects of this governmental interference, the situation exploded violently in 1930 with an event that became known as the Carib War (Honychurch 2000: 183-185). Police came into the reserve searching, as they said, for smuggled goods such as liquor and tobacco. The Kalinago had been used to trading by canoe with Guadeloupe, for instance, and selling items without license. Now, the police decided to seize some goods and arrest suspects. The Kalinago grouped up around the policemen, throwing sticks and stones. The police fired back at the crowd, killing two Kalinago and injuring two more, before escaping from the 'Reserve.' Violence escalated when the Administrator of Dominica asked the Royal Navy for assistance, who stationed a frigate off the coast of the 'Reserve.' The Navy threatened and frightened the Kalinago by prohibiting their movement on sea, firing star-shells, displaying searchlights at night, and searching for suspects on land by day. After an inquiry, a commission demoted the chief and the Kalinago were stripped of the administrative rights they had had (Honychurch 2000: 186). Today, a Kalinago Memorial for the two men who were killed can still be visited in the Salybia area.

Since this violent clash between the Kalinago and the government, the position and autonomy of the Kalinago community has slowly improved. In 1937 a 'Carib Council' with a chairman was established by the government and, after many years of petitioning by the Kalinago, the Administrator approved the installment of a new chief in 1952 (Honychurch 2000: 207). Following the independence of Dominica in 1978, the responsibilities of the council and the regulation of the election of chiefs was consolidated even further by an Act of Parliament (Carib Reserve Act, Chapter 25:90, 1978). As mentioned previously, the communal lands were officially renamed to 'Kalinago Territory' as recently as 2015. It consists of seven settlements, from North to South: Bataka, Crayfish River, Salybia, St. Cyr, Gaulette River, Mahaut River, and Sineku (Honychurch 2000: 179).

Today, Dominica is one of the most sparsely populated island countries in the Caribbean region with a population of just over 71,000 (Commonwealth of Dominica



Figure 16: Surveyor John Byres' map of Dominica, 1776.

2011: 6). In the official census of 2011, 2145 persons were registered as living in the Kalinago Territory, although the Kalinago themselves estimate their number to be approximately 3000, which is also echoed elsewhere³⁶ (Commonwealth of Dominica 2011: 18; Smith 2006: 74). Marked by this low population density, and turning its underdevelopment into an asset, the island with its many high peaks, jagged valleys, and lush natural parks has been branded ‘the nature island’ (Smith 2006: 73). While most of the Caribbean tourist destinations are known for their sandy beaches and comfortable resorts, Dominica is described in opposite terms, as a pure, simple, natural, and adventurous place. In the Kalinago Territory, some say that “if Columbus returned, Dominica would be the only island he’d recognize.”³⁷ The same sentiment was also expressed at a meeting in the Kalinago Territory by Prime Minister Roosevelt Skerrit: “Where in the world, where in the world today, has such utopia been realized [as in Dominica]?” (Skerrit 2015: min. 23:13) This representation of Dominica as ‘the nature island’ is in no small part strengthened by the presence of the Kalinago. Initially, in advertisements in the 1960s, the image of Dominica as the “home of the last of the Caribs” (Honychurch 2000: 73) was propagated by the Dominica Tourist Association beyond the control of the Kalinago. Today, similar vocabulary can still be found on Dominica’s official tourism website: “Dominica is the only Caribbean island with a remaining population of pre-Columbian Carib Indians.”³⁸ However, the same language is also echoed by the Kalinago themselves: “Dominica is the home of [...] Kalinagos, the remaining survivors of the first inhabitants of the island.”³⁹ It is in this complex history of settlement, colonization, marginalization, cultural revival, identity formation, and representation that one must place the creation of a museum in the Kalinago Territory.

The Kalinago Barana Autê

The Kalinago Barana Autê (meaning ‘Kalinago Village by the Sea’; KBA) is an open air museum located in the Kalinago Territory, overlooking the Atlantic Ocean. It is a grassroots initiative, as the plans for the project were developed within the Kalinago community. These first plans and proposals called the KBA a “Carib Cultural Village.” Today, the KBA can be characterized as an ecomuseum. This section will first provide a history of the development of the KBA, then describe the ecomuseum as it appears to visitors today, and finally characterize the KBA as an ongoing community engagement project.

The idea for the (model) cultural village first appeared on paper in a proposal written by visiting anthropologist Arthur Einhorn in 1972 (Smith 2006: 78). Einhorn stated that the concept was already envisioned by several individuals in the Territory. Indeed, interest in the development of Kalinago cultural heritage can also be identified

36 *About Us*, Kalinago Territory website: <http://kalinagoterritory.com/about-us/> (Accessed: 22 January 2016)

37 Conversation with interviewee KBA#16 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

38 *History & Culture*, Discover Dominica Authority: <http://www.dominica.dm/index.php/history-a-culture> (Accessed: 22 January 2016)

39 *About Dominica*, Kalinago Territory website: <http://kalinagoterritory.com/getting-here/about-dominica/> (Accessed: 22 January 2016)

in the story of the children's book *In Our Carib Indian Village* written by then Chief Faustulus Frederick and Elizabeth Shepherd (1971). Frederick developed these ideas into his own proposal for a cultural village, which was submitted to the government of Dominica in 1976 (Honychurch 2000: 214). According to his idea, the village would consist of thatched houses, containing craft workshops, canoe building sheds, a small restaurant, and a kitchen for preparing cassava meals (see figure 17). The main aim of the project, as envisioned by the Chief, was to create employment within the Territory, a part of which would be achieved by including huts for overnight visitors. Although most literature credits Frederick as being the first Kalinago to present the idea of the cultural village, this is contested by some other families in the Territory who claim they came up with the idea first.⁴⁰ Ultimately, it was Frederick's proposal which first got the attention of the government and was reworked by a team of consultants from the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in 1982 (Smith 2006: 214). This team prepared a report, which outlined a number of recommendations for the further development of the project. A proposal for funding was then attached to the 1987 *Report on Carib Cultural Village* by the National Development Corporation. This proposal stated an aim of the project that echoed Chief Frederick's intention, albeit in more openly economic terms:

The main objective of the project is to develop a tourism product around indigenous resources that will ensure job creation as well as a viable tourist attraction that is in keeping with Dominica's tourism strategy.

National Development Corporation (quoted in Honychurch 2000: 213)

The project stagnated in the late 1980s due to lack of funds (Smith 2006: 78). This was caused by the fact that the land in the Kalinago Territory is held in common ownership which, at the time, made it impossible to receive a loan against property. The plans for the cultural village were revived in 1994 as part of the Caribbean Development Bank's *Upgrading of Ecotourism Sites Project* (UESP) that provided loans to tourist sites around the country (Smith 2006: 78). The government, through the Minister of Tourism, was able to apply for this loan and thus, at this point, took over and ran the development project. It was noted already by the ILO in 1982 that both the chief and his council were aware of the fact that the development of such a heritage site would inevitably have a cultural impact on the Kalinago community and would result in local changes. It was reported that "they were more than willing to accept [these changes] in order to obtain increased income" (ILO Carib Village Report 1982, quoted in Honychurch 2000: 214). It had not been the intention of the Kalinago to have the cultural village as a governmental project, but due to financial restraints this proved to be the only way (at the time) that the project could be completed.

As a project headed by the government, construction of the actual heritage village itself was put out for competitive tender. Effectively, this excluded the Kalinago from building their own project, as they did not have the financial resources to put in a bid. Besides not giving the Kalinago the chance to invest their own time and energy into the construction of the site (thus creating a sense of involvement), this also meant that the

40 Conversation with interviewee KBA#16 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).



Figure 18: Map of the Kalinago Barana Autê, posted near the entrance.

village was built without the use of Kalinago tools, skills, and cultural traditions – such as cutting timber during a dark moon to avoid rotting. It has been argued that the resulting model village is a construction “that could never have been built by Caribs” (Smith 2006: 80). Furthermore, some Kalinago argue that the site was constructed poorly and therefore requires extensive – and expensive – maintenance.⁴¹ Although a project manager from the Kalinago community was appointed in 2002, the KBA ultimately falls under the responsibility of the Ministry for Tourism. It was stated at the time that the intention of the Ministry was to eventually hand over responsibility for the heritage site to the Kalinago Chief and Council, once they had met certain requirements. The KBA was opened to the public in 2006. Since then, the ownership of the ecomuseum has remained the same, falling under the government and the Ministry of Tourism, while being managed locally by a member of the Kalinago community. Naturally, this has complicated the degree to which the Kalinago community can feel connected to the site and has also influenced the value that the KBA has for them (see *Perceiving the Kalinago Barana Autê*, page 119).

The KBA today contains fewer buildings than were initially planned for the site (see figure 18). Visitors most often come to the site in groups as part of island tours, cruise packages, or in school groups. Visitors who come to the site on their own, without a guide, are less common. For all visitors, the experience of the KBA follows a similar plan. Visitors are greeted by a tour guide and gathered in the interpretation center. This small building contains a number of panels with images and information, which tell

41 Conversations with interviewee KBA#1 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 31 July 2015) & interviewee KBA#48 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

visitors about the prehistory of the Kalinago on the island and in the whole region, as well as the more recent history of the Territory and its Chiefs. Whenever a tour guide is available, she or he will meet the group of visitors here and discuss these topics. The guide will also show a number of Kalinago objects to the visitors, such as a cured snake skin, a woven fish trap, or basketry. Upon leaving the interpretation center, the rest of the visit takes place in the form of a tour through the model village. Due to the sloping terrain of the KBA and the generally hot weather, the tour has a slow pace, with frequent stops to discuss cultural elements and examine different structures and natural features. Thus, the tour passes over the small Crayfish River, while the guide describes traditional fishing methods, and past a canoe where shipbuilding and the Kalinago connection to the sea are explained. Then, the group visits the *karbay*, also called *taboui*, the large house or hall where the men would gather. In the *karbay*, visitors learn about the traditional organization of the Kalinago. Often, craft vendors can be found here, selling jewelry made of seeds and plants, as well as basketry and decorated calabash. On the stage inside the *karbay* traditional dances and music are sometimes performed by one of the Kalinago cultural groups, but this generally has to be arranged beforehand. Further along the path are a number of smaller *ajoupas* (shelters against sun and rain) and *mouinas* (family houses). In these smaller houses or huts, visitors learn about traditional food and drink, as well as family life. It is also here where visitors can learn how cassava and sugar cane are produced and prepared, and taste cassava bread and herbal tea. The tour continues along the coast past panoramic coastal views to explore the trees and plants that are endemic to the island. When visitors pass along the river a second time, they will learn about the ways in which the Kalinago dye *larouma* reeds which are used for weaving. The tour concludes at the viewpoint over the ocean, near the entrance to the site. This is where visitors will find the facilities, a picnic area, and small restaurant, all of which are in traditionally styled buildings. This is also where the guide talks about the previous Chiefs while visitors can view the wooden sculpted heads that are on display, representing each Chief. The slow-paced stop-and-go nature of the tour following a number of different topics allows visitors plenty of time to interact with the guide and ask questions. Observations by myself, as well as the staff of the KBA, note that visitors are generally satisfied with the tour. However, on occasion, there is a disparity between visitors' expectations of the KBA and reality. Namely, visitors sometimes expect the KBA to be a *living* Indigenous village where they will encounter the Kalinago community living in traditional fashion in the houses on the site (as opposed to a non-inhabited model village). This misunderstanding might stem from the fact that the visiting public does not always distinguish between the advertisements of the Kalinago Territory (as the place where the Kalinago live) and the Kalinago Barana Autê (as a model of a traditional Kalinago village).

The experience of these non-Kalinago visitors to the KBA is markedly different from the use of the site by the Kalinago community themselves. The Kalinago rarely visit the KBA as part of a tour, only as part of a school outing, for instance, or to bring visiting friends. Instead, the Kalinago use the site in other ways and the accessibility of the site for the community is maintained by providing unrestricted and free entry for community members. Even before the KBA was built, the Kalinago living in the surrounding area were used to visiting the mouth of the Crayfish River, the falls, and the pools. This tradition is still kept today, with people visiting the pools to meet friends

and family, to bathe in the river or sea, and to relax. However, with the construction of the KBA, the community has added new ways in which they use the site. Most obvious, perhaps, is the use of the site as a place of employment, for instance for tour guides, guards, cooks, or craft vendors. Indirect employment has also been created for people to deliver goods or services to the KBA, for instance the dancers of the cultural groups, the cassava bread bakery, the people who maintain the site, or those who sell the vetiver grass that is used as thatching on the roofs. In addition to employment opportunities, the KBA has also become a venue for community events. Workshops, gatherings, or meetings are organized regularly and some people stop by the KBA just to visit their friends or family who are working there. Festive events, such as birthday parties, graduations, or weddings are also celebrated within the KBA. Thus, while for visitors the KBA is mainly a cultural and educational experience, for the Kalinago community it is principally a place that supports community socializing and creates employment opportunities.

The Kalinago Barana Autê fits the definition of an ecomuseum as described in an earlier chapter (see *Ecomuseums*, page 73). It is a museum that was developed as the result of a grassroots initiative with a strong focus on a particular community, in this case the Kalinago community. The KBA extends beyond the walls of the museum building (the interpretation center) into a wider landscape, encompassing both structural and natural elements. Environmental sustainability is emphasized in the traditional materials used on the site, while cultural preservation and transmission (to younger generations of Kalinago and to visitors) form the core of the tour of the KBA. Cultural preservation is also encouraged by some of the employment opportunities that support traditional crafts and skills, such as basketry or woodworking. This leads to the fourth aspect of ecomuseums, skill development, which is again encouraged by employment opportunities related to the KBA, but also by hosting training sessions and workshops for community members on site. The KBA is not a finished community engagement project, but rather an ongoing and long-term process of collaboration and negotiation between Dominica's government (Ministry of Tourism) and the Kalinago community.

Fieldwork: Aims and Experiences

The Kalinago Territory and the Kalinago Barana Autê (KBA) were first visited in March 2015 during a week-long stay in Dominica. During the regional survey of Caribbean museums, the KBA was identified as a complex case of an ecomuseum that began as a grassroots initiative, but was taken over and developed as a governmental project. As part of the aim to investigate a wide range of types of communities, it was preferred to also include modern Caribbean Indigenous communities.⁴² The Kalinago Barana Autê was selected as a case study based on a number of parameters (see *Case Studies*, page 58). The complex position of the KBA, as being guided by both governmental and community influence and desires, led to the hypothesis that this might be an area of

42 It should be noted here that the Kalinago are not the only living Caribbean Indigenous community, nor is the KBA the only Caribbean Indigenous heritage site included in the regional museum survey. Other examples include Belize's *Luba Garifuna Cultural Museum*, the *Santa Rosa First Nations Community Museum* in Trinidad & Tobago, or the Indigenous inhabitants of the dual villages of *Christiaankondre* & *Langemankondre* in Suriname.

contention or conflict. This could possibly provide thought-provoking insights into the dynamics of the process of community engagement between the Kalinago and government over the KBA.

This particular study of the KBA was framed by other fieldwork studies conducted in roughly the same time period by colleagues in the NEXUS1492 and associated research projects. Around this time, multiple colleagues worked within the Kalinago Territory: Eldris Con Aguilar (teacher workshops on indigenous heritage), Jimmy Mans (oral histories and indigenous legacies), Samantha de Ruiter (archaeological fieldwork of settlement patterns), Eloise Stancioff (heritage and landscape changes), and Amy Strecker (indigenous rights). Although they were couched in different disciplines and collected different types of data, all of these studies were based on community collaboration. While this study of the KBA did not directly overlap with any of these previous studies, the presence of these researchers will have impacted the community and may have engaged the same community members in surveys, interviews, or other interactions with researchers. When asked, community members were generally positive about contributing to foreign-based research projects, but clearly stated their wish for research results to return to the Territory for their benefit.

The main fieldwork was set up to take place in the Kalinago Territory from July 28th – August 21st 2015. I spent this time living in the territory as part of the community and taking part in a number of community events to provide context to the fieldwork by means of participant observation. This method enables the fieldworker to experience a community and the behavior of its members and also to intellectualize everything that has been seen or heard; to be able to place things into perspective (Bernard 2006: 344). Being able to do this requires a certain amount of ‘insider knowledge’ and firsthand experience. Secondly, it has been noted in many fieldwork campaigns that presence builds trust (Bernard 2006: 354). This also proved to be true in this case. I was frequently asked where I was staying as I moved through the Territory and spoke to people. When I replied that I was renting a room with a well-known community member (rather than staying outside the Territory), this frequently led respondents to feel more at ease and more willing to engage in a conversation. In addition, this allowed community members to come by at a later time to answer questions when it was more suitable, or to simply stop by to ask how the research was progressing. It cannot be overemphasized how important ‘hanging out’ is to build rapport (Bernard 2006: 368). In the case of this fieldwork, it was also valuable for establishing a common ground to initiate conversations. For instance, it was an excellent ice breaker to start a conversation based on both having been to the cricket game last weekend.

Although traditional anthropological field research often takes a year or longer, many studies can be completed in a number of weeks or months (Bernard 2006: 349). If the fieldworker, for instance, already speaks the native language and is familiar with (some of the etiquette of) the community, this reduces a number of boundaries between fieldworker and community members and fieldwork can thus be sped up. This was the case for me in the Kalinago Territory. In addition, having visited the Territory once before, I was already in contact with a number of Kalinago community members, which again facilitated access to the community. Due to the short time frame available for the fieldwork for this case study, participatory rapid assessment was used, which

requires having clear questions and a limited amount of variables ready before entering the field (Bernard 2006: 353).

Besides participant observation, I had arranged a survey to be completed as a self-administered questionnaire and also prepared questions for interviews with members of the community who were particularly involved in the KBA. The full survey can be found in the appendix (see *Questionnaire: Kalinago Barana Autê*, page 257). The questions that were incorporated in the survey and the oral interviews were derived from information gathered from informal open interviews conducted during the first visit to the Kalinago Territory and the KBA. Such informal interviews are particularly helpful at the start of a fieldwork campaign to identify which topics are valuable to explore in more detail (Bernard 2006: 211).

At the outset, I planned to complete the survey/self-administered questionnaire by using a street-intercept method (Bernard 2006: 257). The plan was to walk around the Kalinago Territory, asking people to “please answer a few questions about the KBA,” and then giving them the survey on paper with a pen. For this reason, the survey was kept brief and the questions were short and relatively easy to answer as they were opinion-based. However, it became apparent from the first day of trying to administer the survey as a questionnaire, that this method was not preferential to the community. The first respondent requested that I read the questions out loud and write down his answers.⁴³ I gave the next several respondents the choice of either filling it out themselves or having me read out the questions and write down the answers; each respondent preferred the latter. After having established this to be a general preference, I decided to read the questions and write down the answers myself by default, unless the respondent indicated that they wished to self-administer the questionnaire. Thus, the survey ultimately became a series of face-to-face interviews, with a few self-administered questionnaires as exceptions. Low literacy levels can be identified as one of the reasons for this preference by community members: although not stated overtly by respondents, discomfort with writing was observed in those cases where persons did self-administer the questionnaire, regardless of age.

The survey contained closed questions (with multiple choice options), open-ended questions, and 5-point scales (Bernard 2006: 269 & 273). Depending on how the survey was conducted (self-administered questionnaire or face-to-face interview), differences may have occurred in how some questions were answered. For instance, question #7 “Is there anything you would like to see changed about the Kalinago Barana Autê?” offered a number of categories as answers on paper. However, when verbally asked this question, the respondent would generally begin to answer without hearing the options and in these cases I would select an appropriate category (or ‘other’). On the other hand, answers written by respondents to open-ended questions were often more brief than those written down ad verbatim by me. Indeed, in the case of a few self-administered questionnaires, some questions were skipped by respondents altogether.

The street-intercept method was applied on roughly half of the fieldwork days. On these days, I mainly approached people who were on their land, around their homes, in the shops, or walking on the main roads. Although community members were often

43 Conversation with interviewee KBA#1 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 31 July 2015).



Figure 19: The Kalinago Territory cricket tournament was a wonderful event for hanging out with the community and also offered opportunities for conducting surveys.

occupied when approached in these places, hanging laundry, working, farming the land, doing crafts, or engaged in social activities such as hair braiding or dominoes, many were very willing to participate in the survey – often continuing their ongoing activity in the meantime. Many people in the community spend a significant part of the day outside their homes, on their terraces, in their yards, on their land, or in public spaces. Thus, I chose to approach people in these spaces, rather than to knock on doors and intrude on people inside their homes. On the remainder of the days, different methods were applied to approach community members in other situations. For instance, I visited the local clinic in Salybia on a few days, surveying patients in the waiting room. I also approached community members during a number of events, such as during the games of the Kalinago Territory cricket tournament (played on the weekends in the Territory; see figure 19) or prior to the start of the “Keeping it Real” public meeting of Dominica’s Cabinet of Ministers with district members held at the Salybia Primary School. By combining these methods, it was possible to survey both men and women of all ages, throughout large parts of the community.

Most community members approached throughout the fieldwork campaign were willing to participate in the survey. In a couple of cases, people were hesitant and stated that they “don’t know anything about that.” When I explained that the survey was more a matter of opinions than facts, most people agreed to answer the questions. Sometimes people would prefer to first see someone else, such as a family member, do the survey (“Granny, you go first”), before offering to also answer the same questions.

Over the course of the fieldwork campaign, only 6 people declined to participate in the survey. In total, 150 surveys were completed.

Additionally, one in depth interview was completed with the then manager of the KBA. Although more interviews had been planned initially, due to the change of the survey to a mainly interview format, this one interview was deemed salient to understand the workings of the KBA, some of the ongoing issues, as well as planned changes. In actuality, many of the surveys conducted as face-to-face interviews contained more questions than the ones on the paper, as respondents naturally turned these interviews into longer conversations. In many cases, they were very interested in me and the overall purpose of the survey and its initial results. Some community members insisted to first ask me a few questions, before answering the questions in the survey.

The aim of this case study was to understand the Kalinago community's perceptions of the KBA. Firstly, I wanted to know more about the issue of governmental ownership: did this affect community members' visitation of the site? Was this something that community members resented? Secondly, the aim was to uncover the importance of the site and its benefits for the community as they perceived it. Was the museum an important locus of community identity? Did it create employment opportunities? Or did all the income leave the Territory to the Ministry? Finally, I wanted to find out how community members would like to see the KBA changed or improved. At the outset, I had anticipated that community members might be dissatisfied with the ownership of the KBA, its entry fees (as being too high), or that they might overall not feel very involved or invested in the museum. However, this did not prove to be the case for the majority of the Kalinago community surveyed.

Perceiving the Kalinago Barana Autê

This following section will present the results of the survey and interviews held in the Kalinago Territory as part of the case study fieldwork. The collated, categorized, and calculated survey responses can be found in the appendix (see *Questionnaire Results: Kalinago Barana Autê*, page 257). This section begins by presenting the basic statistics and demographics of the survey respondents, before delving more deeply into the community's perceptions of the Kalinago Barana Autê (KBA) based on values and benefits that were identified in the fieldwork data. Following the methodology described in the previous section, 150 surveys were conducted along with one in depth interview. This interview was with the then manager of the KBA, a member of the Kalinago community who lives in the Territory. The majority of the surveys were conducted as face-to-face interviews, with only c. 20 of them completed as self-administered questionnaires. Although only a small segment of the Kalinago community was surveyed, namely 5-7%,⁴⁴ both genders are well represented and the age groups are fairly well represented.

⁴⁴ This percentage depends on how one measures the size of the Kalinago population. If one uses the 2011 census of a population of 2145 persons, the survey included 7% of the community (Commonwealth of Dominica 2011: 18). Instead using the approximation of 3000 persons from the Kalinago Territory website, gives a 5% representation of the community.

The results of the survey were presented, for feedback and discussion, to members of the Kalinago community during a special meeting held at the KBA, 18 March 2016 (see *Case Studies*, page 58). Community members present at this meeting, many of whom work at the KBA, noted that they considered the 150 surveys to be a representative sample size. Furthermore, they noted that they found the results themselves also to be representative, based on their own conversations about the KBA with other community members. They were interested in recommendations on how to move forward with the future plans of the KBA by incorporating these results. They stated that many of the issues revealed in the survey results were known to them through conversations, but that they had until now lacked the data to support these notions. This enabled the usage of the preliminary survey results, for instance, to rework their mission statement or to apply for funding to make certain changes or improvements to the site.

Survey Demographics

Kalinago community members from all parts of the Territory were surveyed, by conducting surveys along the main roads, as well as at community gathering places such as important meetings, sporting events, and the central health clinic. In order to assess the value of the KBA for the Kalinago community as a whole, it was deemed necessary to ensure that community members of all ages and genders were represented. Furthermore, fieldwork aimed to achieve a demographic balance as much as possible, in order to eliminate the results being biased to specific groups within the community.

The gender balance in the survey respondents was almost exactly even with 74 female respondents and 76 male respondents (see figure 20). The age distribution of the respondents shows a lower representation by children (under 15) and those aged over 65, while there is a higher amount of teenagers (aged 15-24). Young children were surveyed less frequently, as they had some difficulty answering some of the open-ended questions, specifically related to the importance and benefit of the KBA for the community. Community members aged over 65 were approached as frequently as community members of other age groups, however several of them declined participating in the survey. Those who declined either believed that they did not have the knowledge required to answer the questions or only spoke Creole. The overrepresentation of teenaged respondents (aged 15-24) can be explained by, on the one hand, the extent to which they were curious about me and approached me (instead of vice versa), and, on the other hand, the extent to which this group socializes collectively in public – playing sports and attending events or just hanging out on the street. Especially the latter reason often led to several individuals of this age group wishing to be surveyed one after the other.

Visitation of the KBA

In identifying the value of the Kalinago Barana Autê for the Kalinago community, the first criteria was set as the visitation of the KBA by community members. It was hypothesized that community visitation of the site would not be high and that, therefore, the value of the KBA as a place to visit would not be particularly significant. This hypothesis was based on the (in retrospect) erroneous assumption that the entry fee of the KBA would be too steep for community members to visit on a regular basis. The error of this assumption was pointed out early in the course of the fieldwork: although

not openly advertised, members of the Kalinago community can enter the site free of charge and freely. Using the walking trails and the old coastal road, they are able to access the site without having to use to main entrance. The site is not fenced off in any way, but is overseen by security guards after hours. Community members can and do




Figure 20: Gender and age distributions of survey respondents in Dominica.




Figure 21: Respondents' visitation percentage and number of visits to the Kalinago Barana Autê.




Figure 22: Respondents' reasons for visiting the Kalinago Barana Autê.

use the site at any time of the day. The manager explained that “the intention was to leave the facility a hundred percent accessible to the local residents.”⁴⁵

The importance of the KBA for the Kalinago community was reflected in the survey results related to visitation of the site. Except for six respondents, everyone else stated that they had visited the KBA since its opening in 2006 (see figure 21). Those who had not visited the KBA, alternately said it was too difficult to go there (physically, because of the access road), that they pass through there but do not specifically ‘visit’ the place, or that there was no particular reason that they had not been to the KBA. Of those respondents who had visited the KBA, an overwhelming majority stated that they had visited more than 5 times, exclaiming “oh! Many times!” “hundred times!” or “ten, twenty, fifty times.”

It is clear, then, that the KBA is a place for the Kalinago community to visit and that most of them choose to visit the site frequently. Reasons for the visitation of the heritage site by the community can be grouped into roughly four categories: recreational, social, professional, and educational. Recreational reasons, such as visiting the site “for enjoyment,” “for an event,” or “to bathe” were mentioned most often by the respondents and were clearly the first major association with visitation of the KBA when asked (see figure 22). These recreational reasons sometimes overlapped with, or were closely tied to, social reasons, such as visiting the KBA “for an event,” “for meetings,” or for “taking visiting friends or relatives.” However, overtly social reasons were stated much less frequently than reasons of recreation. Professional reasons were also less frequently stated, noting visitation “as staff,” “as a performer or artist,” “as a tour guide,” “to sell crafts/souvenirs,” “to build or maintain the site,” or for “business/meetings.” This grouping of professional reasons is quite diverse and reflects community members who are employed directly by the KBA (as staff or guides), those hired incidentally by the KBA (such as the dance groups or maintenance workers), or those who use the site of the KBA as their place for work (such as the craft vendors or those attending business meetings on site). Finally, the category of educational reasons was the least important for community visitation of the heritage site, reflected in the survey by the response “to learn about my heritage.” Ultimately, the Kalinago community most of all associates visiting the KBA with recreation.

Importance of the KBA

The importance of the KBA for the Kalinago is already implicitly clear in the survey results from the frequency of community visitation. However, this result is echoed strongly in the responses to the direct question of the importance of the KBA (see figure 23). Almost all of the respondents, 97%, stated that they considered the KBA to be “a lot” or “extremely” important to the community. None of the respondents felt negatively about the importance of the KBA. In an open question, respondents were asked to elaborate and explain why they felt that the KBA was important for their community (in total 132 responses, some with multiple reason). It is interesting to note that in answering this question, respondents only rarely thought of their own personal visitation of the site for recreational or social reasons as a reason for the

45 Interview with manager of *Kalinago Barana Autê* (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).





Figure 23: Respondents' assessment of the importance of the Kalinago Barana Autê.

KBA's importance. Instead, communal importance was more frequently associated with other reasons.

Chief of these reasons are those that can be termed internal cultural reasons, for instance related to the preservation of the Kalinago heritage, knowledge of the ancestors, or the teaching of Kalinago history within the own community. One respondent stated that the KBA "is important because this is the only place you could know about the Kalinago history."⁴⁶ Another respondent noted its importance by saying that "it has helped to reidentify the Carib people."⁴⁷ The importance of the KBA as a place to learn about the community's ancestors was also noted: "because it is an Indigenous place and there we get a lot of information about our ancestors."⁴⁸

An almost equally important category of reasons was the one related to the attraction of tourists or visitors from outside the community. The KBA is thus considered an important hub that draws people to the community "because so many people come all the time to visit."⁴⁹ The importance of the KBA as such an attraction was usually not stated specifically in economic terms, but rather as bringing people together and creating awareness for the Kalinago: "it brings a lot of visitors to our island to visit our people and heritage"⁵⁰ or "we have visitors worldwide every day."⁵¹ The KBA is seen as

46 Survey KBA#3 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 7 August 2015).

47 Survey KBA#39 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 11 August 2015).

48 Survey KBA#89 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

49 Survey KBA#24 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

50 Survey KBA#49 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

51 Survey KBA#76 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

the focal point of the whole Territory, specifically for drawing in visitors from beyond the community, it is the “most important site in the Territory.”⁵²

Separately grouped are the responses that are specifically related to economic importance, either the direct employment opportunities at the KBA or the increased income to the Kalinago Territory as a whole thanks to its attraction of visitors. One respondent said that the KBA was important “because of the employment for the Kalinago people and for tourism.”⁵³ Another respondent explained that “as a tourist attraction site, it can help to improve the economy of the Territory, which could change the lives of families and communities in general.”⁵⁴ This sentiment was put even more strongly by another respondent who said “I view the KBA as the economic artery of the Territory.”⁵⁵

Importance related to the enjoyment of the KBA or the use of the museum for events or meetings was less frequently overtly stated by the respondents, despite (as mentioned above) the high visitation of the site by community members. It is possible that while individuals visit the site frequently, they do not associate *personal* recreation and enjoyment with importance for the *community*. It is likely that the phrasing of the question led respondents to downplay this recreational/personal importance. More often, community events are mentioned: “people celebrate anniversaries there and things are well attended.”⁵⁶ Nonetheless, some respondents noted the importance of “the pool to bathe and fish.”⁵⁷

Finally, a number of respondents gave other reasons that do not fall in the above-mentioned categories. For instance, one respondent stated that the KBA was “an important tourism tool to help create sustainable development.”⁵⁸ This respondent pictured the KBA as a model or good example for the development of other sustainable businesses in the Kalinago Territory. On the other hand, another respondent indicated that the community did not sufficiently appreciate the importance of the KBA: “we don’t participate as locals, we take it for granted, but it is important.”⁵⁹ The KBA can also function as a place to encourage talent, for dancers or crafts(wo)men, “because it helps them display talents and skills.”⁶⁰ One respondent stated the importance of the KBA in terms of its uniqueness, because “apart from the Barana Autê I don’t think there is any other place that has these kinds of activities and things.”⁶¹ Ultimately, it can be said that the communal importance of the KBA is most often seen in cultural terms and as a point of attraction for visitors, while employment or economic reasons are of less importance.

52 Survey KBA#132 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 16 August 2015).

53 Survey KBA#7 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 7 August 2015).

54 Survey KBA#84 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

55 Survey KBA#45 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

56 Survey KBA#83 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).



57 Survey KBA#35 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

58 Survey KBA#144 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 18 August 2015).

59 Survey KBA#130 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

60 Survey KBA#97 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

61 Survey KBA#115 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).



Benefits of the KBA

When respondents were asked to discuss the *benefits* of the KBA for the community, rather than its importance, responses were more diverse and included negative reactions (see figure 24). The responses indicate that the *intrinsic values* of the KBA are not contested, while the Kalinago community is more conflicted about the *instrumental values* of the KBA. Following the definition by John Holden, intrinsic values are those which pertain to “a subjective experience of culture” (Holden quoted in Scott 2009: 196). Instrumental values, on the other hand, are more clearly utilitarian and are associated with specific outcomes. This type of value is often also more tangible, quantifiable, and easier to measure, for instance economically. In her research, Carol Scott has identified intrinsic values in categories such as: well-being, empathetic, historical, spiritual, or social (Scott 2009: 201). Instrumental values are categorized as economic, capacity building, or learning, among others. In this survey, ‘importance’ was more often seen as a “subjective experience” and associated with intrinsic values. As mentioned above, the Kalinago community was overwhelmingly positive about these value. However, the communal ‘benefit’ of the KBA is seen as referring to tangible benefits and clear outcomes. When considering these values, the Kalinago community was much more divided. It appears that the Kalinago intrinsically (subjectively, emotionally) highly value the KBA, but that they are not all pleased with the actual, quantifiable outcomes that the KBA has generated.

A slight majority of the respondents, 53%, considered the KBA to be “a lot” or “extremely” beneficial. However, there is also a significant number of respondents, 25%, who stated that the KBA was “not at all” or “a little” beneficial. The remainder of

the respondents were neutral. This picture becomes more complex when one looks at the responses to the open question, asking respondents to elaborate on their perception of the KBA's communal benefit. These responses have been categorized in different groups, largely relating to the tone of positivity or negativity of the response or by the specific reason indicated, such as a cultural or economic reason. Some respondents (35) did not answer this open question or said something like "I don't know much about that"⁶² or "not too sure of that."⁶³

Beginning with those responses which were overall more positive in tone, we can identify a number of benefits which were also stated in the question regarding importance: cultural, employment, and attracts tourists. Employment is stated exactly as often as a positive benefit to the community as it was given as the reason the KBA is important to the community, namely by 32 respondents. Respondents noted: "the community benefits because people get employed"⁶⁴ and "people go there and work, and people do the crafts."⁶⁵ For some, the benefit of the KBA for the Kalinago community is seen as "mostly economically."⁶⁶ One respondent noted that the benefit of the KBA is that it is a "source of income for the Territory."⁶⁷

Linked to the perceived benefit of employment was the benefit of the KBA in attracting tourists or visitors. Respondents stated that "people come to visit"⁶⁸ and that because of the KBA "more tourists come to the Territory."⁶⁹ This was sometimes directly related to economic outcomes by stating that "tourists come to the shop."⁷⁰ In most cases, respondents did not elaborate much further on this point beyond stating that the KBA brings in visitors.

Cultural benefits were stated least of all, possibly because cultural values were perceived to be largely intrinsic and intangible and thus not associated with a more quantifiable term such as 'benefit.' When cultural values are mentioned, they are described in strongly positive terms. Respondents noted that the KBA is "a part of the culture of the Territory"⁷¹ and that it "reminds us of who we are as a people."⁷² Besides relating these benefits to identity, they are also connected with cultural preservation: "it helps educate the children and people, causing the Kalinago culture to remain active."⁷³ However, ambiguity of the community regarding the benefit of the KBA can be seen in one response which stated that "the community benefits from the preservation [of culture] but not financially."⁷⁴

Besides the positive responses indicating benefits of the KBA for cultural reasons, employment, or attracting tourists, some respondents more generally stated that "everyone

62 Survey KBA#134 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 16 August 2015).

63 Survey KBA#82 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

64 Survey KBA#3 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 7 August 2015).

65 Survey KBA#147 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 18 August 2015).

66 Survey KBA#77 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

67 Survey KBA#132 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 16 August 2015).

68 Survey KBA#65 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

69 Survey KBA#21 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

70 Survey KBA#17 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

71 Survey KBA#129 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

72 Survey KBA#141 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 16 August 2015).

73 Survey KBA#92 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

74 Survey KBA#39 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 11 August 2015).

benefits.”⁷⁵ It was noted of the KBA, that beyond being a museum, “it’s more community tourism, so most of the people are benefitting.”⁷⁶ One respondent explained that “directly or indirectly, they do [benefit]; it gives the Territory a good image.”⁷⁷

Despite these positive responses, and the abovementioned comment that in some way everyone in the community benefits, this is not perceived to be true by everyone. Some responses occupy a more negative middle ground, stating that the community is “not [benefitting] in the way that it should.”⁷⁸ One respondent felt that “more people could be employed”⁷⁹ and in the words of another respondent: “I feel that the Kalinago Barana Autê is under-exploited.”⁸⁰ These responses indicate that some community members, although seeing that there is a benefit of the KBA for the community, feel that this benefit could and should be greater.

More strongly negative responses come from community members who feel that *others* are benefitting from the KBA but they themselves, personally, are not. These responses frequently carry tones of envy: “much of the community does not benefit, only those who work here”⁸¹ or “we don’t really benefit, but the manager does.”⁸² Some even feel that the community does not benefit from the KBA at all, only the government: “it benefits the people who run it, not the community.”⁸³ Other responses note injustice in the division of the benefits of the KBA throughout the community: “so far, I have not seen it [the benefit], there are not enough jobs there, it is unfair.”⁸⁴ This same feeling was stated by another respondent who said that the KBA “creates some employment for some people in the Territory, a handful, the chosen ones from the management body. You feel left out.”⁸⁵

Finally, a group of respondents simply did not perceive there to be much or any benefit for the community from the KBA. These responses do not contain emotions related to envy or unfairness, but simply note a lack of benefit. Most of these responses were very brief. Respondents said the benefit of the KBA for the community was “not too much.”⁸⁶ Others said that the community benefitted “to an extent,”⁸⁷ “not really,”⁸⁸ or “not at this point.”⁸⁹

Ultimately, it is clear that while the community has no problems identifying the *importance* of the KBA, there is a greater division when it comes to assessing the *benefits* of the KBA. Some community members feel that everyone benefits, for instance by the good image which the KBA creates of the Territory or as a site that preserves Kalinago culture. Employment is clearly a contested benefit, with some respondents

75 Survey KBA#28 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

76 Survey KBA#58 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

77 Survey KBA#100 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

78 Survey KBA#57 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

79 Survey KBA#9 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 7 August 2015).

80 Survey KBA#91 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

81 Survey KBA#4 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 7 August 2015).

82 Survey KBA#25 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

83 Survey KBA#119 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

84 Survey KBA#136 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 16 August 2015).

85 Survey KBA#144 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 18 August 2015).

86 Survey KBA#6 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 7 August 2015).

87 Survey KBA#11 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

88 Survey KBA#24 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

89 Survey KBA#45 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

stating employment in fully positive terms, others more negatively noting that the site could be exploited more, and yet again others enviously describing the employment of a handful of ‘chosen ones.’ One of the issues with the community’s perception of benefits related to employment is that the original aim of the KBA, when it was first designed and developed, was to provide employment to the community. That has always been stated as one of the main aims for the Kalinago community of this community engagement process. However, over time, it has become clear that not every community member can economically benefit directly and in quantifiable ways from the existence of the KBA. This has created conflict and contention. During the meeting at the KBA when these survey results were presented, members of the new management team of the KBA stated that creating employment was not (anymore) a main goal for the museum. It was suggested to develop a new mission statement which could express its aims on the one hand for the Kalinago community and on the other hand for outside visitors. A mission with a clear goal for the Kalinago community, unrelated to economic gain or employment, may make it easier in the future to demonstrate communal benefits and outcomes.

Associations with the KBA

As part of the survey, respondents were asked to “please characterize the Kalinago Barana Autê in three *positive* keywords” and to then do the same exercise with three *negative* keywords. Many respondents initially needed help in answering the question, as they did not fully understand the way it was phrased. In these cases, I would prompt them by asking “how would you describe the KBA to someone in three positive words? The KBA is...” and then encourage the respondent to “say the first three words that pop into your mind.” I purposefully did not prompt the respondents by providing examples of keywords, to make sure respondents made their own associations.

The survey respondents overwhelmingly associated the KBA with positive keywords. Of all the respondents, only 6 did not answer the question. Most of the respondents mentioned two or three keywords, giving a total of 392 responses to this question (or 2.7 keywords per respondent). These keywords were manually counted for duplicates and then categories were identified (see figure 25). Any respondent could give up to three different words, but these could all be in same category, for instance they could all be ‘aesthetic’ keywords. The positive keyword most often associated with the KBA was ‘beautiful’ (36 respondents). Most of the keywords mentioned related to intrinsic values, meaning values that follow from a subjective experience of the site. The responses to this question reflect the responses to the question of the importance of the KBA for the community (see above). In both cases, responses are overwhelmingly positive and based on personal experiences. The positive keywords are more closely connected to their own visitation of the museum, reflecting their emotions and experiences of the site itself, personally and subjectively.

Many of the responses were linked to the aesthetic (90), experiential (65), recreational (39), and natural (38) qualities of the landscape and the site of the KBA. Aesthetically, community members commented on how the KBA is *beautiful*, *attractive*, and has a *wonderful view*. In the experiential category are keywords that are more general positive words of appreciation of the site, such as *nice*, *exciting*, and *interesting*. Related to the community’s recreational use of the site of the KBA are keywords such




Figure 25: Respondents' positive keywords for the Kalinago Barana Autê. In brackets the top keyword for each category.




Figure 26: Respondents' negative keywords for the Kalinago Barana Autê. In brackets the top keyword for each category.

as *relaxing*, *peaceful*, and *quiet*. Keywords specifically related to the natural aspects of the landscape were *natural*, *cool*, and *good location*. All of these keywords show the intrinsic values that community members place on the KBA, mostly related to their own experience of the site. These are therefore also clearly related to how the community uses the site: for recreational purposes in an aesthetically pleasing and experientially enjoyable place.

Respondents also noted cultural keywords (73), referring to the KBA as a *cultural*, *historical*, and *traditional* place. Many of these keywords related also to education, identity, and the preservation of heritage and ancestors. These values can be considered to be both intrinsic *and* instrumental, as on the one hand they reflect subjective experiences of the KBA (*e.g. traditional* or *authentic*) while on the other hand they refer to outcomes of the community engagement process of the KBA (*e.g. preserving* or *educational*). Many of the cultural keywords also refer to specific activities that take place at the KBA, such as the *local bread* and *delicious meals* which are made there, the opportunities to *learn different crafts* and the dancers who *help visitors dance to the music*.

A mix of intrinsic and instrumental values can also be found in the categories of touristic (21) and economic (19) keywords. Community members associated the KBA instrumentally as a place that is a *tourist attraction* and where they conduct *private tours*. Intrinsically, it is a *nice visit* and *good for visitors*. This is related to largely instrumental economic keywords such as *income*, *improvement*, *earning*, and *cash*. One respondent described the KBA by saying that it *helps us*, while another pointed out that it *enhances the reserve*. Both touristic and economic reasons were also given by respondents in relation to the questions of the importance and benefit of the KBA for the community. However, both of these categories are less represented in the positive keywords than they are as responses to those other questions. The phrasing of the question asking for positive keywords was more likely to have encouraged community members to consider their own visitation and experience of the site as the source for their responses. Thus, it is likely that mostly respondents who actually personally receive income or employment at the KBA would mention economic keywords, while other community members would use different keywords.

Finally, community members described the KBA in a few other intrinsic categories, noting its uniqueness (26), cleanliness (8) and the hospitable atmosphere (13). Community members subjectively experience the KBA to be *unique*, *special*, and an *icon* within the Territory and the world beyond. A few community members particularly pointed out that the experience of the site is enhanced by the *friendly staff*, and that the KBA is *welcoming* and *inviting*. Cleanliness was the smallest category, containing keywords such as *clean*, *tidy*, and *neat*.

Whereas almost all respondents were able to describe the KBA in positive keywords, the majority was unable to provide any negative keywords. Of all the respondents, 107 were unable or unwilling to say a single negative keyword, saying “I wouldn’t know anything negative to say about that.” Of those who did describe the KBA with negative keywords, this was often only one or two keyword(s). In total, 68 negative responses were given by 43 respondents, an average of 1.6 keywords per respondent. Just as with the positive keywords, words were manually counted for duplicates and separated into a number of categories (see figure 26). Several of these keywords were phrased as a “lack of..” or “poor...” implicitly stating how these perceived negative values could be countered or alleviated. Negative keywords were mainly related to instrumental values, where a lack of a specific outcome or state is perceived. It can be inferred that a majority of the Kalinago community does not have significant negative subjective experiences of the KBA and therefore chose not to answer this question.

Negative keywords were frequently directed towards the physical state of the site, referring to its development (21), accessibility (7), and issues of safety (7). Regarding the development of the site, respondents noted that the KBA *needs (some) improvements*, is *incomplete*, and *outdated*. Most of these comments were accompanied by suggestions for maintenance of the site and expansion of the KBA and its scope (see *Improvements for the KBA*, page 131). Negative keywords related to the accessibility of the KBA were all about the physical location of the site on the old coastal road and the difficulty of using the connecting access road from the new coastal road. Respondents noted that the KBA was *too far down*, *too far*, and that the road was *steep* making it a *tiring walk*. The issue of the access road is one that has also been discussed by the management of the KBA, with various solutions having been suggested over time

(more on this below). Regarding safety, a few respondents said that the KBA has *poor lighting*, that the *river crossing is difficult*, and that the site is *dangerous*. Most of these comments related to safety have to do with the fact that community members are used to using the site regardless of the weather or time of day. Therefore, they may have difficulty maneuvering the site after heavy rainfall or in the dark. Most of these negative keywords, as mentioned before, already imply solutions and are not expressed in overtly negative tones.

A few respondents offered negative keywords related to the content of the heritage of the KBA, categorized as educational values (9). These respondents said that the KBA *lacks information*, *lacks authenticity*, or *needs more pictures*. Although many of the community members do not often visit the KBA in the same manner as visitors from outside the community, some individuals still wish they could learn more from the site about their own culture. These comments were expressed by teens and young adults, for instance, who suggested that the KBA should have more information, more pictures, and more cultural elements.

Finally, community members stated negative keywords related to the business side of the KBA, about staffing (15), ownership (5), and profitability (4). Some members of the Kalinago community feel that the KBA has *poor management*, is *disorganized*, or that there is a *lack of communication* (for example between the management and the rest of the staff). Of course, issues of staffing and management are closely related to (or sometimes seen as responsible for) some of the other negative values mentioned above, such as the (lack of) development of the site or the perceived lack of information. These problems are also tied to the issue of ownership. I had assumed prior to this fieldwork that the governmental ownership of the KBA would be a major source of contention. However, only 5 respondents specifically stated that the KBA is *not enough self-managed* and that it is negative that the *government runs it*. A few respondents commented negatively on the profitability of the KBA, saying that it *doesn't make enough money* and that it is *slow as [the] season closes*. One of them felt that the KBA is *expensive* for visitors.

Improvements for the KBA

Although the members of the Kalinago community responded overwhelmingly with positive keywords associated with the KBA, of course this does not mean that they do not see room for improvement regarding the continued operation and existence of the site. Those respondents who provided negative keywords frequently phrased these in ways that already implied suggestions for improvement or problem-solving. Many respondents who did not want to give negative keywords, nonetheless provided suggestions for changes to the KBA. The survey asked respondents “is there anything you would like to see changed about the KBA?” and respondents could pick multiple options from a number of categories, add their own category, and elaborate on their suggestion(s). Respondents could also choose ‘nothing’ as their answer to this question. Of all the respondents, 45 said that they would not like to see anything changed about the KBA. In these cases, respondents either said they didn’t know of anything to change or that the KBA is nice or good the way it is. One respondent explained: “maybe as




Figure 27: Respondents' suggested improvements for the Kalinago Barana Autê.

time goes by, do some changes to better it up, but it is going on good.”⁹⁰ A majority of the respondents, 70%, suggested changes and many of them also suggested changes in other categories than those provided on the survey form (see figure 27). As respondents were able to elaborate, they often provided extensive details of the changes they proposed and how they felt these should be implemented. Some respondents provided a list of suggestions, others only suggested one change. In the remainder of this section, each category will be discussed one by one, with the category of ‘other’ responses being discussed last as this contains a multitude of different suggestions in itself.

In the category of activities (19), community members mostly suggested the addition of more activities or creating different activities. One respondent explained that “they should always have some new things, [now] every time people go it’s the same.”⁹¹ Another respondent agreed, saying the KBA should have “more live shows, educational meetings, more of an attraction, see [that] there’s always something to do.”⁹² A more specific suggestion was given by another respondent who said that “more cultural activities could be done at the site, especially shows for Carib week.”⁹³

Many of these suggestions were already known to the staff and management of the KBA and had been taken under consideration. The intention to add more activities to the cultural output of the KBA was expressed in the interview with the manager. However, he noted that all these plans must also be reviewed in terms of their financial viability.

One of the focus is to have more activities on the spot, on the facility. [...] we have been able to have the cassava bread circling on a fairly steady basis. We have engaged the dancers. Once the weavers are there, they do their thing, so that is not a problem. But there are other traditional activities we would love to have more, on a more steady basis, including the construction of a canoe. [...] because that is something that visitors always have an interest in, the construction of the canoe.

90 Survey KBA#83 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

91 Survey KBA#60 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

92 Survey KBA#98 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

93 Survey KBA#94 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

There are other activities that we are looking at, for example traditional fishing, the processing of all things such as cocoa and coffee, that sort of thing, so these are things we are looking at doing. And of course, other activities such as face painting, especially for the children, right, and storytelling.

Again they are brilliant ideas, very good ideas but the next challenge is the financing. Because while we would love to have all these things one time or today, but there appears to be financial implication. So we need to know that, I mean, we have the required financing to meet these costs, once we start engaging the people.⁹⁴

Some respondents suggested that the KBA could benefit from the addition of more objects (7) or archaeological artefacts. Currently, the museum mainly consists of the buildings of the model village, as well as the landscape, and the interpretive center. The latter contains panels with texts and images as well as some objects, all of which are ethnographic. One respondent said that the KBA should have “more historical stuff”⁹⁵ and another respondent echoed the sentiment, saying that they should “bring back the ancient things the Caribs used to use.”⁹⁶ Another respondent said that “they need a better museum with all the past chiefs and their personal items.”⁹⁷ The KBA could benefit from adding more objects to their collection and displays, whether these are archaeological artefacts (some of which are currently held in the capital, Roseau, while others are in museums overseas), more ethnographic materials, or historic objects belonging to ancestors and chiefs.

The buildings (24) were also suggested as a part of the KBA that could be changed. Some community members suggested the addition of new buildings, “maybe some guesthouses for people to overnight.”⁹⁸ However, responses were more often related to the maintenance of the current buildings. It is understood within the community that the current use of vetiver thatching on the roofs of the buildings is expensive to maintain. One respondent suggested that “shingles would last longer & improve the buildings.”⁹⁹ Another respondent, who has worked on maintaining the buildings, made a similar comment to switch to “more modern materials that still look traditional, [it] would need less maintenance.”¹⁰⁰ According to the manager, the maintenance of the buildings is currently one of the biggest consistent expenses of the KBA.

One of the questions I am usually asked is where in maintenance [...] do we spend all that money? Or so much money? Because we are using thatch, right, the local thatch, there is a challenge, right, because it takes [...] quite a bit of grass to cover the structures. And the lifespan, it's at the most about two-and-a-half to three years. So then you have to start changing that, and it is not one structure, it is several structures. So you see, when you add it up, it means that a significant

94 Interview with manager of *Kalinago Barana Autê* (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

95 Survey KBA#123 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

96 Survey KBA#114 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

97 Survey KBA#60 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

98 Survey KBA#82 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

99 Survey KBA#17 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

100 Survey KBA#1 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 31 July 2015).

*amount of money goes into that. [...] we are exploring different avenues in which the material that we use can be supported or where the lifespan can be extended with various techniques [...] keeping as close as possible to the traditions.*¹⁰¹

However, he pointed out that the current use of thatch actually provided indirect employment to members of the community. Certainly, changing the materials used on the roofs of the buildings would therefore affect the economic situation of the community as a result.

*All the thatch which is bought, it is purchased from the local residents, of the community. Because again given the demise of the agricultural sector in the community, once upon a time more than 90% of the revenue or the income of families in the community was generated [...] from the agriculture sector, primarily banana. But since [...] the collapse of the banana industry, it meant that a lot of people have become almost paralyzed as it were with regards to income generation. So [...] a number of residents in the community have seen the cultivation of the thatch as a very good avenue for them, where they could generate revenue for themselves. So it means that the more we can buy, the better for the residents.*¹⁰²

The staff (25) was another category in which respondents suggested change. Some respondents felt that the KBA should change “the amount of staff, [have] more people who know more about the culture.”¹⁰³ Several respondents specifically indicated that more young people should be working at the KBA, either to provide employment to this generation, “give young people more jobs to do,”¹⁰⁴ or to make them more invested in the community. To that extent, one respondent said that they should have “more young people helping the community & the KBA go further. [The] chief should encourage young people.”¹⁰⁵ Another respondent said that the staff should improve their internal cohesion and communication, “to come together as a whole with the staff and have meetings.”¹⁰⁶ Financial management of the KBA was also suggested for improvement. One respondent said that the KBA should change “the salary, especially [for] the guides.”¹⁰⁷ Another respondent was dissatisfied about the management saying that “they take too long to pay people who sell the vetiver, sometimes months.”¹⁰⁸ Thus, for some respondents negative personal experiences in dealing with (the management of) the KBA influenced their suggestions for improvements specifically, while other respondents made more general suggestions for the staff to expand or improve.

The entry fee (4) was not an issue to most of the respondents. This is understandable since the Kalinago community has free access to the site, so they are not confronted with a fee. Only a couple respondents considered the price that visitors pay: “I just find

101 Interview with manager of *Kalinago Barana Autê* (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

102 Interview with manager of *Kalinago Barana Autê* (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

103 Survey KBA#119 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

104 Survey KBA#138 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 16 August 2015).

105 Survey KBA#2 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 3 August 2015).

106 Survey KBA#6 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 7 August 2015).

107 Survey KBA#62 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

108 Survey KBA#16 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

that it's too high, it could attract a lot more if the price was lower.”¹⁰⁹ One respondent suggested that the entry price should also be free for Kalinago from other islands, such as Guadeloupe or St. Vincent, not only for those living on Dominica: “make it easy for Kalinago people to access, free for all Kalinago.”¹¹⁰

The guided tour (3) was brought up by only a few respondents as something that could be changed. Again, this is understandable as most community members do not take the tour when they visit the site. One respondent did elaborate on their suggestion to change the tour, saying that there should be “more tour guides who speak different languages.”¹¹¹

Closely related to the previous category, is that of the narrative (9) or story told at the KBA, mostly consisting of comments about the need for more cultural content. One respondent said that “more history [is] needed down there,”¹¹² another felt the same way that “they should have more aspects of the Kalinago.”¹¹³ Specifically, it was suggested that the KBA should have “more information and pictures, [to be] more in depth and about the culture.”¹¹⁴ A different suggestion was provided by another respondent who said that there should be “more information and plaques at various places, like at the cassava mill”¹¹⁵ This would allow visitors to visit the KBA by self-guided tour, following signs to information plaques, rather than with a tour guide. This suggestion was brought up during the presentation of the preliminary survey results. One of the community members asked whether visitors would be willing to pay the entry fee for the KBA if they did not receive a guided tour, a concern which was discussed collectively. While visitors may expect to have a guide when they are visiting museums as part of an organized tour or large group, many would not be surprised to visit without a guide if they come alone or in a small group. Thus, community members considered the potential benefits of a self-guided tour and of adding informative plaques throughout the route followed on the site and the management of the KBA will consider these possibilities in developing future plans.

Regarding visitors (5), respondents only commented on the fact that the KBA should have more visitors. One community member said that “we need more tourists,”¹¹⁶ another saying that “more visitors should visit the site.”¹¹⁷ Respondents did not make any suggestions regarding where visitors are coming from or if visitors are coming as part of tours or individually.

As mentioned, many respondents suggested changes that did not fit into one of the provided answer categories. These ‘other’ answers (60) are quite diverse, although some points were iterated by multiple respondents (see table 2). Some respondents stated a general need for improvements (7). One respondent said “the whole facility need improving.”¹¹⁸ Another felt that “they have it carelessly, [they must] keep it up to date

109 Survey KBA#8 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 7 August 2015).

110 Survey KBA#80 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

111 Survey KBA#81 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

112 Survey KBA#43 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 11 August 2015).

113 Survey KBA#61 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

114 Survey KBA#115 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

115 Survey KBA#148 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 18 August 2015).

116 Survey KBA#12 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

117 Survey KBA#92 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

118 Survey KBA#57 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

'Other' suggested improvements	Amount of times suggested
Access road/trails, wayfinding, bus system, wheelchair access	15
Marketing & visitors' expectations	14
More local foods/drinks/music/souvenirs, authenticity, less modernized	10
General improvement	7
Herbal garden	4
Stronger community bond	4
Employment	3
Expansion	3
Living experience	3
Local management	2
Ocean access	2
Implement a business plan	1
Improve the bridge over the river	1
Improve washrooms	1
More tours linked to the cruise ships	1
Open in the evenings	1
Organized craft association	1
Pipeline for fresh water	1
Zoo with parrots and peacocks	1

Table 2: 'Other' suggested improvements for the Kalinago Barana Autê.

and keep it interesting.”¹¹⁹ However, it was pointed out that “there is always place for improvement, but you need the financial collateral first.”¹²⁰ Other respondents more generally spoke about expanding (3) or enlarging the KBA. This was often also coupled to suggestions for more employment (3). A few suggestions were made only by single individuals, for instance to include a small zoo with peacocks and parrots or to organize a craft association for all the weavers. Other such suggestions were to install a fresh water pipeline, for use by the bathers, and to create more tours that link directly to visitors disembarking from the cruise ships. One respondent suggested improving the washroom, another commented on the bridge over the river that was slippery at times. One community member felt it would be nice if the site was also open (to visitors) in the evenings. Another felt that the current management of the KBA did not have an actual business plan in place and suggested that one be implemented.

Other suggestions were voiced by multiple respondents, such as the physical accessibility of the site (15). This is a serious and well-known concern, on the one hand for community members to walk down there and on the other hand for the visitors' coaches and buses. Many solutions have been offered over the years, such as creating a scenic route over the old coastal road, starting at the Salybia church. In the words of one respondent, the KBA should change “the road down there, people don't always

119 Survey KBA#79 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

120 Survey KBA#129 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

find the turn. [They should] improve the old coastal road from the north end.”¹²¹ Another suggested to use “maybe this road [from Jolly John] and open up the [old] coast road.”¹²² Wayfinding is also an issue, so it was suggested that the KBA should have “more signs to show the way.”¹²³ One respondent had noticed that “wheelchairs cannot go through it.”¹²⁴ Besides the fact that the current access “road is too steep,”¹²⁵ they should “upgrade the trails, they can be dangerous.”¹²⁶ The issue has been problematic since before the KBA was constructed.

*The accessibility to the facility is a major concern and again it shows one of our flaws in our planning. Because when that was being conceptualized it was never ever thought that coaster size vehicles would be transporting any passengers down here. [...] The thought was that only small cars would be coming down here so there was no need to have in place a two-lane type of road. And given the sharp corners that you have... So it is a major concern. Because I know there are drivers who have expressed to me that they are not driving down here. [...] There was consideration to connect the facility with another access road going straight across to the Salybia church. [...] But for whatever reason, the road was constructed where it is right now and it is just not the best point of access to the facility. Because, as I said, you have sharp corners, steep hills and deep drains, so that's a major challenge. [...] As to any immediate plan to enhance access, this would not be a distant dream.*¹²⁷

Second most mentioned in the category of ‘other’ improvements, were the marketing (14) and advertising of the KBA. A respondent noted that the KBA needs “more publicity, advertising. Let the wider world know what it’s all about.”¹²⁸ One of the members of staff said “perhaps, if I must say, the expectations of visitors: they think they will find Kalinago living in the village in the old ways.”¹²⁹ This point resonated with other staff members at the KBA when the preliminary survey results were presented. They discussed the reasons why visitors are sometimes disappointed when their expectations do not align with the reality of their visit. Staff and management agreed to reconsider how they brand the KBA and with what visual imagery they represent themselves, for instance on their website and Facebook page. Featuring photographs of the dancers in traditional clothes in the *karbay* creates certain expectations, while photos of a tour guide in regular clothes demonstrating the sugar cane press creates others.

The need to be more authentic and less modern was expressed by a number of respondents who suggested that the KBA should have more local foods, drinks, music,

121 Survey KBA#146 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 18 August 2015).

122 Survey KBA#108 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

123 Survey KBA#77 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

124 Survey KBA#64 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

125 Survey KBA#56 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

126 Survey KBA#99 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

127 Interview with manager of *Kalinago Barana Autê* (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

128 Survey KBA#11 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

129 Survey KBA#3 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 7 August 2015).

and souvenirs (10). As one respondent said, the KBA should have “more Indigenous flavor: music, food, and the guides in uniforms.”¹³⁰ Another respondent agreed that “the snackette must be more traditional and not American, using our local provisions. Only natural souvenirs.”¹³¹ Someone else suggested adding “hammocks made from natural materials.”¹³² In general, it was felt by these respondents that the KBA “should be really how they had it in the past (not modernized).”¹³³ Although management is not convinced about the need to implement some of these traditional elements, such as guides in traditional clothes, they do support the idea of providing visitors with more traditional cuisine.

*Even for some of the folks who we have operating here, they sometimes forget the image [...] that we are supposed to be portraying [...] One of the concerns that they [visitors] have, for example, is when they come, they don't get enough of the Kalinago cuisine. [...] while they like the food, the food is good, but they would have preferred if it was more traditional, something more Kalinago. And that is the reason why [...] we give them a complementary sampling of the cassava bread and a local herbal tea or local coffee or cocoa-tea. And that has been assessed very, very, very well.*¹³⁴

Related to the feeling that the KBA should become more authentically Kalinago, a few respondents suggested adding a garden (4). One respondent explained that the KBA “needs [a] vegetable garden, [and] grow the plants for the crafts.”¹³⁵ If the site would grow traditional plants, vegetables, and herbs, the KBA could provide the materials for the basketry and weaving on site as well as produce all the food and ingredients needed to cook local dishes and make local drinks in the snackette. Additionally, a few respondents felt that the KBA could offer more of a ‘living experience’ (3): “maybe have people living there in the traditional outfit.”¹³⁶ However, not everyone agrees that this would be a good idea, as it might confuse visitors even more if the model village becomes a living village.

A few individual respondents remarked on the fact that the KBA should build a stronger bond within the Kalinago community and not just provide services to visitors. One respondent said that the KBA should be “more community oriented.”¹³⁷ This suggestion was also discussed then the preliminary survey results were presented and received agreement from those present: the KBA should consider in what ways it can be of more relevance to the Kalinago community. One person present at the meeting suggested perhaps language lessons could be provided. Staff and management of the KBA are considering how they can include the Kalinago community into the mission of the KBA and create activities or programs that will support the community. In

130 Survey KBA#103 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

131 Survey KBA#80 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 13 August 2015).

132 Survey KBA#72 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

133 Survey KBA#61 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

134 Interview with manager of *Kalinago Barana Autê* (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

135 Survey KBA#104 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

136 Survey KBA#75 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

137 Survey KBA#45 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

line with one of the most common uses of the KBA by the Kalinago community for bathing, two respondents suggested improvements relating to the access to ocean. The KBA could “make the river more suitable for bathing and [provide] easier access to the ocean, maybe with steps and railings.”¹³⁸

The need for more local management was also raised during the survey, with a handful of respondents indicating that they felt the KBA should be governed locally. One respondent felt very passionately that “the Kalinago people have got to rise and take ownership of it.”¹³⁹ Another statement was clear that the KBA should have “people here more involved in running it and the government not being involved.”¹⁴⁰ Part of this desire for self-governance of the site is the fear that the government is benefitting financially from the KBA and the efforts of the Kalinago community, thus: “[it] should be managed by the Kalinago themselves, maybe the fund [income] is going to the government.”¹⁴¹ This concern has been voiced by community member before and was known to the manager.

The intention was always to pass over the facility to the people. [...] The sole reason why it has not yet been done it's [...] based upon the sustainability of the facility. [...] Because it is presently under the supervision of the Ministry of Tourism slash government, periodically when we have major works to be done or when there is a significant drop in revenue during the lull, it means that the Ministry of Tourism, government, will come in to meet the financial shortfall. [...] Because actually, all the revenue that the facility generates, it stays largely in the community. The revenue is spent on maintenance. Maintenance, staff salaries, the little promotion that can be done, so these are the primary areas that we spend the money.

Interviewer: “And those people who are employed in maintenance and so on, are from the community?”

Everything. The only finance that goes out of the Territory, it's utilities. [...]

Interviewer: “So there is no overhead profit or anything that goes back to the Ministry of Tourism?”

*No. Certainly not, certainly not. Actually we are very happy when we are able to meet our expenditures on the monthly basis and [...] we do not have to be calling in the government.*¹⁴²

Summary

Taking the Kalinago Barana Autê (KBA) as a case study of an ongoing Caribbean community engagement project, this chapter has attempted to provide and illustrate

138 Survey KBA#19 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

139 Survey KBA#144 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 18 August 2015).

140 Survey KBA#18 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 10 August 2015).

141 Survey KBA#58 (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 12 August 2015).

142 Interview with manager of *Kalinago Barana Autê* (Kalinago Territory, Dominica, 15 August 2015).

one possible answer to the sub question: “how are community engagement processes, including their value and outcomes, perceived by Caribbean communities?” (see *Research Questions and Objectives*, page 18). The KBA was a grassroots initiative by the Kalinago community in Dominica, planned by the community since the 1970s. It was ultimately funded, developed, and constructed by Dominica’s Ministry of Tourism and opened to the public in 2006. It is currently managed and staffed by members of the Kalinago community. As a participatory practice, the KBA can be characterized as an Indigenous grassroots initiative which was governmentally developed and is currently collaboratively operated.

Firstly, how is the *process* of the KBA perceived by the Kalinago community? The answer to this must be sought in the various statements and comments made by community members regarding the management or lack of local management of the KBA. Certainly, a number of respondents consider that the KBA in its current state is not independently financially viable and thus needs to remain under the Ministry of Tourism. Some community members felt that if the KBA were to be administered by the current chief and council, this would actually be detrimental to the museum. These individuals feel that the chief and council are not taking care of other community matters and thus adding the KBA to their responsibilities would be unwise. However, other members of the Kalinago community are convinced that the KBA should be entirely communally owned. For them, the community engagement project of the KBA remains incomplete until it is self-governed. It is important to note that this is also the intention of the government. When the plans for the KBA were created, a set of criteria were developed to measure financial and managerial viability. Once these criteria are met by the KBA management and the Kalinago chief and council, ownership of and responsibility for the KBA will be handed over to the community. However, as was indicated also by the manager, the KBA is now still dependent on occasional financial support. Ultimately, the process of the KBA is perceived to be working well according to the majority of the respondents. However, parts of the community would welcome local ownership of the heritage site – either now or in the future when financial viability has been achieved.

Secondly, how is the *value* of the KBA perceived by the Kalinago community? Focusing on intrinsic values, the Kalinago community is overwhelmingly positive about the KBA. These intrinsic values can be separated further into direct values, the results of the use of the site by the community members themselves, and indirect values, namely value for the community resulting from the use of the site by other visitors. The latter, indirect intrinsic values, can be characterized as the perceived importance of the KBA on a global scale, the prestige associated with such an attraction, and the value of creating global awareness of the existence of the Kalinago Indigenous community. Respondents frequently noted the importance of the KBA, its uniqueness, and the cultural qualities. These comments along with the perceived importance of the KBA as an attraction for visitors reveal such values.

The community attaches even greater importance to the direct intrinsic values of the KBA which are described more frequently and highly positively. Almost all members of the community habitually visit the site, revealing the importance of the KBA as a place for recreation and relaxation in an environment that is aesthetically and naturally appealing. The KBA is an important focal point of Kalinago cultural identity and helps

community members to strengthen their cultural awareness and maintain an ancestral connection. For the community, the site of the KBA was already a social gathering place in the past, but this has been aided by the construction of the model buildings and the creation of new social spaces. As such, it is an important tool in the facilitation of social cohesion, as a place where community members can meet, celebrate events, and conduct business. Thus, the intrinsic values of the KBA are perceived to be highly important and are greatly appreciated by the Kalinago community, even if not always on a conscious level.

Thirdly, how are the *outcomes* of the KBA perceived by the Kalinago community? Focusing on outcomes, and thus on instrumental values, the Kalinago community is much more conflicted about the KBA. On the one hand, the community recognizes that the KBA has succeeded in becoming a community hub where social events can be celebrated and business meetings can be held. It is also widely understood that the KBA has been instrumental in preserving certain aspects of Kalinago culture and has supported cultural preservation and education. However, the community is much more conflicted and divided when it comes to outcomes such as employment and income. It is understood that the visitors attracted to the KBA create direct employment opportunities (*i.e.* the staff at the KBA) as well as encourage other sources of income to the Kalinago Territory (*e.g.* craft vendors along the main road, guest houses). Nonetheless, members of the community feel that these sources of income are not benefitting the whole community or are unfairly distributed. While some people feel that in some way everyone benefits, others speak with envy. The shortfall of this outcome is particularly painful as the original aim of the KBA (when first stated in 1976) was to generate income and employment for the Kalinago.

Looking overall at the process, intrinsic values, and instrumental outcomes, it is clear that the KBA is not a finished community engagement project. There is room for improvement and a need to continue developing the project. As of 1st January 2016, the overall manager of the KBA was succeeded and, in addition, a new day-to-day manager was appointed together with a new administrative assistant. Thus, some changes have already taken place regarding the management structure of the KBA. The new management will have to consider and create a mission statement for the KBA that includes aims to fulfil the needs of the community *and* its visitors. Regarding visitors, the KBA will consider how to represent and brand itself, somewhere on the spectrum from traditional to modern. Additionally, the KBA will develop a stronger community focus, for instance on cultural transmission, linguistic preservation, or cultural sustainability. Currently, with income as the main goal, it is understandable that people are disappointed if their income has not (noticeably) increased. Ultimately, the KBA will need to work to become a financially viable organization, for instance by finding ways to reduce their maintenance expenses. If they reach such organizational sustainability, the community as a whole can collectively consider whether they wish to make the change towards self-regulation of the Kalinago Barana Autê and its independence from the Ministry of Tourism, as was always the plan.

